AGENDA FOR THE EXECUTIVE

Date: Monday, 3 September 2018
Time: 6.00 pm
Venue: Collingwood Room - Civic Offices

Executive Members:

Councillor S D T Woodward, Policy and Resources (Executive Leader)
Councillor T M Cartwright, MBE, Health and Public Protection (Deputy Executive Leader)
Councillor F Birkett, Housing
Councillor Miss S M Bell, Leisure and Community
Councillor K D Evans, Planning and Development
Councillor S D Martin, Streetscene
1. **Apologies for Absence**

2. **Minutes** (Pages 5 - 10)
   To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 09 July 2018.

3. **Executive Leader’s Announcements**

4. **Declarations of Interest**
   To receive any declarations of interest from members in accordance with Standing Orders and the Council’s Code of Conduct.

5. **Petitions**

6. **Deputations**
   To receive any deputations, of which notice has been lodged.

7. **Minutes / References from Other Committees**
   To receive any reference from the committees or panels held.

   **Matters for Decision in Public**

   *Note: Where an urgent item of business is raised in accordance with Part 3 of the Constitution, it will be considered with the relevant service decisions as appropriate.*

8. **Housing**
   Non-Key Decision

   (1) **Housing Revenue Account Borrowing Programme Funding Bid** (Pages 11 - 14)
       Report by the Managing Director of Fareham Housing and the Director of Finance and Resources.

9. **Streetscene**
   Non-Key Decision

   (1) **Single Use Plastic Policy** (Pages 15 - 26)
       A report by the Head of Streetscene.

10. **Health and Public Protection**
    Key Decision

    (1) **Air Quality - Outline Business Case and Consultation Proposals** (Pages 27 - 42)
        A report by the Director of Planning and Regulation.
11. Planning and Development

Non-Key Decision

(1) **Response to Draft Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan** (Pages 43 - 152)
A report by the Director of Planning and Regulation.

(2) **Custom and Self Build Strategy and Delivery Plan** (Pages 153 - 180)
A report by the Director of Planning and Regulation.

12. Policy and Resources

Key Decision

(1) **Locks Heath Memorial Hall Progress Report** (Pages 181 - 192)
A report by the Head of Leisure and Corporate Services.

(2) **Business Rate Retention Pilots 2019-20** (Pages 193 - 198)
A report by the Director of Finance and Resources.

Non-Key Decision

(3) **Daedalus Gate Guardian** (Pages 199 - 208)
A report by the Head of Leisure and Corporate Services.

(4) **Review of Policy Development and Review Panels and Scrutiny Board Meetings** (Pages 209 - 228)
A report by the Head of Democratic Services.

P GRIMWOOD
Chief Executive Officer

[Website Link]
29 August 2018

For further information please contact:
Democratic Services, Civic Offices, Fareham, PO16 7AZ
Tel: 01329 236100
democraticservices@fareham.gov.uk
Minutes of the Executive
(to be confirmed at the next meeting)

Date: Monday, 9 July 2018
Venue: Collingwood Room - Civic Offices

Present:
S D T Woodward, Policy and Resources (Executive Leader)
F Birkett, Housing
Miss S M Bell, Leisure and Community
K D Evans, Planning and Development
S D Martin, Streetscene

Also in attendance:
Mrs C L A Hockley, Chairman of Leisure & Community Policy, Development and Review Panel; for item 8(1)
J S Forrest, for item 10(4)
1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

   Apologies for absence were received from Councillor T M Cartwright, the Executive Member for Health and Public Protection.

2. **MINUTES**

   RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 04 June 2018 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

3. **EXECUTIVE LEADER’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

   The Executive Leader advised the Executive that on Tuesday 26 June the Secretary of State announced a programme to stimulate new council housebuilding, by allowing Councils in areas with the highest affordability pressures for homes, including Fareham, to bid for an increase in its borrowing cap. This means that, if successful, the Council would be allowed to take on more debt to build new council houses.

   £1 billion of new borrowing is being made available, with half of this open to bids from Councils outside of London. The programme is for 3 years from 2019-2022 and successful bids would enable loans to be drawn down from April 2019.

   As the delivery of affordable homes is a corporate priority for the Council, the Executive Leader has asked officers to prepare a number of bids to be submitted by the deadline of 7 September 2018.

   The Minister also announced that Councils would be able to increase housing rents again from 2020. This would allow rents to increase by Consumer Price Index +1% each year and could increase rental income for the Housing Revenue Account by £400,000 per year. This is another positive step as rents will be able to support our investment in new council houses.

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

   Councillor Miss S Bell, Executive Member for Leisure and Community, declared a Personal Interest for item 8(2) – Citizen of Honour Award Scheme – Special Group Achievement Category, as she is the Council appointed representative to the One Community board.

5. **PETITIONS**

   There were no petitions submitted at this meeting.

6. **DEPUTATIONS**

   There were no deputations made at this meeting.

7. **MINUTES / REFERENCES FROM OTHER COMMITTEES**

   Planning Committee - 20 June 2018
Minute 10 – Neighbour Notification Policy

The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning and Regulation on the proposed revisions to the Council’s policy on the publicity of planning applications.

RESOLVED that the Committee:-

(a) notes the proposals the Director of Planning and Regulation is making to the Executive in respect of publicity for planning and similar applications; and

(b) recommends to the Executive that the proposed Community Notification Scheme (CNS) be endorsed, when it considers this item at its meeting on 09 July 2018.

A report on this matter is at item 9(1) of the agenda

8. LEISURE AND COMMUNITY

(1) Ferneham Hall

At the invitation of the Executive Leader, Councillor Mrs CLA Hockley addressed the Executive on this item.

RESOLVED that the Executive agrees that:

(a) Ferneham Hall remains in its current location within the Civic Quarter;

(b) the vision for Ferneham Hall, attached as Appendix A to the report, is approved;

(c) the business plan created by AEA Consulting is refreshed and updated, excluding details of the Ashcroft Arts Centre, to ensure that all of the relevant data is available to make an informed decision going forward;

(d) a procurement process be undertaken to identify a Leisure Trust operator as a partner, prepared to support the development of the new facility, including securing external sources of funding where appropriate, then managing the new facility in the future;

(e) Ferneham Hall is closed in late 2019 to enable construction works to be undertaken;

(f) the construction works are undertaken in three phases. The first phase would include the remodelling of Ferneham Hall, demolishing the Octagon Lounge and opening up the foyer area. The second phase would focus on the secondary theatre. The third phase would be the dance studio;

(g) in principle, the costs of phase one of the project be funded from the Community Infrastructure Levy and external funding where possible, with full project cost to be reported to the Executive later this year.
Funding of the latter phases of work would be subject to a further report, once an operator has been selected;

(h) delegated authority be given to the Director of Finance and Resources, following consultation with the Executive Member for Leisure and Community, to utilise an initial sum of £100,000 to enable expenditure on fees covering aspects such as surveys, building redesign, further market research, the preparation of a planning application and project management.

(i) a member working group be established to oversee the design and construction of the project, chaired by the Executive Member for Leisure and Community, to include four other members: Councillors TM Cartwright, MJ Ford, T Davies and Mrs KK Trott. The final design and costs will require the approval of the Executive prior to seeking planning permission; and

(j) options for naming the new venue be presented to a future meeting of the Executive.

(2) Citizen of Honour Award Scheme - Special Group Achievement Category

Councillor Miss S Bell, Executive Member for Leisure and Community, declared a Personal Interest for this item, as she is the Council appointed representative to the One Community board. Councillor Miss Bell confirmed that she has not attended any of the board’s meetings as yet.

Councillor Miss Bell remained in the room, taking part in the debate and the decision for this item.

RESOLVED that the Executive approves:

(a) the creation of the Special Group Achievement Award to recognise community groups, voluntary organisations and charities that have made outstanding contributions to the lives of residents;

(b) the proposed arrangements for deciding and granting the Special Group Achievement Award, as set out in the report from paragraph 5; and

(c) that the first Special Group Achievement Award be presented to One Community.

9. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

(1) Proposed Revisions to The Council's Policy on the Publicity of Planning applications

The recommendation from the Planning Committee was taken into account when determining this item (see minute 7 above).

RESOLVED that the Executive:
(a) approves the Community Notification Scheme as set out within Appendix B to this report;

(b) agrees that this Scheme comes into effect from Monday 23 July 2018; and

(c) agrees that any representations received without a valid full name and postal address being provided, will not be taken into account when determining planning or similar applications.

10. POLICY AND RESOURCES

(1) Fareham Civic Quarter Regeneration Proposals

RESOLVED that the Executive approves a budget of £275,000 to facilitate procurement of a dedicated resource to masterplan and programme manage delivery of the phases comprising the Fareham Civic Quarter Regeneration project and to undertake surveys and technical reviews for the progression of more detailed designs and programming for the Fareham Civic Quarter Regeneration project.

(2) General Fund and Housing Revenue Account Outturn 2017/18

RESOLVED that the Executive:

(a) approves the carry forward of £335,900 to fund the completion of the General Fund expenditure programmes in 2017/18, as contained in the report;

(b) approves that an overspend of £478,000 from the HRA Capital account is rolled forward to correct budget phasing to support the future programme in 2018/19; and

(c) notes the contents of the report.

(3) Capital and Treasury Management Outturn 2017/18

RESOLVED that the Executive:

(a) approves that the General Fund capital programme for 2017/18 be approved and financed as set out in this report;

(b) agrees that the additional expenditure incurred, amounting to £133,275 be financed retrospectively from surplus capital resources; and

(c) notes the treasury management activity for 2017/18.

(4) Sale of Land to HCC at Daedalus for Stubbington Bypass

At the invitation of the Executive Leader, Councillor J Forrest addressed the Executive on this item.
RESOLVED that the Executive approves the terms agreed with Hampshire County Council as shown on the confidential Appendix A attached to this report.

(The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 6.31 pm).
Portfolio: Housing; and Policy and Resources
Subject: Housing Revenue Account Borrowing Programme Funding Bid
Report of: Managing Director of Fareham Housing and Director of Finance and Resources
Corporate Priorities: Providing Housing Choices

Purpose:
To agree the principle of the Council submitting a bid for additional Housing Revenue Account borrowing.

Executive summary:
At the end of June 2018, the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government announced the availability of additional Housing Revenue Account (HRA) borrowing funds for ‘high affordability pressures areas’. High affordability pressure areas are those where the average weekly cost of private rent is £50 or more than the average cost of social rent. Fareham borough is one of many authorities in England where this applies.

£500 million of additional borrowing is available outside of London between 2019/20 and 2021/22. With the Council’s Corporate priority of ‘Providing Housing Choices’ the availability of the additional HRA borrowing could provide an important opportunity to enable the delivery of additional affordable homes on Council owned (or potentially owned) sites.

Bids for additional HRA borrowing must be site specific and include certain criteria and information. The bids must be submitted by 7th September 2018.

This report seeks Executive approval for the principle of bidding for this additional borrowing, with the total amount bid for not exceeding £13million. The final bids will be submitted by the Managing Director of Fareham Housing and based on the detailed information required for each site/bid, including the expected development costs and borrowing required. This can vary depending on the individual site, affordable tenure and other matters. It is not expected to exceed £13million.

It should be noted that this is a decision to approve the principle of bidding for money and not a decision to accept or use any funds that may subsequently become available.
**Recommendation:**
It is recommended that the Executive agrees to delegate authority to the Managing Director of Fareham Housing to submit bids for additional borrowing of up to £13million to the Ministry of Housing, Community and Local Government under the Housing Revenue Account Borrowing Programme (2019/20, 2020/21, and 2021/22) by the deadline of 7th September 2018.

**Reason:**
To seek Executive approval for the principle of the total bid(s) to be submitted, as per a requirement of the bid submission process.

**Cost of proposals:**
The costs of bid submission are covered in existing operational budgets of Fareham Housing and Finance and Resources.

**Appendices:**
None

**Background papers:**
Corporate Strategy 2017-2023

**Reference papers:**
Additional Housing Revenue Account Borrowing Programme (2019-20, 2020, 21, and 2021/22) – Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (June 2018)


Report to the Executive for Decision 09 April 2018 – Affordable Housing Schemes – Progress Report
INTRODUCTION

1. At the end of June 2018, the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government announced the availability of additional Housing Revenue Account (HRA) borrowing funds for ‘high affordability pressures areas’. High affordability pressure areas are those where the average weekly cost of private rent is £50 or more than the average cost of social rent. Fareham borough is one of many authorities in England where this applies.

HRA BORROWING BIDS

2. The limitations on borrowing against the Councils HRA were referred in a report to Executive on 9th April 2018. In that report it was explained that the existing borrowing headroom would not support the delivery of new homes at all six sites referred to in that report.

3. Although there may be other alternative delivery mechanisms to using the HRA for new Council home delivery (such as Aspect and other partnerships) it is appropriate to consider and embrace all potential funding opportunities and this includes this new opportunity for additional HRA borrowing.

4. Additional information relating to the bid process, including the bid submission form, was made available in July. Some key information about the bid process is provided below:
   - £500million of additional borrowing is available outside of London
   - The additional borrowing is available over a three-year period; 2019/20, 2020/21 and 2021/22
   - Bids must be submitted by 7th September 2018
   - Bids must be for new homes (i.e. not conversions etc.)
   - Bids must be for homes delivered by Fareham Housing/the Council (i.e. not in conjunction with other delivery partners)
   - Bids must be site specific, each requiring certain detailed information on matters
such as site location, tenures, projected delivery, costs, ownership status, etc.
  o The homes must be for social/affordable rent or shared ownership

5. Officers intend to submit bids for the following sites:
   o Hampshire Rose/Highlands Road (Fareham North West)
   o 123 Bridge Road (Sarisbury)
   o Stubbington Lane (Hill Head)
   o Sea Lane (Hill Head)
   o Station Road (Portchester East)
   o Wynton Way (Fareham North West)
   o 335-337 Gosport Road (Fareham East)
   o Former Scout Hut (Coldeast) (Park Gate)

6. These sites are considered to meet the bid criteria and there is sufficient information for each site to enable a bid to be made. The bid process allows for recognition of the ownership status of the sites as well as planning status and projected delivery.

7. The former Scout Hut at Coldeast has not previously been referred to in Executive Reports. This is a new site to the list on the basis of an expected transfer of the site (with outline planning approval) from Homes England that is likely to take place in the coming months.

8. The maximum amount to be bid for will not exceed £13million. Depending on more detailed bid preparation Officers expect that this amount could be less but are seeking Executive approval for the principle of bidding for additional borrowing of up to £13million.

9. This is the first stage in a process intended to ultimately provide more affordable housing in the borough. Seeking and maximising funding initiatives and availability is key so that the Council can then consider the most appropriate and/or financially sustainable way in which these new homes can be funded and delivered. It is therefore appropriate that the opportunity to bid for this additional HRA borrowing is utilised.

NEST STEPS

10. Officers will submit bids before the 7th September deadline. Updates on the success or otherwise of the bid process will be advised to the Housing Policy Development and Review Panel. There is no specific date yet advised as to when bids will be confirmed as successful or not.

Enquiries:
For further information on this report please contact:

Paul Doran, Managing Director of Fareham Housing (Ext 4572)
Andy Wannell, Director of Finance and Resources (Ext 4620)
**Portfolio:** Streetscene  
**Subject:** Single Use Plastic Policy  
**Report of:** Head of Streetscene  
**Corporate Priorities:** Protect and Enhance the Environment

**Purpose:**  
To agree the Council’s Single Use Plastic Policy and Communications plan.

**Executive summary:**  
A notice of motion was considered by Council on 23 February 2018 in relation to the Council’s use of single use plastic (SUP). Council agreed to review Fareham Borough Council’s use of SUP and develop a strategy to phase out their use within the Council’s offices and buildings as quickly as it is reasonably practicable to do so.

An officer working group was formed and subsequently completed an audit of the main Council buildings. The Council has an extensive range of buildings in its ownership, but in respect of the policy, the scope was confined to buildings where the majority of the Council’s workforce is located and the high profile public buildings.

The information gathered in the audit has been used to prepare a series of policy statements which are set out in this report. These policy statements have been developed with the aim of phasing out SUP in Council buildings by 2020.

The proposed name for the policy is ‘Give Plastic the Push’. A communications plan has been developed to help educate residents, businesses, Council staff and elected members about ways to help reduce the use of SUP. The implementation of the plan will be supported by a SUP Coordinator who will attend community events, visit businesses and schools to promote the policy and advise on ways to reduce SUP use.

There will be a range of ‘Give Plastic the Push’ promotional material including signs on the side of the Council’s refuse and recycling vehicles, a promotional banner for events, and branded reusable coffee mugs and reusable drinking water bottles. Posters and leaflets will be available for distribution at key strategic sites around the Borough and the key messages for residents will be included in the bin collection Christmas calendar.
The policy statements and communications plan have been presented to the Streetscene Policy Development and Review Panel and were fully supported by the members of the panel.

**Recommendation/Recommended Option:**

It is recommended that the Executive approves:

(a) the Council’s single use plastic policy ‘the Push’ as set out in paragraph 20 of the report, and

(b) the Communications Plan to promote the policy.

**Reason:**

To address the actions arising from the Notice of Motion submitted to Council on 23 February 2018 in relation to the Council's use of single use plastic (SUP).

**Cost of proposals:**

The cost of the communications plan to promote single use plastic policy is £10,000 which can be met from existing revenue budgets.

**Appendices:**

A: Give Plastic the Push Branding  
B: Communications Material for Residents & Businesses  
C: Communications Plan Costs  

**Background papers:**


**Reference papers:**  
None
INTRODUCTION

1. A motion was submitted by Councillor Martin to Council on 23 February 2018 in relation to the Council’s use of single use plastic (SUP). The motion, as agreed, was that the Council will review its use of “single use plastic” and develop a strategy to phase out their use within the Council’s offices and buildings as quickly as it is reasonably practicable to do so.

2. The Council requested that the Streetscene Policy Development and Review Panel leads a review and researches the following additional actions:

   i. Commence a programme to end all sales of SUP bottles in Council buildings and the use of plastic drinking straws by the end of 2018;

   ii. Plan the replacement of drinks machines that meet the Council’s strategy as they come to the end of their current contracts, providing water stations for staff as required;

   iii. Develop an education programme within the borough to encourage businesses, restaurants and bars to phase-out SUP glasses, bottles, cutlery and straws and encourage reusable or deposit scheme cups;

   iv. Develop an education policy to encourage, promote and assist employees and councillors to move towards finding alternatives to “single use plastic”;

   v. Roll out this Education programme to the residents of Fareham;

   vi. Develop an Officers working group to develop the strategy and provide regular reports on progress to the Streetscene Panel.

BACKGROUND

3. Single-use plastic, or disposable plastics, are used only once before they are thrown away or recycled. These items are things like plastic bags, straws, coffee stirrers, fizzy drinks and water bottles and most plastic food packaging.
4. Approximately 300 million tons of plastic is produced each year and half of it is disposable. World-wide only 10% of plastic items are recycled. The nature of petroleum based disposable plastic makes it difficult to recycle and new virgin materials and chemicals must be added to it to do so. Additionally, there are a limited number of items that can be made from recycled plastic.

SUP PROJECT TEAM

5. A group of officers were invited to join the project team to research the different actions and help shape the Council’s single use plastic policy. This group is made up of representatives from Leisure & Community, Streetscene, Estates, Communications, Civic Offices and Finance. These officers were invited to join the group as they have knowledge of where and how SUP is currently being used in Council buildings.

SINGLE USE PLASTIC – KEY AREAS

6. The initial work of the project team was to understand where SUP is currently being used in Council buildings. The Council has an extensive range of buildings in its ownership, but in respect of the policy, the scope was confined to buildings where the majority of the Council’s workforce is located and the high profile public buildings. This included the following:

i. Civic Offices
ii. Broadcut Depot
iii. Ferneham Hall
iv. Fareham & Holly Hill Leisure Centre (Managed by Everyone Active)
v. Westbury Manor Museum (Managed by Hampshire Cultural Trust)

7. The following provides a short summary of the findings from the investigation into current SUP use in the Council buildings included in the scope. As well as identifying current SUP use, there are also proposals for alternative arrangements to phase out or mitigate SUP use.

8. Civic Offices has limited SUP use with the main issue identified being the hot drink vending machines in the meeting rooms which dispense plastic cups. Wooden stirrers are available and the catering in the Mayor’s parlour utilises steel knives and forks and ceramic cups and plates. Chilled drinking water points for staff are available in all the kitchenettes on each floor of the building. There is some use of bottled water for large civic events but these bottles are collected and recycled as part of the recycling collection arrangements for the building. There is some use of plastic containers and packaging for the sandwich delivery service and there will be further discussions about alternative packaging going forward.

9. Westbury Manor Museum is managed by Hampshire Cultural Trust who have a strong ethos of using reusable and recyclable products. The Trust is committed to reducing waste and increasing recycling. Although Hampshire Cultural Trust does not have a policy on SUP, Westbury Manor Museum is keen to work with the Council on a SUP policy. The café does not supply straws with drinks made on the premises, and all adult drinks are sold in glass bottles, washable cups and glasses. The take-away coffee cups are SUP, though the sales of this product are very low. However, the childrens’ drinks that the shop stocks (Innocent, Fruit Shoot) contain plastic straws or are sold in plastic bottles.
10. Fareham and Holly Hill Leisure Centre are managed under contract by Everyone Active who have environmental policies and recycling arrangements in place but not a specific SUP policy. Fareham Leisure Centre has a café that currently uses plastic straws, stirrers and cutlery. However, Everyone Active has already made the commitment to stop using SUP straws and stirrers and is limiting plastic cutlery to customers who request them when taking food off site. They are looking at ways to eliminate plastic cutlery and introducing reusable cups for takeaway teas and coffee. There are several vending machines at both centres that dispense drinks in plastic bottles but all these are recyclable. Both leisure centres have robust arrangements in place for recycling including bins for segregated recycling, so all plastic bottles collected on site are sent for recycling.

11. Ferneham Hall bar & café have been using a range of SUP including straws, stirrers and disposable cups for consumption of drinks in the auditorium. However, they are going to stop using SUP straws and stirrers and are investigating alternatives to SUP glasses such as hard plastic reusable alternatives. They have hot drink vending machines that dispense plastic cups and vending machines that dispense plastic bottles. There are no recycling facilities in place although these are currently being considered.

12. Broadcut Depot has limited SUP use except for the vending machines in the staff rest area. Chilled mains fed drinking water is available in the staff kitchen and has also been installed in the rest area. This will mean a significant reduction in the consumption of plastic cups used to vend chilled drinking water from the vending machine.

13. Hot Drinks Vending Machines in the Civic Offices, Broadcut Depot and Ferneham Hall use SUP cups which are not recycled. The vending supplier is currently looking at alternative recycled material for the cups but has given no indication when this might be available. The current contract expires in 2020 and the cost of an early termination of the contract is £6,000. There is agreement from the different service areas that a vending operation that uses non-SUP cups will be procured when the current contract expires.

14. Plastic Bottle Vending is not available at the Civic Offices or Broadcut Depot. Drinks in plastic bottles are sold and dispensed via vending machines in the Leisure Centres, Westbury Manor Museum and Ferneham Hall. All the bottles in question can be recycled and there are appropriate collection arrangements in place at each of the properties. The only exception being Ferneham Hall which is currently considering introducing recycling collection arrangements.

15. Catering Concessions are in place at several locations across the Borough. There are four summer ice cream concessions and two winter hot food concessions which have licenses that are renewed every three years and are due to be re-tendered in 2019. The proposal is to include a clause in the licence that requires the licensee to be SUP free in line with the Council’s SUP policy. There is a lease for the catering concession at Monks Hill, known as the Shack, which expires in 2021. The proposal is to include a clause in the lease that requires the licensee to be SUP free in line with the Council’s SUP policy. The Daedalus café has a new licence for 12 months and the licensee has already made a commitment to be SUP free going forward.

16. Other Areas have been identified by the project team at several Council owned buildings that are managed via long term lease arrangements. These are either leased by commercial companies or not for profit organisations, such as community
associations. These have not been included in the scope of the detailed investigation as they are governed by long term lease arrangements but there is an opportunity to encourage the leaseholders to sign up to the Council’s SUP policy. Longer term, when the lease is renewed, the proposal is to include a clause relating to the Council’s SUP policy in the new lease agreement where appropriate.

**SINGLE USE PLASTIC POLICY**

17. The investigations into current SUP use have been undertaken in accordance with the actions defined in the notice of motion. These investigations have highlighted where SUP is being used in Council buildings and in some other areas where the Council has arrangements in place with external organisations.

18. Based on these findings, actions were developed which form the draft Fareham Borough Council policy statement on the use of SUP. The aim being that implementing this policy will set out the principle actions to phase out SUP in Council buildings.

19. These actions were debated by the Streetscene Policy Development & Review Panel when the findings of the investigation into the use of SUP in Council buildings were presented to the Panel meeting on 7 June 2018. There was unanimous endorsement of the actions from the members of the panel.

20. The following sets out the principle actions that will form the basis of the Council’s Single Use Plastic Policy:

   i. Stop using plastic straws and stirrers in Council buildings by the end of 2018;
   
   ii. Implement non-SUP cups in the hot drink vending machines in the Civic Offices, Broadcut Depot and Ferneham Hall, if an alternative becomes available or install machines with non-SUP cups when the contract expires in 2020;
   
   iii. No sale of drinks from SUP bottles in the Civic Offices and Broadcut Depot and seek suitable alternative arrangements at Fareham and Holly Hill Leisure Centres, Westbury Manor Museum and Ferneham Hall to phase out the sale of drinks from SUP bottles by 2020;
   
   iv. Implement recycling bins with appropriate arrangements for collection and recycling at Council buildings where recyclable plastic bottles are sold or used, by the end of 2018;
   
   v. Ensure all staff who work in the Civic Offices, Broadcut Depot and Ferneham Hall have access to appropriate mains fed drinking water facilities by the end of 2018;
   
   vi. Where appropriate, leases and licences for catering concessions, commercial properties and community centres, will include a clause requiring the organisation to reduce the use of SUP in line with the Council’s policy. These arrangements will be introduced when the lease/licence is renewed, where appropriate;
   
   vii. Reduce the use of goods that contain excessive plastic packaging and containers and include the reduction of SUP packaging as a criterion in the procurement of goods and services going forward, where appropriate;
   
   viii. Make it easier for residents to recycle by seeking ways in which a wider
range of plastics and other dry recyclable materials can go in the blue top bins.

SINGLE USE PLASTIC POLICY COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

21. The notice of motion made specific reference to the requirement to promote the SUP message to the key groups, elected members and employees of the Council, residents and business in the Borough of Fareham.

22. To help promote the Council's SUP policy, the officer working group developed a strap line for the policy ‘Give Plastic the Push’. This is supported with a campaign logo incorporating the ‘Give Plastic the Push’ strap line which can be seen in Appendix A.

23. A SUP page on the Council's internal intranet pages commenced in June 2018 and was a key feature in the Chief Executive Officers e-bulletin. This provided Council employees with updates on progress with the development of the SUP policy and hints and tips on how to reduce the use of SUP. Plans are in place to publish similar information in the Members Newsletter and to provide information about the work of external organisations.

24. A series of five key messages aimed at reducing SUP have been developed to target residents and businesses. These have been reproduced in graphic form, incorporating the ‘Give Plastic the Push’ logo and branding. Examples of these can be seen in Appendix B but a summary of the messages is as follows:

Residents

- Say no to disposable straws and cutlery;
- Carry a reusable water bottle;
- Bring your own cup;
- Bring your own shopping bag;
- Skip the plastic produce bags.

Businesses

- Offer to fill reusable water bottles for free;
- No more single-serving plastic sachets;
- Stop serving drinks with plastic straws;
- Provide reusable cutlery and crockery;
- Cut down on plastic packaging.

25. To effectively promote the SUP policy to residents and businesses alike, the proposal is to employ a SUP coordinator for three days a week for a period of six months. The role of the coordinator will be to attend community events and to visit businesses and schools to promote the policy and advise on ways to reduce SUP use.

26. There will be a range of ‘Give Plastic the Push’ promotional material including signs on
the side of the Council’s refuse and recycling vehicles, promotional banners for events, branded reusable coffee mugs and reusable drinking water bottles. Posters and leaflets will be available for distribution at key strategic sites around the Borough and the key messages for residents will be included in the bin collection Christmas calendar.

27. The proposed Communications Plan for the Single Use Plastic Policy was presented to the Streetscene Policy Development & Review Panel on 12 July. The members of the panel fully endorsed the plan.

28. The cost of the Communications Plan is £10,000. A detailed breakdown can be seen in Appendix C.

RISK ASSESSMENT

29. There are no significant risk considerations in relation to this report

CONCLUSION

30. The investigations carried out by the project team have identified where there is currently SUP use in the main Council buildings. In many cases there are alternative arrangements that can implemented and there is already a strong commitment to reduce SUP from Council staff and the organisations that mange the public buildings. Therefore, the Council is in a good position to respond positively to the actions identified in the notice of motion.

31. A series of policy statements and a communications plan to promote these have been developed by the SUP team. These proposals have been presented to the Streetscene Policy Development and Review Panel and fully endorsed by the members of the panel.

32. There will be ongoing monitoring of the progress made with the implementation of the SUP policy which will be reported to the Streetscene Policy & Development Review Panel.

Enquiries:
For further information on this report please contact Mark Bowler. (Ext 4420)
Appendix B – Communications Material for Residents

5 TIPS

1. Say no to disposable straws and cutlery

2. Carry a reusable water bottle

3. Bring your own cup

4. Bring your own shopping bag

5. Skip the plastic produce bags

www.fareham.gov.uk/gptp

FAREHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL
5 TIPS FOR YOUR BUSINESS

1. Offer to fill reusable water bottles for free

2. No more single-serving plastic sachets

3. Stop serving drinks with plastic straws

4. Provide reusable cutlery and crockery

5. Cut down on your plastic packaging

FAREHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

www.fareham.gov.uk/gptp
## Appendix C – Communication Plan Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUP Coordinator – 3 days a week for 6 months.</td>
<td>£7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 SUP logo branded reusable coffee mugs and Water Bottles</td>
<td>£600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic design work for logos posters and leaflets</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Costs</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop -up promotional banner</td>
<td>£300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse &amp; Recycling Vehicles banner</td>
<td>£400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£10,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report to the Executive for Decision
03 September 2018

Portfolio: Health and Public Protection
Subject: Air Quality – Outline Business Case and Consultation Proposals
Report of: Director of Planning and Regulation
Corporate Priorities: Protect and Enhance the Environment
A Safe and Healthy Place to Live and Work

Purpose:
This report has a dual purpose. The first is to provide a progress update to the Executive on the continuing works to meet the requirements of the compliance Directive which was issued to the Council by the Department for the Environment, Food & Rural Affairs on 27 July 2017 in respect of Air Quality. The second is to obtain authority from the Executive to undertake a public consultation on those measures that are being considered for submission as part of the Outline Business Case. If approved by JAQU at that stage, the measures will be presented as part of the Final Plans/ Final Business Case to be submitted before the end of the year. Following public consultation, the results of that consultation will be brought back to the Executive with the Outline Business Case in late October for approval for submission to JAQU.

Executive summary:
On 27 July 2017, the Department for the Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) issued a Compliance Directive on Fareham Borough Council, along with the other (22) Authorities that were listed. This Direction required the authority to undertake, and submit by 31 March 2018, a Feasibility Study (Initial Plan/Strategic Outline Case). This was completed and the Strategic Outline Case submitted under delegated authority granted by the Executive following a report to its January 2018 meeting. This case set out a list of options which, if implemented, could make a positive difference to Air Quality within the study area. Since March officers have been working with consultants towards identifying exactly what the likely exceedance would be and also refining the option or options which will deliver compliance with legal limits. The authority must also submit a Final Plan/ Final Business Case by 31 December 2018 which must identify the preferred option or options to deliver compliance. Prior to this an Outline Business Case needs to be submitted to JAQU, this is likely to be ready towards the end of October. This report therefore seeks to obtain Executive approval to carry out a consultation on the current list of measures for six weeks from 4 September 2018 to the 8 October 2018. The results of the consultation and the Outline Business Case would then need to be brought to the Executive for approval in time for submission on 24 October 2018.
**Recommendation:**
It is recommended that the Executive approves the proposed consultation on the current list of Air Quality Improvement measures detailed in APPENDIX C.

**Reason:**
Before implementing any policies that would affect such a large proportion of the community, the Council should consult. Although the basis for this sits within Case Law, in this particular case it would be useful to understand the priority the general public would attach to each of the measures, to inform the final list and to also understand if there are any additional measures that could implemented over the course of 2019, that have been overlooked.

**Cost of proposals:**
There are no costs associated with this proposal as the Joint Air Quality Unit are funding this work.

**Appendices:**
- A: Air Quality study area
- B: Fleet Composition 2021
- C: List of measures
- D: Project Timeline

**Background papers:** None

**Reference papers:** None
INTRODUCTION

1. In November 2016, the non-profit environmental law organisation ClientEarth won a Supreme Court ruling against the Government. The ruling ordered ministers to come up with a plan to bring down air pollution levels within the UK to fall within legal limits as soon as possible.

2. The latest plan, “The UK plan for tackling roadside nitrogen dioxide concentrations” was published in July 2017. Fareham Borough Council was highlighted as one of the Authorities required to produce a targeted local plan to tackle likely exceedances of Nitrogen dioxide levels.

3. The area of likely exceedance highlighted by this plan for Fareham relates to an area of road from the Delme roundabout through Eastern and Western Way and onto the A27 by Fareham train station. It includes the A32 branch from Market Quay ‘through-about’ and branching into the Portchester Road A27. These areas are as outlined in Appendix A.

4. On 27 July 2017, the Department for the Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) issued a Compliance Directive on Fareham Borough Council, along with the other (22) Authorities that were listed. This Direction required the authority to undertake and submit by 31 March 2018 a Feasibility Study (Initial Plan/Strategic Outline Case). This was completed and the Strategic Outline Case submitted under delegated authority granted by the Executive following a report to its January 2018 meeting. This case set out a list of options which, if implemented, could make a positive difference to Air Quality within the study area.

5. There are many sources of nitrogen dioxide, however the principal cause nationally is vehicle exhaust emissions. Since 1992 new engines have had to meet Euro Standards on emissions. The latest Standard is Euro VI for diesel engines and the improvement between Euro V to Euro VI is vast. The Euro VI standard was introduced from September 2015. Diesel engines prior to this date are the worst polluters in terms of Nitrogen Dioxide.
6. The government set up the Joint Air Quality Unit (JAQU), who have set out the process Local Authorities must follow and are directing this work. JAQU are funding the work that has been justified to them.

7. Since March officers have been working with consultants towards identifying exactly what the likely exceedance would be and also refining the option or options which will deliver compliance with legal limits. The authority must also submit a Final Plan/ Final Business Case by 31 December 2018 which identifies the preferred option or options to deliver compliance. Prior to this an Outline Business Case needs to be submitted to JAQU; this is likely to be ready towards the end of October.

8. The National Plan was based on the National Pollution Climate Model data, which the Government used in producing its plan. In December 2017, a week long, 24 hour ANPR traffic survey was undertaken within the study area in Fareham. The data from this was used to identify the number and type of vehicle that makes up the local fleet; that information was then used to calculate pollution in terms of Nitrogen Dioxide. Once this work was completed, the dataset was adjusted for factors such as gradient and weekend flow differences, where receptors (public exposure) was likely etc.

9. Whilst the evidence is currently being finalised, early indications show there is not likely to be any exceedances of EU limits from 2021 forward within the study area. It does show however that there is likely to be a small exceedance of the 40ugm$^3$ limit during 2020. This exceedance is estimated to be 40.9ugm$^3$. It is generally accepted that in time the improvements in engine technology will see the fleet locally come into compliance; the problem is that the health effects in the meantime of poor air quality is causing around 40,000 premature deaths nationally each year.

10. The current focus of this project is to finalise the likely exceedance level and agree that with JAQU. At the same time, it is necessary to refine the measures detailed in the Strategic Outline Case to a shorter list of measures which will achieve the very small reduction in NO$_2$ within the study area.

11. At the same time as developing the initial list of measures, the process defined by JAQU require a Benchmark option to be determined. This, where possible, should be one of the four types of Charging Clean Air Zone (CAZ). This would be the option that would achieve compliance in the shortest possible time in the absence of another option. JAQU are insisting that the benchmark option for Fareham to be a CAZ A. This is the type which affects the least amount of vehicle groups i.e. Buses, Coaches and Taxis/Private Hire vehicles. It is highly unlikely that in the absence of any other measures a CAZ could be put into place before the end of 2019.

12. The local fleet composition is within Appendix B. In line with the National fleet the majority are diesel vehicles. The general approach to refining the measures is to look at those which can be implemented during 2019 so that the benefit can be seen in 2020. A second factor is to focus on measures where the NO$_2$ reduction is calculable. As the reduction required to achieve compliance is so small, it is understood that any measure that affects any of the more polluting vehicle types would be appropriate regardless of their contribution to the fleet as a whole.

13. The initial list comprised 60 measures; these were scored based on Primary and Secondary success factors. The Primary factor was whether each measure could deliver compliance in the shortest possible time, this now means during 2019. The Secondary factor was a combination of factors following JAQU guidance. These were:
Strategic and wider Air Quality fit; Affordability; Supply side capacity and capability; Achievability; Distributional impacts and Value for money.

14. This resulted in a smaller list of measures, which were presented within the Strategic Outline case in March. Since then, as the potential exceedance has been defined and more is known about the fleet, work is currently progressing to reduce that list to a final shorter list of measures which will achieve the very small reduction in NO$_2$ that is required within the study area.

15. The list of measures that are now being refined can be seen in Appendix C. Some of these will not now be viable due to the reduced period for implementation (2019). The council’s consultants are currently working on the reduction to NO$_2$ each measure is likely to achieve before a decision is taken as to which measure(s) will be put forward for the Outline Business Case and Final Business Case.

16. Before implementing any policies that would affect such a large proportion of the community, the Council should consult. Although the basis for this sits within Case Law, the leading case is Moseley v London Borough of Haringey 2014, another key case is Draper v Leicestershire 2014. Both require consultation to be carried out when policy proposals affect a significant issue or number of service users at a formative stage of the proposals (in order to influence options and final decision) to be timely, meaningful, providing all relevant information and sufficient time for response. In terms of time for consultation, Cabinet office guidance sets best practice at 12 weeks but that time can be reduced if local circumstances demonstrate that is reasonable in the circumstances such as a very focused issue. This is a very focussed issue and also the deadlines that are being imposed by JAQU are difficult. These are being driven by the “shortest possible time” ruling. In this instance, it is suggested that a 5 week consultation would be sufficient.

17. This report therefore seeks to obtain Executive approval to carry out consultation on the current list of measures for 5 weeks from 4 September 2018 to the 8 October 2018. The communications team would take a proactive approach with all communications, both in the lead-up to, and during consultation to ensure reaching the widest possible audience. Analysis would be ongoing to ensure the results of the consultation and Outline Business Case could be brought to the Executive for approval in time for submission on 24 October 2018. This project has had very challenging deadlines from the start, this unsurprisingly continues to be the case. If the Outline Business Case is submitted for the 24 October deadline there is just about time for the 8-week review required by JAQU before submission of our Final Plans/Final Business Case by the end of the year. The project milestones can be seen in Appendix D.

Enquiries:
For further information on this report please contact Ian Rickman (ext 4773)
Fleet Composition 2021
List of Measures to Improve Air Quality

1. **Tackling Bus (and coach) and Taxi emissions at source**

The local bus fleet has been the subject of an early review and there are around 25 buses which regularly move within the study area, for which a retrofitting option exists to bring them up to Euro VI emission standard. The local air quality impact of upgrading the 25 Euro 5 buses to Euro 6 could be significant; funding would be sought by a Government grant. Furthermore any coaches that regularly enter the study area, that are not Euro VI, could possibly be retrofitted. As a measure of potential significant air quality benefit, this strategy aligns well with the Government’s wider undertaking to provide £100 million for a national programme of support for retrofitting and new low emission buses in England and Wales.

2. **Walking and Cycling infrastructure and marketing**

Where journeys can be shifted to alternative modes, they not only help to ease the strain on local networks, but can also provide significant wider health benefits, improving fitness and wellbeing as well as helping contribute to reduced absenteeism. This aligns well with the Government’s plans to invest £1.2 billion nationally to make cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys. Improvements to infrastructure would create an enhanced strategic route together with new storage and hire opportunities which would benefit both existing and new cycle commuters and leisure cyclists. This measure helps to reduce car trips by developing improved alternatives to private car trips.

3. **Business Engagement**

This measure will help to reduce emissions by working with local businesses and organisations to encourage behavioural or organisational change that can result in fewer car trips.


Traffic signal timing and priority changes can significantly influence the operation of local transport networks, smoothing or gating traffic flow to ease congestion, respond to demand or prioritise other modes such as buses and active travel. Smoothing traffic flow and increasing speed results in lower vehicle emissions. This measure helps to reduce emissions through more efficient management of local transport networks as well as managing pollution hot spots. It may potentially include improving journey times for other modes, thereby developing improved alternatives to private car trips.

5. **Bus and ferry marketing, ticketing discounts**

Traditionally, ticket offers to incentivise usage of the ferry have been successful in driving up patronage and the cycle parking at the terminal is well used due to the relatively high modal share cycling enjoys in Gosport (around 11%). Therefore, it is expected that a renewed ticket offer, in conjunction with improved cycle facilities, will support patronage growth. This measure helps reduce car trips by developing improved alternatives.
6. **Bus stop info and Real Time Information (RTI)**

Real Time Information at bus stops is a well-recognised measure to increase bus patronage. Providing real time information results in greater confidence in the public transport network and journey time reliability. This measure helps to reduce car trips by developing improved alternatives.

7. **Local Travel Plan review**

This involves travel planning work with schools and workplaces across Fareham/Gosport. This measure helps to reduce emissions by working with local businesses to encourage behavioural or organisational change that can result in fewer car trips.

8. **Bus Services**

Bus services play a key part in providing an alternative mode to private car for distances that are not easily commutable by active mode, or connect users to transport hubs as part of a wider journey. Hampshire County Council could undertake a review of local services to identify any popular routes which can be grown, or gaps in provision where wider uptake of public transport can be encouraged. HCC could also develop new approaches to enhance wider connectivity and bus service reliability. Part of this work could include looking at smaller vehicles to take people to main bus routes where access is currently a problem.

9. **Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP)**

Increasing local provision of EVCPs within public car parks and key destinations would potentially contribute significantly to regional EVCP capacity. Increased visibility may also help tackle range anxiety amongst potential electric vehicle buyers, providing reassurance in a ULEV purchase and helping to smooth transition in line with the Government’s plan to end the sale of new conventional petrol and diesel cars and vans by 2040. This is supported by the Government’s pledge to spend £1 billion supporting the take-up of ultra low emission vehicles (ULEV), including helping consumers to overcome the upfront cost of an electric car. HCC would investigate and establish the best strategic locations to support EV take up in Fareham and Gosport, working with both councils to explore potential sites and establish viability and priority.

10. **Fleet Recognition Scheme**

Fleet recognition schemes have been shown to be effective across the country where local authorities have put in place initiatives for engaging with local fleet operators. This approach, often underpinned by Government funding, helps to drive efficiency improvements, reduce both emissions and fuel consumption, and potentially deliver cost savings. This measure helps to reduce emissions by working with local businesses to encourage behavioural or organisational change that can result in fewer trips. It also helps to reduce emissions at source through fleet renewal / upgrade.
11. **CAZ Class A – Benchmark**

This is an alternative measure that has been set down as a Benchmark option. Whilst this is the case, it is extremely questionable whether this could in fact be implemented by January 2020. By contrast, a combination of the above measures would result in a successful outcome.

The following categories of vehicle would be subject to charging for entering a charging CAZ A:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class A - Buses, coaches, taxis and private hire vehicles (PHVs)</th>
<th>Vehicle type</th>
<th>Euro Category</th>
<th>Euro standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>M3 (GVW over 5000 kg and more than 8 seats in addition to the driver)</td>
<td>M2 (GVW not exceeding 5000 kg, ref mass exceeding 2610 kg and more than 8 seats in addition to the driver)</td>
<td>Euro VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Euro VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi and private hire</td>
<td>Minibus - M2 (GVW not exceeding 5000 kg, ref. mass not exceeding 2840 kg and more than 8 seats in addition to the driver)</td>
<td>Passenger vehicle with up to 8 seats in addition to the driver</td>
<td>Euro 6 (diesel) Euro 4 (petrol)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ultra low emission vehicles with significant zero emission range will never be charged for entering or moving through a Clean Air Zone.
Air Quality Compliance Directive Project Timeline

03/09/2018: Executive Report – to approve 5-week consultation

08/10/2018: Consultation ends

15/10/2018: Special Executive – to submit OBC and delegated Authority for FBC

24/10/2018: Submit Outline Business Case (OBC) to JAQU
            8 weeks for Government to review

19/12/2018: Receive feedback on OBC

21/12/2018: Submit Full Business Case (FBC) to JAQU
Portfolio: Planning and Development

Subject: Council’s Response to Pre-submission (Regulation 14) Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan

Report of: Director of Planning and Regulation

Corporate Priorities: Providing Housing Choices, Protect and Enhance the Environment, Strong, Safe, Inclusive and Healthy Communities, Maintain and Extend Prosperity

Purpose:
To agree the Council’s, as the Local Planning Authority, response to the Pre-submission (Regulation 14) Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan consultation.

Executive summary:
In March 2017, the Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum and Titchfield Neighbourhood Area were designated by the Council for the purposes of allowing the Forum to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan. In accordance with Regulation 14 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (2012), Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum is required to undertake Pre-submission consultation and publicity on its Pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan, which includes sending a copy of its proposals to the Council (as the Local Planning Authority) to comment on. The purpose of this report is to set out the Council's response to the Pre-submission consultation on the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan (TNP). The deadline to respond to the consultation is the 10th September 2018.

Recommendation:
It is recommended that the Executive agrees the Council’s response to the Pre-submission (Regulation 14) Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan.

Reason:
The Council has a statutory duty set out in paragraph 3(1) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to provide advice and assistance to ‘qualifying bodies’, which includes Neighbourhood Forums, undertaking neighbourhood planning.
Cost of proposals:

There are no direct financial implications arising from this report. However, it is important to highlight that Officers time has been subsumed into the existing budgets.

Appendixes:  
- Appendix A: Pre-submission Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan
- Appendix B: Local Planning Authority comments on the Pre-submission Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan

Background papers:  
- Executive Report 6 March 2017 – Application for Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum and Titchfield Neighbourhood Area

Reference papers:  
- The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012
- Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
- National Planning Practice Guidance – Neighbourhood Planning
INTRODUCTION

1. The Localism Act (2011) introduced a mechanism for local communities to produce Neighbourhood Plans for their area, enabling communities to have a greater say on the future development of their area. Once a Neighbourhood Plan is ‘made’, i.e. adopted, it becomes part of the statutory Development Plan for that area, and will be used, alongside local and national planning policy and guidance to determine planning applications within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

2. On 5th December 2016, the Council received an application for the designation of a Neighbourhood Forum and Neighbourhood Area for Titchfield for the purposes of producing a Neighbourhood Plan. This was followed by a consultation period on the proposal from December 2016 to February 2017. On 20th March 2017, the Council designated the Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum and Neighbourhood Area for the purposes of Neighbourhood Planning.

3. The Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum are at the first formal stage of plan making, which is consultation on the Pre-submission Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan.

4. National Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) states that if a Local Planning Authority (LPA), in their assessment of the neighbourhood plan, considers that the plan falls short of meeting one or more of the ‘basic conditions’, such concerns should be discussed with the qualifying body, i.e. the Neighbourhood Forum, before the Neighbourhood Plan is formally submitted to the LPA.

"If a local planning authority considers that a draft neighbourhood plan or Order may fall short of meeting one or more of the basic conditions they should discuss their concerns with the qualifying body in order that these can be considered before the draft neighbourhood plan or Order is formally submitted to the local planning authority." (PPG, Paragraph 67, Ref ID: 41-067-20140306).
5. Prior to the Pre-submission consultation the Local Planning Authority provided helpful guidance and advice over several meetings with the Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum and most comments made in the LPA response (Appendix B) have been previously made. As the following paragraph explains, the responsibility for producing and consulting on the Neighbourhood Plan rests with the Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum at this stage.

NATIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PRE-SUBMISSION NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS (REGULATION 14)

6. Relevant national legislation, policy, guidance and regulations require a Neighbourhood Forum to publicise the Neighbourhood Plan in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work or carry out business in the Neighbourhood Area. The Forum must also consult any consultation body referred to in Schedule 1 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 whose interests may be affected by the proposals for a Neighbourhood Plan. Details of the proposals for the Neighbourhood Plan together with details of how and when to make representations on the Neighbourhood Plan must also be published. This is referred to as the Pre-submission consultation.

7. Regulation 14 (c) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires the Neighbourhood Forum to send a copy of the Pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan to the Council. The Council then has a statutory duty to provide advice and assistance to the Neighbourhood Forum. It is considered that providing constructive comments and suggested amendments (where possible) on a Pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan forms part of this duty.

8. Responding with comments provides a Neighbourhood Forum with the opportunity to address any concerns from the Council and to amend the Neighbourhood Plan accordingly. It is hoped that constructive comments made by the Council will assist in the preparation of a robust Neighbourhood Plan for submission, prior to the subsequent consultation held by the Council and thereafter the independent Examination.

9. As a Neighbourhood Plan can form part of the statutory Development Plan if 'made', i.e. adopted, it is therefore important that the Council provide comments on the wording to ensure policies are clear and unambiguous, enabling a decision maker to apply policies consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications within the Neighbourhood Area.

PRE-SUBMISSION TITCHFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

10. In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, the Pre-submission version of the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) was published for consultation on 20th July 2018, which is due to close on 10th September 2018. The consultation material includes the Pre-submission (Regulation 14) Neighbourhood Plan (Appendix A), along with a range of evidence base documents which are referenced in the TNP as appendices, a consultation statement and a basic conditions statement.

11. The Pre-submission Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan is the first Neighbourhood Plan in the Borough to reach this first formal stage in the process. The Council recognises the considerable efforts the Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum has made in preparing the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan.
12. Currently, when assessing an emerging Neighbourhood Plan, the National Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) states that a Local Planning Authority should provide constructive comments:

"A local planning authority should provide constructive comments on the emerging Neighbourhood Plan or Order proposal prior to submission and discuss the contents of any supporting documents including the basic conditions statement" (PPG, Paragraph 67, Ref ID: 41-067-20140306).

13. The Pre-submission (Regulation 14) Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan (Appendix A) includes policies relating to a number of planning issues such as:

- New housing
- Housing mix/Affordable housing
- Design of new development
- Footpath and cycle network
- Supporting existing retail units
- Supporting the efficient use of energy in new developments
- Preserving the historic environment

14. Appendix B to this report sets out the Council's (as the Local Planning Authority) comments and suggested amendments (where possible) on the Pre-submission (Regulation 14) version of the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan, which the Council has provided to help the Neighbourhood Forum when progressing the Neighbourhood Plan. The Local Planning Authority has provided support and guidance as the Neighbourhood Plan has developed. It is important to highlight that how the Neighbourhood Plan progresses is a matter for the Neighbourhood Forum.

**WHAT THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY NEEDS TO CONSIDER WHEN RESPONDING TO A PRE-SUBMISSION NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

15. The Council's comments and suggested amendments (where possible) are set out in a report (Appendix B) which is divided into two sections. The first part is a summary of the assessment of the TNP in relation to the 'basic conditions'. The 'basic condition's' state that a neighbourhood plan must:

i. Have regard to national policy and advice.
ii. Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.
iii. Be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan.
iv. Not breach, and be otherwise compatible with EU and Human Rights Obligations.

16. The second part of the report provides more detailed advice on the Pre-submission Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan for the Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum.

17. The TNP has been reviewed by the Local Planning Authority in the context of national policy and available guidance, as well relevant legislation and regulations on neighbourhood planning on the date of the start of the Pre-submission consultation (20th July 2018). Therefore, the Local Planning Authority has assessed the Pre-submission Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published in 2012. It is important that the Neighbourhood Forum is aware that a revised NPPF was published on the 24th July 2018.
18. Paragraph 214 of the revised NPPF states that:

“The policies in the previous Framework (2012) will apply for the purpose of examining plans, where those plans are submitted on or before 24 January 2019”.

This statement applies where a ‘qualifying body’ (i.e. the Neighbourhood Forum) submits a plan to the local planning authority in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The next stage of plan progression is submission (Regulation 15) of the Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Planning Authority. Therefore, if the Neighbourhood Forum submits the TNP to the Council after the 24 January 2019, the Neighbourhood Plan will need to be re-assessed against the revised NPPF (published 24 July 2018). In addition, the Government will be updating the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) in due course as a consequence of revising the NPPF, and this may have implications for the Neighbourhood Plan.

19. The Local Planning Authority’s assessment of the Pre-submission Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan concludes that the plan falls short of a number of the ‘basic conditions’.

**SUMMARY OF THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY’S RESPONSE TO TITCHFIELD PRE-SUBMISSION NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

20. The Local Planning Authority has made comments at this stage in response to the Pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan, with the view to assisting the TNP’s progress to independent examination. These should be seen as constructive advice to the Neighbourhood Forum. The LPA has a number of key concerns at this stage and has offered suggested amendments where possible when the Neighbourhood Plan falls short of the ‘basic conditions’. The areas where the LPA considers the Pre-submission Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan falls short are:

i. Having regard to national policies and advice (particularly the requirements of the PPG).

ii. Ensuring the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan is in general conformity with the Adopted Local Plan (ALP), i.e. the Development Plan which includes Development Plan (Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies) and does not undermine the strategic policies in the Development Plan.

21. Please note, in addition to the above (under category i), it is important to highlight that the Pre-submission Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan does not provide:

- Sufficient clarity to allow a decision maker to apply them consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications in the neighbourhood plan area.
- Sufficient flexibility to ensure they plan positively to support local development.
- Set out the justification and evidence to clearly support policy requirements.
- The potential of some policy requirements having a negative impact on viability and therefore on the deliverability of housing.
POTENTIAL NEXT STAGES

22. At this stage, any decisions over the content of the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan and whether comments should be taken on-board, rests with the Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum.

23. Following the close of the Pre-submission consultation, the next stage of the process in preparing the TNP is for the Neighbourhood Forum to consider all the comments received and make any amendments to the Neighbourhood Plan that it considers appropriate. Following consideration of comments received from consultees, the Forum can then choose to submit the Neighbourhood Plan to the Council for Examination by an Independent Examiner.

CONCLUSION

24. This report recommends that the Executive agrees that the Local Planning Authority's comments on the Pre-submission Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan are submitted to the Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum as part of the Pre-submission (Regulation 14) consultation. The Local Planning Authority has, however, raised concerns which it believes need to be considered by the Neighbourhood Forum, prior to progressing the Neighbourhood Plan.

Enquiries:
For further information on this report please contact Claire Burnett, Head of Planning Strategy and Regeneration (Extn. 4330).
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FOREWORD

The Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum was set up in January 2016 by a group of 25 people keen to ensure that Titchfield continues to be a good place to live, work and play and to ensure that the area gets the right type of development. With the aim of improving the Neighbourhood Plan area and delivering sustainable development over the coming years, the Forum asked residents to identify issues they felt were important to the area. These include:

- the lack of affordable housing
- traffic and parking
- maintaining the historic ambience of the village
- health and the environment, including litter
- access to the country park
- presentation and promotion of the village

In March 2017 the Forum was designated by Fareham Borough Council (FBC) for the purpose of producing a neighbourhood plan. The Forum then produced this Neighbourhood Plan. This Plan is for everyone in the boundary plan area regardless of their age, ethnicity, impairment or sexuality. Unlike most wishes for the village, however, this Plan will have the force of law and has been drawn up in consultation with residents throughout the process.

I would like to thank the Forum members for working assiduously in the preparation of the Plan. I also appreciate the support and help we have had from many members of the public and local businesses.

Ann Wheal
Chair
Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum
Chapter 1 - Summary

1.1 The Neighbourhood Plan
The Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan sets out the aims, objectives and policies for the growth of Titchfield over the period 2018 to 2036. The aim of the Plan is to endeavour to conserve and enhance the local built, historic and natural environment of Titchfield and to enhance the special interest, character and appearance of the area and its historic setting.

The Neighbourhood Plan has been drawn up by the Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum following two and a half years consultation and involvement with residents via public meetings, newsletters, questionnaires and the Forum website, www.titchfieldmatters.org.uk. This document sets out the aspirations of the community and is intended to be a template for the development of the village over the Plan period. It incorporates the work of Forum sub-groups that have investigated specific topics.

The health and well-being of the residents is reflected throughout, not just by policies and tasks, but by the accessibility audit carried out in July 2017 and the Health Day in September 2017.

The key policies contained in this document relate to: Map 1 - Plan Area on facing page

1.2 Housing
During the life-time of the Plan, an average of 10 dwellings per year will be needed, with the emphasis on affordable rental housing and smaller homes to buy. History (FBC Emerging Local Plan 2018 - 2036, p. 32, policy H1 Strategic Housing Provision) shows us that approximately 10% of the housing demand will be met by windfall sites (see Glossary p59) within the Borough. As such, housing needs within the Plan area are expected to be met, through windfall sites and small-scale infill development preferably within the proposed extended settlement boundary. Housing needs can be reviewed every 5 years.

1.3 Getting Around
Traffic policies and tasks are proposed that are designed to reduce the impact of traffic throughout the Plan area so that the safety and environmental needs of pedestrians are given priority.

1.4 Commercial and Economic Considerations
The area has a thriving local economy at its centre offering employment opportunities as well as services for residents. Policies are proposed to ensure the continued success and focus of business premises in the High Street, The Square and South Street. Proposals to convert business or commercial premises into residential use will be resisted.

1.5 The Built and Natural Environment
Policies are proposed to ensure that Titchfield remains a village with an enhanced environment and valued open spaces.

1.6 Historic Titchfield
The objective of the Plan is to respect and preserve the history of the area for future generations whilst allowing it to continue to develop and grow.

If the Neighbourhood Plan is successful at referendum, it will become part of the statutory development plan for the area. Consequently, decisions on whether or not to grant planning permission in the neighbourhood area will need to be made in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan. This would be part of the statutory local development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise - Locality, Neighbourhood Plans, Roadmap Guide.
The Great Barn
Chapter 2 - A Brief History of Titchfield

Titchfield was established in the 6th century by a tribe of Jutes from Denmark known as the Meonwara. By the time of the Domesday Book, Titchfield was a flourishing village of 150 souls. St. Peter's Church, built in the 7th century, is still a place of worship today. Titchfield Abbey was built in the 13th century. At the Restoration it was turned into Place House by the first Earl of Southampton. Eight monarchs, from Richard II in 1393, through Henry V before Agincourt to James II in 1686 all visited the Abbey. Shakespeare may have taught at the Old Grammar School in Mill Lane, established by Henry VI after his marriage to Margaret of Anjou in the Abbey in 1445.

Titchfield Abbey

Medieval Titchfield was an important port. The Square had a market hall - later taken down due to the poor state of repair. It was moved to Barry's Meadow but eventually was rebuilt at the Weald and Downland Living Museum, Sussex. There was a tannery (now a small industrial estate), several breweries and the area became famous for its strawberries. At the height of strawberry growing, in the early 20th century, a rail connection was built at Swanwick so that Titchfield strawberries could be shipped easily and quickly to London markets.

For over 100 years Titchfield carnival was famous throughout the south and attracted thousands of people to its afternoon and evening processions. Recently its future has become uncertain due to the high costs of putting on such an event.

Appendix 18 gives a brief history of Titchfield from medieval times until 1781.
Breast Cancer Haven, Titchfield
Chapter 3 - Titchfield Today

A large part of the Plan area is a conservation area and many of the houses in Titchfield village are listed. The Abbey, controlled by English Heritage, is key to much of the history of the area. The 14th century Barn, adjacent to the Abbey, is used as a theatre, concentrating mainly on Shakespearian plays.

The original medieval village, consists of The Square, High Street, West Street, Church Street, East Street, Southampton Hill and South Street. The growth of Titchfield, which was a major port until 17th century, fell into decline due the silting up of the estuary as well as the development of the town of Fareham and the major port of Portsmouth.

The expansion of the village into its present form began with the development of the Bellfield estate in 1932 to the south west of the village and the more recent Garstons estate to the west. There has been some in-filling within the conservation areas. The A27, a dual carriageway to Fareham and Southampton, bisects what was originally a complete village. This leaves the Abbey, the Barn, three small lakes, recreation ground plus two pubs and 2 garden centres on the other side of the dual carriageway. There is shortly to be a country park. Access from the south side of the village on the north side is via a pedestrian crossing and traffic lights. Some new buildings have been developed on the north side of the A27 and currently a retirement home complex is being built there. Despite the A27 dividing Titchfield, the communities are well integrated.

Today, Titchfield is a desirable place in which to live. It has a thriving community with a wide range of organisations including:

- a Boxing club
- the Arts Society
- an Allotment society
- several Bridge clubs
- two WIs
- a History society
- three theatre companies
- three hairdressers
- two beauty salons
- five pubs all serving food
- two coffee shops
- a doctors' surgery
- a dentist
- car repair services
- a community centre
- the parish rooms
- an Old English Bowls club

For a list of all the clubs and societies in the village see Appendix 1.

Titchfield house prices are relatively high compared to other local areas and very few young people can afford to buy property here. We need to redress the balance.

Like most villages, Titchfield has a traffic/parking problem, especially in the rush hours when the village is used as a traffic short-cut from the A27 to Lee on Solent, Stubbington and Fareham.
Chapter 4 - How the Neighbourhood Plan Developed

The Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum started out as a sub-committee of the Titchfield Village Trust (TVT). In October 2015 comments, complaints, and suggestions were made by residents to TVT regarding the village and the surrounding related areas. The Trust asked TVT member, Ann Wheal, to set up a working party to look at the issues. Eight people joined the group at the first informal meeting on Thursday October 20th, 2015. They met monthly after that until January 2016 when a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) was suggested as the best way to influence current and future developments in the area.

In January 2016 a Forum was formed, consisting of 25 members from a cross-section of residents.

4.1 Neighbourhood Plan-Making and Planning

*Neighbourhood planning, introduced in 2011 by the Localism Act, gives the Titchfield community direct power to develop a shared vision for the neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of the local area. The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) must contain policies which are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and support FBC Local Plan.*

*Neighbourhood Plans must also conform to European Regulations on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and habitat regulations. The Neighbourhood Forum (NF) has worked with Fareham Borough Council (FBC) to assess the need for a SEA. No requirement has been confirmed by FBC, Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency. Full details are contained in Appendix 15.*

The starting point was to define the area that would be covered by the Plan. This took some time but was finally agreed after discussions with FBC. Then the views of residents were canvassed. Over 500 questionnaires were sent to residents, businesses and local groups. 152 questionnaires were returned. These were analysed and the results published and presented at a meeting of the Forum in February 2016.

The results of the survey have been key factors in the development of the Neighbourhood Plan. Since January 2016 there has been much activity. Sub-groups of the Forum have worked on specific topics. There have been 5 public meetings and there have been obvious changes within the village and surrounds. For example, Titchfield entered the Britain in Bloom Competition and a vibrant interest in the appearance of the village has ensued. More details are to be found on the Forum’s website [http://www.titchfieldmatters.org.uk](http://www.titchfieldmatters.org.uk)

4.2 The Forum and TVT

In January 2017 it became clear that for the NP process to continue, the NP Forum would need to be an independent organisation – no longer a sub-committee of TVT. The Forum now has its own constitution - Appendix 2 and terms of reference – Appendix 3. Having been approved in March 2017, it is a statutory body formally recognised by the Secretary of State and FBC. The finances of the Forum are separate from TVT but NP funds are held in the TVT bank account as TVT is a charitable organisation so meets the necessary criteria for grants and funding.

The Forum has been able to draw on much valuable historic data and on contributions made by individuals and the many societies in the village.
4.3. Consultation and Monitoring

The most important requirement of a Neighbourhood Plan is that at all stages the Forum must reflect the views of residents. To this end the Forum has:

- held 5 open meetings
- had one television interview
- given two newspaper interviews
- made presentations to local groups
- took a stand at the church fete in 2016, 2017 and 2018
- maintained a regular discussion service on its website.

Throughout the process we have kept the community informed by:

- by-monthly newsletters
- articles in the parish magazine
- open meetings
- publishing information on the Forum website

4.4 Resources:

- public exhibitions, meetings and events Appendix 4
- shop window displays Appendix 5
- a questionnaire/survey sent to over 500 households Appendix 6
- housing survey Appendix 7
- a traffic survey Appendix 8
- accessibility audit Appendix 9
- updates on the Forum website
- via Facebook
- via the Parish magazine
- contact with local businesses and groups
- smaller focus groups within the village
- consultation 'windows' during which comments have been invited on the Draft Plan documents.
- bi-monthly newsletters sent to over 700 residents via e mail Appendix 10
- FAQ leaflets distributed from September 2017, initially at the Health Day Appendix 11
- an audit trail of the key meetings is posted on Appendix 4
Chapter 5 - The Neighbourhood Plan Area

The NP area is shown on Map1 on page 6.

5.1 The Plan boundary takes the village as its focus

The Plan boundary takes the village as its focus. To the north, Titchfield Abbey conservation area and the railway line create a clear physical boundary. To the west, the Plan area is defined by the built-up edge of Locks Heath and Park Gate, following Cartwright Drive, Warsash Road and Brownwich Lane. Similarly, the eastern boundary is defined by the built-up edge of Fareham and housing along Abbeyfield Drive and Catisfield Lane.

There are protected public open spaces such as Chilling Woodland (Thatcher’s Copse) and Titchfield Haven National Nature Reserve. These woodland blocks and open spaces provide a distinctive southern approach to the village, characterised by large open vistas across fields to surrounding urban areas.

The approach to Titchfield from all directions involves changing from an urban area through water meadows, valley and woodland towards the village centre.

A more detailed explanation of the Plan area is in Appendix 13 and a map is in Appendix 14.

Two important considerations in respect of the Plan area relate to the Urban area boundary for Titchfield (Core Strategy Adopted 2011) Policies CS2, CS6, CS9 and CS11 which deals specifically with Titchfield) and the Strategic Gap (Policy CS22).
5.2 Urban Area Boundary

The NP Policy H.3. recommends extending the existing Urban Area Boundary for Titchfield to include properties along Southampton Hill. On the northern side of Southampton Hill the existing Urban Area Boundary stops at the Village Gate housing complex. On the southern side it cuts through the more recent Titchfield Meadows housing development and Jubilee Surgery.

During consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan, this part of Southampton Hill was seen to form an integral part of the village footprint. The properties clearly read as part of Southampton Hill entirely in keeping with the village character and the view along the street leading to and from the village centre. Their inclusion within the Urban Area Boundary for Titchfield would provide potential opportunities for small scale infill development in line with Policy CS11 (Core Strategy Adopted August 2011).
5.3 Strategic Gap

Adopted Core Strategy, Adopted August 2011, Policy CS22 identifies land around the village between Fareham/Stubbington and the Western Wards as the Meon Gap – a Strategic Gap. Importantly, all of this land is treated as countryside. This means that proposals for development will not be permitted, either individually or cumulatively, if they would significantly affect the integrity of the gap. Similarly, in the case of the physical and visual separation of settlements. In effect the gap represents a green jacket around the village.

A recent review of the Strategic Gap designations as part of the Local Plan Review (Fareham Landscape Assessment – Part Three, 2017) has considered it critically important to retain the Strategic Gaps in the Borough. In particular, the Meon Gap, which plays a vital role in helping to maintain the separation of Titchfield from settlements to the west and east of the valley. The Meon Gap is shown on map 4.
The Old Baker's House – now a hairdressing salon
Chapter 6 - The Vision for Titchfield

A clear vision for the future of Titchfield reflects the aspiration of the community. It covers these core themes:

1. Preserving village life and amenities together with conservation issues
2. Ensuring that any new housing meets the criteria set out in this Plan
3. Addressing traffic and parking issues to ensure a safe and healthy environment
4. Ensuring that the local economy for employment and facilities will continue for residents and visitors
5. Having an enhanced environment
6. Sustaining a sense of community and heritage
7. Giving the Plan area a sense of identity including design and promoting a village emblem, supporting the Britain in Bloom village entry

Chapter 7 - Turning the Vision into a Plan

The plan sets out aims, objectives and policies in the following areas. These came from the initial survey plus the work of the Forum sub-groups and consultation meetings with residents:

- Housing
- Getting Around
- Commercial and Economic
- The Built and Natural Environment
- Historic Titchfield

7.1 Strategic Environmental Assessment

FBC as the Responsible Authority in this matter, is required to determine whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) needs to be carried out for this Plan.

The Forum has received the SEA and has been informed that at the present time, no action needs to be taken. In conjunction with Natural England, the Environment Agency and Historic England, FBC has analysed and assessed the draft Plan and the processes which led up to its production. They have decided that a SEA is not required. The full document can be seen in the audit trail, April 2015 SEA Screening decision - HNP final, Appendix 15.
7.2 The Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan, the National Plans and the FBC Plan

The NPPF and Sustainable Development

The golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking within the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development (NPPF, para 14). Sustainable development, which is defined as ‘meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’ (Resolution 42/187 of the United Nations General Assembly), incorporates the three inter-related dimensions of: an economic role, a social role and an environmental role. Plans need to take local circumstances into account so that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development in different areas and in different ways that ultimately seek to (NPPF, para 9):

- make it easier for jobs to be created in cities, towns and villages
- move from a net loss of bio-diversity to achieving net gains for nature
- replace poor design with better design
- improve the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure
- widen the choice of high quality homes.

Table 1 (below) sets out in broad terms how the Neighbourhood Plan supports the planning policies of the NPPF and need for achieving sustainable development.

7.3 Table 1 Titchfield NP Support for the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Achievement of Sustainable Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titchfield NP Policies</th>
<th>NPPF Achieving Sustainable Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Building a Strong, Competitive Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ensuring the Vitality of Town Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Promoting Sustainable Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Delivering a Wide Choice of High Quality Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Promoting Good Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Promoting Healthy Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding &amp; Coastal Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Conserving &amp; Enhancing the Natural Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Conserving &amp; Enhancing the Historic Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titchfield NP Policies</th>
<th>NPPF Achieving Sustainable Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UAB.1. Urban Area Boundary</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1. Windfall Development</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2. Affordable Housing</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3. Local Need</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4. Quality Design &amp; Local Character</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA1. Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA2 Cycle Links</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA5. Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO1. Parking</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE1. Conversion of Commercial Premises</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE2. Access to Shops &amp; Amenities</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNE1. Built &amp; Natural Environment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNE2. Wider Impacts of Development</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNE3. Renewable Energy &amp; Efficiency</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNE4. Protection of Local Green Areas</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS1. Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4 Support for FBC Local Plan

The statutory Development Plan applicable to the NP area currently comprises:

- Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (Adopted 2011)

FBC has committed to a review of its Local Plan (Fareham Draft Local Plan 2036) to reflect emerging housing and employment needs until 2036.

Within the adopted Local Plan, Titchfield is recognised as an important village location which is expected to maintain its role as a local centre. The Local Plan recognises that changes of use away from retail will be resisted in the centre to ensure the retention of local services, vitality and viability, and wider hierarchy of centres (Strategic Objective SO4. Policy CS3). Only small-scale development is envisaged within the settlement boundary (Policy CS11). The key factors shaping future development in Titchfield are its important historic environment, which includes three of Fareham’s six Scheduled Ancient Monuments, and its position in the Meon Valley separating the two main urban areas within Fareham.

A summary of the relationship between the NP and Key Policies of the Adopted Local Plan is set out in Table 2. (Below)

### 7.5 Table 2. Titchfield NP Support for Adopted Local Plan Key Policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titchfield NP Policies</th>
<th>Fareham’s 5 Key Local Plan (Part 1) Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS1 Employment Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAB.1. Urban Area Boundary</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1. Windfall Development</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2. Affordable Housing</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3. Local Need</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4. Quality Design &amp; Local Character</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA1. Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA2. Cycle Links</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO1. Parking</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE1. Conversion of Commercial Premises</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE2. Access to Shops &amp; Amenities</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNE1. Built &amp; Natural Environment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BNE2. Wider Impacts of Development</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BNE3. Renewable Energy &amp; Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BNE4. Protection of Local Green Areas</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIS1. Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An Open Meeting
Chapter 8 - The Structure of the Plan

Aim – highlighted in lavender

Objectives – highlighted in red

Policies which form part of the Neighbourhood Plan– highlighted in pale blue

Aspirational tasks to be undertaken by the Forum and community – highlighted in orange.

Note: Tasks do not concern land use matters and as such are not part of the formal Neighbourhood Plan. However, they set out the aspirations of the community, and are a significant part of what the community is trying to achieve.
Note - The Urban Settlement Boundary is the area referred to as the 'built up area'.

Map 5 - Housing
Chapter 9 - Housing

9.1 Background and rationale

Map 6 (inset and on facing page) shows the main housing locations and some of the key features within the Plan area. The historic core of the village, including the village square is covered by the Titchfield conservation area. This area contains many Grade II listed buildings plus St Peter’s Church which is a Grade I listed building. To the north of the A27, Titchfield Abbey conservation area covers a large area which includes the ruin of Titchfield Abbey (Place House), a Scheduled Ancient Monument as well as the surviving medieval fishponds to the west.

The history and heritage of the area is such that an archaeological investigation is required prior to any development within the two conservation areas. A policy for this is included in this Plan, policy HT2, Historic Titchfield.

Housing development is mainly located to the south-west of the village centre either side of Coach Hill. These include the Garstons’ estate to the north and the Bellfield estate to the south. Originally the Bellfield estate was made up of rented properties but currently over 54% of the homes are owner occupied (FBC). This home ownership of properties throughout the village means there are less properties available to rent than previously.

Titchfield house prices are high compared with other properties in the borough and young people cannot afford to buy property here. This plan proposes to redress the balance.

9.2 Meeting future housing needs in Titchfield

Forecasting housing needs is not an exact science. When new developments occur, it is not always possible to know the quantity and type of property that will be built until the build process is completed. Market forces and planning issues can change the original plan as building is in progress.

Also, at the time of writing, the NPPF is under review. There are proposals to change the methodology for assessing local housing needs. In the light of these proposals, it is likely that FBC will reassess the housing requirement for the borough, but the results are unlikely to be published until the finalised NPPF is published – expected to be late 2018.

That said, what follows is based on the best data available at the time of writing:
9.3 How many additional houses are needed in Titchfield?

The Forum commissioned a Housing Needs Assessment from AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited ("AECOM"). The report was completed in 2017 - Appendix 31.

The AECOM report para 20 states “Therefore, in arriving at a final housing figure, we do not judge there is any justification to make an uplift to the figure beyond 262 dwellings for the Neighbourhood Plan period.”

The period covered by the AECOM Report is for 2018-2034, which at the time the report was commissioned was the NP Plan period, so the AECOM report was proposing a housing increase of 262 additional dwelling over a 16 year period - ie approx. 16 dwellings per year.

The AECOM figure does not take into account:

- 20 dwellings (6 houses and 14 apartments) completed since 2011.
- 86 retirement homes currently being built and due for completion in 2018, and
- 3 dwellings under construction on the old Titchfield Motors site.

So, by the end of 2018 a further 109 dwellings – approximately seven years supply - will be completed or under construction.

This leaves a requirement of 153 dwellings to be provided by 2034.

This equates to approximately 10 dwellings per year

Note. Whist the AECOM study was in progress the Fareham Draft Local Plan 2036 was published so the Titchfield NP period (originally 2018-2034) has also changed to align with FBC. However, we believe that it is reasonable to assume that the dwellings per year requirement is still likely to be valid.

Any change to this figure can corrected when the Plan is reviewed after 5 years.
9.4 Types of dwellings in Titchfield?

Fig 3 (below) taken from the 2011 Census shows the type of dwellings that exist within the NP area. Most are owner occupied. There is a higher proportion of rented and private accommodation compared with the rest of the Borough - but lower than national levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flats, maisonettes, apartments</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared homes</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In commercial buildings</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 3

9.5 What sort of dwellings do we need in Titchfield?

The following extract from the Forum's own housing needs survey, Appendix 7, Fig 4, (below) shows that residents have a strong preference for 'affordable to buy' and 'social housing'. Social housing is now known as 'affordable rented housing'. See policy H.2.

- The Forum's Housing survey shows a community preference for smaller dwellings i.e. 1,2 or 3 bedroom houses. Appendix 7
- The community does not support the loss of smaller properties within the NP area
- This Plan requires all development to demonstrate good quality architectural and landscape design that reinforces or promotes the local character of the village and makes provision, where viable, for suitable open green spaces accessible to the public
9.6. Where will the new houses be built?

The Housing group of the Forum identified, assessed and ranked a number of potential sites within the Plan area. Potential sites were identified but no sites fully met our policies or the adopted policies in the FBC Core Strategy, Adopted 2011, Policy CS11.

The Forum is therefore not specifying sites in this Plan. However, the position will be reviewed every 5 years.

This is in line with Fareham Local Plan 2036, 5.46:

'Titchfield is a small settlement, with a rich historic character and a thriving local centre. Few development opportunities have been identified, apart from small scale infilling proposals.'

The approach is that windfall development within the revised Urban Area Boundary will meet 10% of the required housing need. See Policy H1. Windfall Development.

Community consultation showed a preference for new development to be on Brownfield sites as opposed to Greenfield sites. See policy H6, Brownfield Sites.

The Plan acknowledges the contribution that the nearby Southampton Road, Titchfield Common site will make towards meeting Borough housing needs but recognises that it cannot satisfy any of the NP housing need. This development is just outside the NP area but within the Titchfield Ward boundary and is less than 1km to the west of the Plan area. The site is allocated (H3) in the emerging Local Plan and is for 400 new homes, mostly smaller 2-3 bedroom homes with a significant amount of social housing.

Map 7 The Southampton Road Site, known locally as the Hambrook Site
9.7 Housing Aims, Objectives, Policies and Tasks

Aim
To provide for the future housing needs in the Neighbourhood Plan area in accordance with the policies set out in this Plan and the FBC Adopted Local Plan, Part 1 and 2 and emerging plan 2036.

Objective H1.
New housing should be provided within the revised Urban Area Boundary.
See Policy H.3.

Objective H2.
Future housing should meet local needs

Objective H.3. Sites should provide affordable housing where appropriate.
See policy H.2.

Objective H.4.
All new housing to deliver high quality standards of sustainable design in keeping with the existing character of the surrounding area.
See policy H.4.

Policy UAB.1. Urban Area Boundary
This Plan proposes a review of the Urban Area Boundary for Titchfield to include properties along Southampton Hill as shown on Map 7. Page
Policy H.1. Windfall Development:
Housing growth will be met, as far as possible, by small scale infill development (up to ten residential units per development) within the revised Titchfield Urban Area Boundary shown on Map 3. Page 5

Policy H.2. Affordable Housing
Sites should provide affordable housing where appropriate

Policy H.3. Local Need
Future Housing should be mainly smaller dwellings for those who wish to downsize, young single people, couples and families needing a first home.

Policy H.4 – Quality Design and Local Character
Development that takes the opportunities available for enhancing local distinctiveness will be supported where it:

a) relates to local building forms and patterns of development within the village, in terms of scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, access, boundary treatments and visual impact;
b) uses local materials, building methods and details which enhance the local distinctiveness of the village;
c) respects established building lines;
d) creates a clear distinction between public and private areas;
e) respects existing skylines and should only stand out from the background of buildings if it contributes positively to views and vistas as a local landmark;
d) is well landscaped and includes private amenity spaces;
e) incorporates appropriate green technologies;
f) retains as many existing trees and hedges as possible within sites and along the boundaries;
g) provides adequate parking (in accordance with FBC Residential Car Parking Standards SPD, Table 1)

9.8 Supporting Evidence

- Urban Area Boundary Proposal to FBC, Appendix 33
- Housing needs website post, Appendix 29
- Forum Housing Needs Survey, Appendix 32
- The Forum Housing Needs Questionnaire, Appendix 7
- The Forum’s Site Assessment Report, Appendix 34
- Data from the 2011 Census
- FBC Core Strategy 2011 Part 1 and 2
- FBC Emerging Plan 2036
Chapter 10 - Getting Around

This section deals with Traffic, Parking, Pedestrians, Cycling and Footpaths.

10.1 The Neighbourhood Plan and Traffic Issues

The Forum recognises that Neighbourhood Plans cannot deal retrospectively with traffic issues so much of what follows is aspirational. However, a significant concern emerging from the village survey and open consultations is the present traffic and parking situation.

Many of the community aspirations set out in this plan have been identified as tasks, in the hope that, by working with appropriate stake-holders, further improvements to traffic management in the Plan Area can be made.

The Forum recognises that Hampshire County Council (HCC) is the highway authority and is responsible for the up-keep, improvement and expansion of the highway network within Hampshire borders.

10.2 Introduction

The Village survey, Appendix 6, carried out by the Forum in 2016, included the question: ‘What are the main problems in the village?’

Traffic and parking issues made up 72% of the responses.

In answer to the question: ‘What would make Titchfield a better place to work, live and play?’ the top two items were:

- 20 mph speed limits and
- Safer crossing places

10.3 Background

Titchfield has a history of traffic problems and action being taken to mitigate them. The A27 Titchfield bye-pass (mid 1930s) is a prime example where the solution to a traffic issue was found by cutting a swathe through the area. More recently the change to the road configuration in South Street (circa 1960) has improved some aspects of road safety but still South Street is a daily cause of congestion and frustration to motorists and pedestrians alike – especially during peak traffic times. See Appendix 16.
10.4 Where we are now

Areas where traffic issues dominate are set out in Appendix 19:

For more details see the Forum Traffic Group Report – Appendix 20

10.5 Pedestrians

As traffic has increased over the years the needs of pedestrians has taken second place. The HCC Transport document for South Hampshire has over 5,000 words but the word 'pedestrian' features only 4 times.

There are only two official crossing points in the area.

- One is at the bottom of Southampton Hill - an island with a 'Keep Left' sign which enables residents to cross to the centre of the road and wait before moving on.
- The other is the pedestrian crossing at the traffic lights on the A27. Elsewhere pedestrians have to take great care and be patient when wanting to cross the road.

People such as those in wheelchairs, using walking aids or pushing buggies are especially disadvantaged by lack of pavements, restricted access on narrow pavements, very few dropped kerbs and no safe crossing points in busy areas – see Accessibility Report, Appendix 9 carried out by the Forum in 2017.

Crossing the Square is difficult for all pedestrians and there is a need for at least one crossing point.

A particular area of concern for pedestrians is where South Street meets Bridge Street and Coach Hill. The pavement on the north side of Coach Hill is dangerously narrow so pedestrians and wheelchair users must use the south side of the road - ie they must cross to the east side of South Street before crossing at the end of Bridge Street to use the pavement on the south side of Coach Hill.

A crossing point is needed here.

People walking to the recently enlarged and busy Titchfield theatre, have to negotiate St Margaret’s Lane, where for the most part there is no footpath. St Margaret’s Lane is notorious for speeding cars.
10.6 Parking

When the NP traffic group met with HCC’s representative he explained that the ratio of cars per household in Hampshire is the second highest in the country. The growth of car ownership has not been offset by any significant increase in parking facilities.

The growth of Titchfield as a business focus, together with the higher than national average of car ownership of residents has increased pressure on parking in the older parts of the village where many houses have no off-road parking.

The village survey indicated that the majority of workers in local businesses are not village residents so use cars to commute, thereby adding to the problem. Staff in local businesses have been asked by FBC to park in the community centre car park rather than occupy places in the High Street and Square. Some have co-operated.

The parking problem is worse when there are events in the village – and Titchfield has many events all year round.

There are some places e.g. Church Street, Mill Lane, West Street, where cars are parked partially on the kerb to ease movement of other traffic, but this in turn means that pedestrians have no choice but to walk in the road. For some, such as wheelchair users, this makes the street virtually impassable unless they take to the road.

There are currently few restrictions on roadside parking.

10.7 Car Parks in the Plan Area

- The Community Centre car park has 121 spaces. No charges apply to people using this facility and there is no time limit - but no overnight parking.

- There is a car park with 46 spaces and a 3-hour limit behind Jubilee Surgery adjacent to Barry’s Meadow

- There is a car park with 15 spaces at the Bridge Street end of the village - no time limit. It is used mainly by people intending to walk the canal path. This car park is poorly signposted and often visitors to the village get into South Street and are re-directed back to the car park they have unwittingly passed.

- There is also a car park (60 spaces) north of the A27 serving the boxing club, tennis courts and play area but its location means that it is not often used by visitors and shoppers.
• There will also be a car park provided off Cartwright Drive to serve the Country Park when the adjacent residential development is complete.

• The other main options for car parking may be found in The Square (some spaces have limited stay times) and the adjoining roads.

All roads that are close to The Square have a mix of resident and visitor parking. There are commuters who regularly park in the Square then car-share or take the bus to their eventual destination. In the event of a serious incident, emergency vehicles could be severely handicapped when trying to access certain areas due to parked cars partially blocking roads.

10.8 Residents’ Parking

The Forum investigated the options for resident parking and controlled parking zones and was informed by telephone that the current FBC policy is ‘There will be no more controlled parking zones in the Borough unless they are in Fareham town centre.’ Given the strength of feeling across the local village residents, this policy needs to be reviewed.

10.9 Buses

The village is served by two bus routes X4 and X5. These services connect Titchfield, Fareham, Southampton, Portsmouth and Gosport. Only the X4 passes through the village centre. As recently as 2016 the X5 passed through the village via Southampton Hill and East Street but now the X5 travels along the A27 so is not as well used as before.

The new, larger buses passing through the village via South Street - where the road is narrow in places - regularly creates difficulties and road rage incidents are commonplace. Views are equally divided, however, on the issue of ‘buses passing through the Square’. Appendix 8 shows the results of the traffic questionnaire completed by the residents.

The Forum supports the retention of two bus routes, but strongly recommend that options are investigated to improve the situation within the village.

10.10 Trains

The nearest train stations are Fareham and Swanwick. From Fareham there are direct services to Portsmouth, Southampton, London, Gatwick and South Wales.
10.11 Cycling and Footpaths

What follows is based on the Footpath and Cycling sub-group report, see Appendix 24.

10.12 Cycling

Cycling in and around Titchfield is difficult and hazardous in most areas. There is no definable cycling route within the Boundary Plan area.

Ideally there should be a definable cycle path connection from the Abbey area in the north to the canal and Titchfield Haven in the south.

The NP recommended cycle route from Titchfield to the beach is via Posbrook Lane, because it would then link with the National Cycle Network (NCN) route along the South Coast. However, Posbrook Lane is narrow and speeding cars make it very dangerous. Some cyclists therefore have taken to using the canal path despite the fact that cycling on the canal path is not allowed. The canal path is well-used by visitors and residents and is a favourite place for families to walk with their children.

It is not safe to have speeding cyclists and walkers using the canal path at the same time.

The NP is not in favour of cyclists using the canal path. The NP recommends having a designated safe route for cyclists via Posbrook Lane to link with the National Cycling Network along the South Coast.
10.13 Footpaths

The main areas of concern are safe routes to schools and condition of pavements around the village. The Forum therefore wishes to consult and work with FBC and HCC and other parties on the improvement and maintenance of all footpaths as well as the promotion and signage of recreational footpaths.
10.14 Transport aims, objectives, policies and tasks

**Sustainable Transport, Policy INF2: Sustainable Transport - Fareham Local Plan 2036**

The Fareham Local Plan 2036 states:

The objectives of national planning policy guidance on transport are to integrate planning and transport at the national, regional, strategic and local level and to promote more sustainable travel choices both for carrying people and for moving freight. This approach seeks to support national economic competitiveness and growth, by delivering reliable and efficient transport networks. Ensuring that homes, jobs, shops and services are accessible by good quality, safe and convenient transport is essential to achieving sustainable development. Satisfying travel needs for individuals and businesses whilst reducing the need to travel, particularly by car, and promoting less environmentally damaging forms of transport is also essential to sustainability. Increasing the proportion of journeys made by public transport, cycling, and walking benefits all sections of society. It provides a means of reducing delay, costs, greenhouse gas emissions, pollution and accidents, conserving resources and sustaining balanced communities that might otherwise become restricted to those with access to a car.

**Aim**

The aim for traffic and parking in Titchfield is to create a pollution free traffic and parking environment that enhances the safe movement of pedestrians, vehicles, cyclists, visitors and residents. This should seek to meet the needs of all, fit or disabled, affording full and safe access to all amenities.

**Objectives**

- **Traffic Objective T.1.**
  Improve highway safety for pedestrians by introducing additional pedestrian crossing points and traffic calming measures.

- **Traffic Objective T.2**
  Reduce pollution caused by traffic to contribute to the delivery of the Council’s Air Quality Action Plan.

- **Traffic Objective T.3.**
  Enhance safe walking and cycling routes within the Plan area.
10.12 Traffic Policies and Tasks

Policy G.A.1 Pedestrian Safety
New development should seek to respond to opportunities to provide new and improved safe and convenient pedestrian routes through the Plan area.

Policy G.A.2 Cycle Links
New development should provide cycling routes to other areas, communities and the National Cycling Network. This to be in accordance with FBC Green Infrastructure Strategy and forthcoming Active Travel Strategy.

The tasks listed below are to be agreed with the highways authority (HCC) if connected with highways.

Task T.1 Work with HCC/FBC to install a pedestrian operated crossing on Coach Hill.

Task T.2.: Negotiate with HCC/FBC to put in place safe crossing points for pedestrians in the following places: Bridge Street, The Square (2), Coach Hill and Posbrook Lane.

Task T.3.: Negotiate with HCC/FBC to create more traffic calming measures that will reduce the speed at which traffic can flow along the roads in and around the Plan area including Mill Lane on the north side of the A27

Task T.4.: Continue to negotiate with HCC/FBC to extend the existing area covered by the 20mph limit.

Task T.5.: Investigate the possibility of providing cycle lanes within the Plan area.

Task T.6. Negotiate with FBC/HCC for additional pavements to increase pedestrian safety – see Accessibility Audit, Appendix 9
10.13 Parking objectives, policies and tasks

Parking Objective 1
Provide adequate off-road parking for motorised vehicles and cycles.

Policy P.1. New Development Parking
Any new, expanded, commercial or housing development within the Neighbourhood Plan Area must be completely self-sufficient in terms of off-road parking, which means:

a. development proposals should, wherever possible, include the maximum level of off-street parking. See FBC Adopted SPDs on residential and non-residential parking standards. See also policy H.4

b. To encourage cycling as a method of travel, safe accessible cycle parking facilities should be provided within residential developments and in appropriate locations and destinations within the Plan area – e.g. the village centre.

Task PO.1. To continue to negotiate for controlled parking primarily in the Square and surrounding streets.

Task PO.2. Negotiate with HFC/HCC for improved signage and lighting for parking areas.

Task PO. 3. Continue to negotiate with FBC to establish additional parking provision.
10.14 Supporting evidence

- the Village Survey carried out in February 2016, Appendix 6
- the Forum accessibility report - July 2017, Appendix 9
- the initial report from the traffic sub-group to the Forum, Appendix 20
- information gathered at open meetings, Appendix 21
- an informal meeting with a HCC representative, Appendix 22
- July 2017 Open Meeting traffic questionnaire results, Appendix 8
- Estimated costs, Appendix 23
- HCC Traffic Plan, Appendix 27
- FBC Traffic Plan, Appendix 28
Chapter 11 - Commercial and Economic Objectives

Titchfield is mainly a residential community. There is, however, a considerable amount of business and commercial activity in the Plan area.

There are small business units in the converted tannery site. These include a carpet retail outlet, a car repair and spraying business and an IT consultancy. Also, there are smaller business activities which provide services and employment in the neighbourhood area. In line with the Core Strategy, Adopted 2011, the residents value the local retail and commercial activities.

11.1 Current activities within the village:

- **Retail** - Two small grocer/supermarkets, butcher, chemist, greengrocer, charity shop, jeweller, emporium, two estate agents, travel agent, an antiques shop, hairdressers and beauty shops
- **Undertaker**
- **Hospitality** - one hotel, five pubs, two cafes
- **Agricultural** - 3 garden centres
- **Several farms as well as fruit and vegetable growers**
- **Motoring** - 1 garage and 2 body shops
- **The Tanneries** business centre
- **Building services** - architects, builders, painters and decorators, plumbers, electricians
- **Domestic services** - cleaners, gardeners, tree surgeons, pet services
- **Creative** - designers, potters, glassworkers, soft furnishing providers
- **Education** - primary school, independent 8 - 13 years school as well as specific types of education that take place in the Community Centre and the local public house
- **Welfare services** - sheltered accommodation, therapists, Earl of Southampton Trust sheltered properties and day centre, doctors' surgery, dentist,

- There are also home-based businesses
11.2 Aims, objectives, policies and tasks

Aim

The area needs to maintain a thriving local economy at its centre offering employment opportunities and services for residents and visitors.

Objectives

CE. Objective 1.
To preserve vibrant economic retail and businesses within easy access to residents.

Policies

CE. Policy 1. Loss of retail premises
Proposals that result in the loss of retail premises in the High Street, South Street and the Square will be resisted unless the property has been marketed for at least 2 years on a market rent.

CE. Policy 2. Accessibility
The Plan will support housing development in the Neighbourhood Plan area so long as it is within walking distance of local shops and amenities.
Note. Walking distance is defined as 2 kilometres or 1-2 miles or 5-10 minutes walk (Planning policy guidance – note 13 Transport 2000-2010). See Map 5.

CE Task.1
Encourage local businesses to recruit local people wherever possible in order to maintain a sustainable community. This to be done by, for example, advertising in local news and websites and posters on local boards when jobs are available.
CE Task. 2
Support any initiative that encourages the frequent use of local shops and services by residents and visitors.
Chapter 12 - Natural Environment

The population of the Plan area is approximately 2500 residents (ref: AECOM Housing Needs Survey). The importance of maintaining the strategic gaps between the main settlement areas in the Borough is a key planning principle at this time.

12.1 The Land

The land surrounding the village includes small scale pasture with a variable cover of trees, open floodplain pasture and complex wetlands to the flat or gently undulating coastal plain. Wetland vegetation is a feature of the river valleys, which are particularly species rich and of high ecological value. There are areas of farmland under arable cultivation and horticultural use.

12.2 The Plan Area

The village is situated in a valley and has within it the Titchfield canal. The canal path from the village to the Meon Shore adjoins the Titchfield Haven National Nature Reserve. The Plan area also borders other sites of national and international importance. These are the Solent and Southampton Ramsar and Special Protection Area sites, relating to wetlands and assemblage of waterfowl. Within the area there are a number of sites of importance for Nature Conservation.

The local population and the Haven share a common interest and responsibility to protect the area and its species. See ‘Protect and where possible enhance the natural environment’, Appendix 35. There is a footpath along most of the canal but there is no official access for cycles and limited access for those in a wheelchair or on a disability scooter.

In times of heavy rainfall the River Meon overflows, resulting in areas adjacent to the canal being flooded. The water meadows give protection and must be retained. The canal is monitored to maintain appropriate water levels and sluice gates are adjusted as needed. Titchfield Haven undertakes this task.

There are two conservation areas, one in the village and the other centred on the Abbey area. There are other listed buildings which are shown on the Plan in Section 1 Housing. The environment of the village is attractive and of historic importance and should be preserved and improved. The landscape within the whole Plan area is one of importance in respect of its character, quality, distinctiveness and its ecological and heritage features.

The traffic and parking issues have been noted in a separate section of the Plan. Both these issues have a negative impact on the overall environment and preservation of the village. The area has no official cycle ways to enable cyclists to avoid the busy roads. Neither are there any bridleways.

12.3 Care for the Environment

The environment can be improved by energy efficiency measures. Housing improvements could be achieved with higher efficiency boilers and heaters and the appropriate use of solar panels. The conservation areas restrict the use of solar panels but other housing is not restricted. The use of appropriate fuel and the reduction of open fires will also help.
Storm water run-off from existing buildings can be eased by planting trees, hedges and shrubs and by the minimisation of paving and the provision of soakaways.

New buildings and developments should be constructed to the highest energy efficiency standards. The use of sustainable storm water drainage (SuDS) should be used where possible. Landscaping including the planting of trees, hedges and shrubs and other biodiversity measures should be encouraged.

A culture of a litter free area will be encouraged and support for the FBC vigilant approach to fly tipping should be adopted.

12.4 Open spaces

In the Plan area there are valued open spaces whose future should to be assured. These are:

- The village green
- The ‘Stones’ area off West Street
- Barry’s Meadow
- Southampton Hill green space
- Allotments adjacent to Titchfield Community Centre
- Allotments off West Street
- Allotments and cemetery at corner of Posbrook Lane
- Allotments at Segensworth Lane East
- The bowling green and car park
- The Church and cemetery
- The canal path and river banks
- Children’s play area – Bellfield
- The Country Park area and lakes
- Abbey and grounds
- Water meadows
- Mill Lane recreation ground

These spaces are variously owned and maintained by private individuals, the Earl of Southampton Trust, FBC, HCC, Historic England and the Church. All these spaces could be protected under the Assets of Community Regulations 2012. This might be a future development after consultation with residents.

There is also a network of public footpaths around the village – see Getting Around para 10.13.
12.5 Natural Environment - Aims, objectives, policies and tasks

Aim

To maintain an area with a continually improving natural environment.

Environment objective E.1
Ensure the country park is designed to enable access for all walkers and the disabled.

Environment objective E.2.
Ensure any proposed new development takes account of the natural environment. Appendix 35

Policies

Policy E.1. New Development
Proposals for new development will be supported provided:

• The main objectives of the Plan are met
• The impact on air pollution, energy, water supply, drainage, waste disposal, traffic volumes and transport routes are assessed and considered.

Tasks

Task E.1. Provide support to the Solent and Southampton SPA, the Ramsar areas and the Titchfield Haven and SSI site. Also support non-statutory sites within the Plan area – eg SINC sites and sites identified as important in the Solent and Brent Geese Strategy 2010.

Note: leaving the EU may result in changes to these regulations.

Task E.2.
Continue to liaise with FBC to ensure residents’ wishes regarding the country park are taken into consideration.
12.6 Energy

12.7 Aims, objectives, policies and tasks

| Aim | To encourage appropriate energy installations in new developments |

Energy Objective EN.1.
Encourage appropriate renewable energy installations.

Policy EN.1 Energy Efficiency
The NP supports the draft Local Plan 2036. This Plan supports the development proposals which, through design and layout, promote the efficient use of energy. The Plan also recommends the effective use of sustainably sourced materials, minimising waste and reduction of CO2 emissions.

12.8 Open spaces

12.9 Aims, objectives and tasks

| Aim | To value our local open spaces |

Objective
To monitor and maintain the areas identified as open spaces in the introduction – see p 46.

Tasks - To continue to work with The Earl of Southampton Trust and FBC to improve the play area and access to Barry’s meadow

To continue to monitor invasive species along the canal path and advise relevant authorities
12.10 Footpaths

12.11 Aims, Objectives, Tasks

**Aim**
To preserve existing footpaths in the NP area

**Objective GA.1**
Protect and improve footpaths to improve access to rural walks

**Objective GA.2.**
In the event of future development in the Neighbourhood Plan area, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding monies will be used to improve area amenities and infrastructure following consultation with NP residents and priority list formed.

**Task GA.1**
Encourage landowners to remove anything unnecessary from Public Rights of Way
Encourage landowners to ensure that footpaths and stiles are accessible and encourage landowners to waymark and signpost footpaths
Work with HCC to ensure public rights of way are clearly signposted and easily passable.
Continue to work with HCC and FBC to ensure that the canal walkway is accessible for disabled people and for walkers at all times
Chapter 12 – Historic Titchfield

13.1 Titchfield Historic Buildings

As mentioned on page 9, A Brief History of Titchfield, the area has a wealth of historic buildings including the Abbey, the 14th century barn (sometimes known as the Great Barn) and St Peter’s Church. The village has two conservation areas and many of the houses are listed buildings.

Whilst we appreciate that heritage and conservation come under specific legislation it is imperative that these buildings and areas are preserved for future generations.

The Titchfield Conservation Area was designated in 1969 and the boundary was subsequently amended to include a larger area in 1994. The village grew from a medieval core, comprising High Street, Church Street, South Street and the lower end of West Street. Its attractive character arises from use of traditional local materials, the small scale of the buildings and the mixture of building styles which range from Tudor and Jacobean through to Georgian and Victorian.

The Titchfield Abbey Conservation Area was designated in 1994. It includes a portion of the Meon Valley, between the A27 north of Titchfield Village and the railway from Fareham to Southampton. This part of the Meon Valley has considerable architectural and historic interest and provides a setting for a number of important scheduled ancient monuments and listed buildings, most notably those associated with Titchfield Abbey. The valley provides a remarkably unspoilt rural backdrop to these historic buildings.

Titchfield has seen many changes over the years. There is still evidence of this throughout the village such as the weighbridge once used to weigh the coke from the gasworks. Several breweries not only made beer but owned most of pubs in the area. Titchfield Mill is probably on the site of the ‘King’s Mill’ mentioned in the Domesday Book. The present building dates from 1830.

Both Conservation areas have issues with traffic. The setting and promotion of the Abbey could also be improved. This Plan makes proposals to address both issues.
13.2 Titchfield Abbey and Fishponds - This is a scheduled monument under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 as amended, as it appears to the Secretary of State to be of national importance. *Historic England*

13.3 The Abbey was converted and became Place House in 1537 when it was re-built into a home for the Chancellor of Henry VIII, Sir Thomas Wriothesley, who became the first Earl of Southampton and for his successors. Although popular with visitors, the outer environs of the Abbey are bleak. The Abbey is on a busy main road and is easily missed by passers-by. The presentation of the Abbey needs improvement. Mill Lane and the adjacent Fisher’s Hill have traffic management issues such as speeding cars, heavy lorries and a huge number of cars especially during rush hour.

In the wall in the Abbey grounds there is clear evidence of a doorway. The owner of the land on the other side of this doorway has suggested, in consultation with English Heritage, that this entrance should be re-opened and a visitors’ centre provided. This new access would not only mean that the busy road junction to access the Abbey is avoided but it would also mean that pedestrians, wheelchair and buggy users as well as children could access the Abbey safely.

The visitors’ centre could also house information on other important aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan area.

13.4 The Ponds - Excavations of the Monastic ponds have shown they were constructed in the 13th century and were maintained in use after the Dissolution of the Abbey in the 16th century. Neither the Monastic ponds nor the newer ponds which were built approximately 40 years ago, are accessible to the public but the Monastic ponds are bisected by a public footpath so one can walk by the two lower ponds. The ponds are maintained by the fishing club and landowner. Both sets of ponds are in the Strategic Gap.

13.5 The Great Barn, often erroneously referred to as the Tithe Barn, is a magnificent example of a Medieval Aisled Barn being one of the largest in the South of England. This Grade I listed building has been deudrochronologically dated 1408/09. This is just before the Battle of Agincourt and as Henry V stayed at Titchfield Abbey on several occasions around this date, there is a strong belief that the Barn was constructed to store his war goods.

Following various agricultural uses over the centuries, the Barn fell into disrepair and was purchased by the Harris family, local market gardeners, who renovated it and used it in conjunction with their business. In later years, the Barn was again abandoned and was acquired by FBC in conjunction with the surrounding land to be designated a Country Park. Titchfield Festival Theatre leased the Barn and then purchased it to create a Theatre and Wedding Venue. The Barn has been substantially restored to suit these purposes. The Theatre presentations concentrate on Shakespearian productions, due to his association with Titchfield.

The entrance road to the Barn has many potholes so the road needs re-surfacing. The area surrounding the Barn needs improvement which would enhance the appearance of the barn itself.
13.6 **St Peter’s Heritage Church** — The church was founded in approximately 689 AD by St Wilfred and has been the centre of the village ever since. In June 2017 it became a Heritage church indicating its' significance as probably the oldest church in Hampshire and also one of the oldest churches in England.

There are many different types of architecture within the church, namely Anglo-Saxon, Norman, Early English (13th century), Decorated (1300-1350), Perpendicular (15th century), 17th century about 1670, Georgian (1776-1801), Victorian (1866-1867), Edwardian 1895 and the present day (Chapter Rooms 1989).

The interior of the church contains significant memorials to various families and people who have had an influence on the village down the ages, not least, the medieval memorial to William Pageham in the south chapel which is unique in England. Also, within this chapel stands the nationally important Wriothesley Monument, circa 1594.

The fact that this church is still thriving and flourishing today indicates its' significance to the village and surrounds.

13.7 **Stony Bridge**, also known as the Anjou Bridge, is a scheduled monument and is Grade II listed. The bridge spans the river Meon linking Fishers Hill to Mill Lane. It was the lowest crossing point of the river and also the coaching route to the village. The Stony Bridge is largely post-medieval in date but built with medieval fabric. It is associated with the marriage of Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou in 1445. Similar promotion to that for the Abbey should be provided.

13.8 **The Historic Houses Project** is putting together previous research by members of the History Society and adding to this body of work through further investigation into the most interesting properties and residents from the past 500 years. Titchfield has over 50 listed buildings, the oldest dating back to 14th century. Many of the houses are medieval with an early timber frame structure. Once research is complete, the aim is to identify a small number of locally important sites and, in discussion with FBC conservation staff, consider a commemoration plaque. Work so far includes physical evidence found of the earlier Titchfield Rectory, documentation identifying a philanthropic resident supporting the Foundling Hospital in London and a family following the Mayflower to the New World.

13.9 **Archaeological survey** - The archaeological significance of the village is established in Hampshire County Council and English Heritage’s Extensive Urban Survey of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight’s Historic Towns (1999). Together with its accompanying strategy document this has been published as part of a countywide survey of Hampshire’s historic towns. It identifies areas that are of archaeological importance, and those that are of 'high archaeological importance'. *Titchfield Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Strategy 2013*.

It is considered essential that should any building development be considered in the future then before this takes place an archaeological survey should be carried out to ensure that buildings of historical interest are not under the ground and so lost by the proposed development.

13.10 **Titchfield canal** was built by the 3rd Earl of Southampton in the 17th century and is believed to be the second oldest canal in Britain. It runs from the village to the coast and is an integral part of the heritage of the village. It is important that the whole canal path is upgraded to enable easy access to the sea for pedestrians at all times of the year. It is also important that the canal is maintained to ensure a steady flow of clean water.
13.11 **Titchfield carnival** has been taking place for some 134 years. It has been run by an historic group known by residents as the Bonfire Boys. The carnival has been an integral part of the village life but sadly, due to the high cost of policing, insurance etc it has not taken place since 2016. Ways should be found to support the Bonfire Boys to enable the biannual carnival to recommence.

13.12 **The heritage** - As part of Historic England services there is a scheme looking at streets within historical towns and villages. It looks at making improvements to public spaces without harm to their valued character, including specific recommendations for works to surfaces, street furniture, new equipment, traffic management infrastructure and environmental improvements. They have also brought uses back to our historic streets, such as markets and social spaces. The result is Streetscapes that are both more attractive and useable and that celebrate their distinctive character.

Their programme offers advice which sets out five clear goals for the improvement of historic streets:

- An inclusive environment
- Economic benefit
- A high-quality environment
- A healthy environment that supports our wellbeing and cohesion
- Public safety and ease of movement - see:

https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/streets-for-all/

as part of this work the proliferation of dull, unattractive, and often unnecessary, street signs should be considered.

13.13 **A wayfarer map** of historic sites should be provided on the village green and in the community centre car park to guide visitors appropriately.

13.14 **Publications** - it is essential that children, as well as adults, should be enlightened on the history of Titchfield over the ages. With this in mind it is intended to publish an historical story book suitable for all ages to read which will contain a flavour of life from the early 6th century until 1950 This proposed publication will complement the books already published by the History Society.

A Timeline has already been produced showing many historical events throughout the ages and it is anticipated that a full record of the history of Titchfield will now also be produced.

13.15 **Aims, objectives, policies and tasks**

**Aim**

To preserve and protect the valued heritage assets of the Plan area

**Objective HT.1.**

To preserve the historic and valued assets of the Neighbourhood Plan area, including the designated conservation areas.
Objective HT.2
To improve and upgrade the environs of Titchfield Abbey and the Great Barn

Objective HT.3
To produce a written record for each historic property in the conservation areas

Objective HT.4
To raise the profile of the Titchfield canal as an ancient waterway

Objective HT.5
To make long-term improvement in the presentation and promotion of Titchfield and its surrounding areas in order to encourage more visitors.

Policy HT.1. Preserving Historic Environment
Development proposals that fail to preserve the historic environment of the Titchfield Conservation Area, the Titchfield Abbey Conservation Area, the scheduled ancient monument of Titchfield Abbey and the listed buildings within its environs will not be permitted except where the public benefits are overriding. (NPPF guidelines 2013)

Policy HT.2 Archaeological Assessment
Due to the historical importance of the area, any development sites within the conservation areas should be subject to archaeological assessment and, if merited, further investigation.
Task HT.2.
To co-operate and negotiate with Historic England and local businesses to create a visitors’ centre and a re-opened entrance to the Abbey.

Task HT.2.2
Work with HCC and FBC to improve traffic management of Mill Lane and Fisher’s Hill in the proximity of the Abbey.

Task HT.2.3
To investigate ways of funding the resurfacing of the entrance road and also to look at ways of improving the area surrounding the barn.

Task HT.3.1
To support the historic houses project to ensure the historic details are not lost. It will also provide property owners with documented historical details of their properties and support the identification of some properties suitable for blue plaques. This project is a History Society project.

Task HT.3.2
To support the local schools, FBC and the Historic Houses project in producing easy to read and understand information on the area as well. A history story book suitable for all to read should be produced which will give a flavour of life through the ages of Titchfield.

Task HT.4
To work with all stakeholders to upgrade the continuation of the canal path beyond the NP area from the point known locally as Posbrook Bridge to the coast at Titchfield Haven. Negotiate with other relevant bodies to fund further improvements and maintenance.

Task HT.5.1
To negotiate with HCC and FBC for the erection of new signs at the entrance to the village relating to the history of the village. These signs should contain a ‘Welcome to Titchfield’ message as well as a coloured historic emblem approved by the residents. See Appendix 12.
Task HT. 5.2
To negotiate with all stakeholders to improve internal village signage and remove all obsolete signs

Task HT.5.3
To encourage and support the continuation of community events such as the carnival

Task HT.5.4
To use societies and media to promote the history of the Neighbourhood Plan area.

Supporting evidence for Historic Titchfield

The Emblem, Appendix 12
The History of Titchfield, Appendix 18
Chapter 14 - Monitoring and Review

The Forum recognises:

“It is important to note that Neighbourhood Forums exist to produce Neighbourhood Plans and have a designation of five years only. They do not have a formal role in the implementation of a neighbourhood plan. The members of a neighbourhood Forum may want to consider how they can stay involved and support implementation, perhaps through the creation of another type of formal group” Locality Road Map page 54

Titchfield,
a place to go to rather than go through
Chapter 15 - Glossary of Terms

AECOM - a consultancy organisation funded by the Government to support Neighbourhood Forums.

Backland - the process of developing on private land in a legal capacity

Biodiversity - the variety and diversity of life in all its forms, within and between both species and the ecosystems

Brownfield Land - Previously developed land, or land that contains or contained a permanent structure and associated infrastructure

Conservation area - area of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance

FBC - Fareham Borough Council

Forum - volunteers who have been working to produce the Neighbourhood Plan

Greenfield Development - Land that has not previously been used for urban development. It is usually land last used for agriculture and located next to or outside existing built-up areas of a settlement.

Infill - Infill development is the process of developing vacant or under-used parcels of land within existing urban areas that are already largely developed

Neighbourhood Plan (NP) - a document drawn up by the Neighbourhood Forum with the help of the community. It helps communities decide the future of the places where they live and work.

Scheduled Monument - is a nationally important archaeological site or historic building, given protection against unauthorised change.

Strategic Gap - relates to areas of open land/countryside that have been defined by FBC to prevent the joining up of urban areas.

TVT - Titchfield Village Trust.

Urban Area Boundary - the boundary between the urban area of the village and the surrounding countryside. A substantial part of Southampton Hill is now included in the Urban Area Boundary for planning reasons. This urban boundary is a true representation of the village.

Windfall sites refers to those sites which become available for development unexpectedly and are therefore not included as allocated land in a planning authority's allocation.
Part A – Local Planning Authority comments in relation to the ‘basic conditions’

1.1 An independent examiner will assess the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan against the ‘basic conditions’, which are:

1. Whether the neighbourhood plan has regard to national planning policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State.
2. Whether the neighbourhood plan contributes to achieving sustainable development.
3. Whether the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the Council’s development plan.
4. Whether the neighbourhood plan complies with EU and human rights obligations.

Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State

The Local Planning Authority is concerned that there appear to be some areas of potential conflict between the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

Policy Wording

1.2 The PPG sets out the requirements in relation to the wording of neighbourhood plan policies. In particular, the PPG states that policies:

“….should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence” (Paragraph 41, Ref ID: Ref ID 41-041-20140306).

1.3 There are a large number of policies that would benefit from further clarity to allow the decision maker to apply them consistently and with confidence. This is discussed further in Part B of this response.

1.4 There are several policies in the plan that require supporting text to explain their intent. Where introductory text has been supplied in the chapters that contain policies in the plan, the link between the policies and the supporting text should be made more explicit. There are several instances where more relevant information should be provided in the introductory text to each chapter, which should be related more directly to policies. In addition, throughout the TNP there is frequently a lack of justification to underpin the approach taken by the policies in the plan. It is suggested that each policy is reviewed to ensure it has the necessary context and evidence to underpin its inclusion and approach.

1.5 The Local Planning Authority is concerned that there appear to be areas of potential conflict between the TNP and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and PPG in relation to the wording of policies. Paragraph 16 of the NPPF states that neighbourhood plans should:
develop plans that support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development”.

1.6 In addition, the PPG sets out the requirements in relation to the wording of neighbourhood plan policies as set out in paragraph 1.2 of this response. The Local Planning Authority is concerned that currently the specific wording of some of the policies is inconsistent with the requirements of the NPPF and PPG. In particular, the policies in the plan require added flexibility to ensure they plan positively to support local development and some of the policies require greater precision and detail to ensure they can be applied consistently and with confidence in the determination of planning applications in the neighbourhood plan area. The policy wording will be considered in detail through the independent examination process. Inflexible, imprecisely worded and unclear policies could potentially be subject to a recommendation for significant changes, or deletion, by the independent examiner. Part B of this report contains more specific comments in relation to this issue.

Evidence Base

1.7 Generally, policies contained within the TNP appear to be largely supported by the results of consultation events held by the Neighbourhood Forum. However, the PPG requires that the neighbourhood plan is supported by appropriate evidence. The Local Planning Authority is concerned that such evidence has not been presented at this stage. Therefore, the Local Planning Authority considers that it would be advisable for the Neighbourhood Forum to ensure that the Regulation 15 submission TNP is supported by additional information setting out the background and justification for the policies which have been included in the document.

Viability and Deliverability

1.8 The PPG states that a neighbourhood plan must not constrain the delivery of important national policy objectives. Paragraph 47 of the NPPF also sets out the need to boost significantly the supply of housing, whilst Paragraph 173 of the NPPF requires plans to be deliverable and viable. In addition, the PPG states that, “what impact the infrastructure requirements may have on the viability of a proposal in a draft neighbourhood plan and therefore its delivery”. (Paragraph 45, Ref ID: 41-045-20140306).

1.9 The Pre-submission TNP has the potential to place additional financial burdens on development, for example through Policies H.3 (Local Need), H.4 (Quality Design and Local Character), G.A.2 (Cycle Links) and E.1 (New Development) Such obligations should not constrain the supply of new housing by undermining the deliverability and viability of relevant proposals and therefore it is suggested that additional justification is provided by the Neighbourhood Forum to demonstrate that these obligations will not undermine the deliverability of new development.

Contributing to achievement of sustainable development

1.10 Paragraph 72 of the PPG (Ref ID 41-072-20140306) states that: “A qualifying body must demonstrate how its plan or Order will contribute to improvements in environmental, economic and social conditions or that
consideration has been given to how any potential adverse effects arising from the proposals may be prevented, reduced or offset (referred to as mitigation measures).

\[ \text{In order to demonstrate that a draft neighbourhood plan or Order contributes to sustainable development, sufficient and proportionate evidence should be presented on how the draft neighbourhood plan or Order guides development to sustainable solutions}. \]

1.11 There are some policies in the TNP which endeavour to support sustainable development such as seeking to provide a smaller mix of housing for specific groups. However, in trying to achieve sustainable development some of these policies may affect the viability and deliverability of new housing development. This is discussed in more detail in Part B of this report.

1.12 There is some information on how the TNP achieves sustainable development in the section on compliance with national policies. However, the basic conditions statement provided with the submission neighbourhood plan should demonstrate how each of the policies achieve sustainable development.

**General conformity with the Council’s Development Plan**

1.13 One of the ‘basic conditions’ is for the neighbourhood plan to be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained with the Development Plan. The strategic policies are contained within the Adopted Local Plan (ALP) which includes the Local Plan Part 1 (LP1): Core Strategy and the Local Plan Part 2 (LP2): Development Sites and Allocations.

1.14 It is welcomed that a draft Basic Conditions Statement has been provided as a supporting document for the Pre-submission TNP consultation. It is noted that the statement does not provide information on whether the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the ALP. This information should be provided to support the Regulation 15 submission version of the neighbourhood plan.

1.15 There are some areas where there are potential conflicts with the strategic policies of the LP1 and LP2, which could be addressed through amended wording in the plan or further emphasis in the policies or supporting text. These concerns are set out in Part B of this report.

**European obligations and human rights requirements**

**Strategic Environmental Assessment**

1.16 One of the key elements of this basic condition relates to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), which is required where a Neighbourhood Plan is likely to have ‘significant environmental effects’. The Local Planning Authority has previously screened the Draft TNP and determined that an SEA in accordance with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 is not required. However, at the time the screening assessment was undertaken there was not a clear proposal to extend the settlement boundary for Titchfield. If this were to facilitate development that would trigger an assessment within the
Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan area then the Council would need to re-visit the original screening opinion.

**Habitats Regulations Assessment and Appropriate Assessment**

1.17 The screening decision and report for the TNP confirms it is necessary to carry out an Appropriate Assessment. The Appropriate Assessment for the TNP concludes that the plan will not adversely affect the integrity of any European sites if the proposed approach to dealing with likely significant effects is followed. The proposed approach is set out in more detail in the Appropriate Assessment.

**Human Rights Requirements**

1.18 No detailed assessment appears to have been made in relation to human rights legislation (Human Rights Act 1998). It may be appropriate for the TNF to consider if an equalities impact assessment of the Pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan is appropriate to assess the positive and negative impacts on groups with protected characteristics. The Local Planning Authority can provide further advice in this regard.

**Conclusion**

1.19 The Council supports the neighbourhood planning process and in assisting the TNF in producing their neighbourhood plan. To that end, the LPA has a number of key concerns at this stage and has offered suggested amendments where possible when the Neighbourhood Plan falls short of the ‘basic conditions’. The areas where the LPA considers the Pre-submission Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan falls short are:

i. Having regard to national policies and advice (particularly the requirements of the PPG).

ii. Ensuring the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan is in general conformity with the Adopted Local Plan (ALP), i.e. the Development Plan which includes Development Plan (Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies) and does not undermine the strategic policies in the Development Plan.

1.20 Please note, in addition to the above (under category i), it is important to highlight that the Pre-submission Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan does not provide:

- Sufficient clarity to allow a decision maker to apply them consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications in the neighbourhood plan area.
- Sufficient flexibility to ensure they plan positively to support local development.
- Set out the justification and evidence to clearly support policy requirements.
- The potential of some policy requirements to have a negative impact on viability and therefore the deliverability of housing.
Part B – Detailed assessment of the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) and supporting documentation

This section provides a detailed assessment of the TNP and supporting documents in relation to the ‘basic conditions’ requirements. This includes an assessment concerning how the TNP would operate in practice once it is ‘made’. Annex 1 to this response provides additional factual observations. The suggestions/recommendations are aimed at ensuring that the policies achieve the objective for which they are intended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Section</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Relevant National Planning Policy Guidance/Legislation</th>
<th>Options/Potential Changes Required to TNP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front page</td>
<td>The neighbourhood plan period should be consistent throughout the plan. For example, the title on the front cover conflicts with paragraph 1.1 of the TNP.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advise amending to 2018 - 2036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contents page (pages 1 and 2)</td>
<td>The contents page (pages 1 and 2) refers to Policy 5 - Smaller Dwellings, Policy H.6 Brownfield Sites and Policy T.2.1 - Pedestrian and Cycling Routes. However, these policies are absent from the TNP.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advise deleting references to Policy 5, Policy H.6 and Policy T.2.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contents page (page 3)</td>
<td>Appendices 16, 17 and 26 are missing from the contents page. These should be removed if they are no longer relevant.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advise renumbering the appendices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreword (page 5)</td>
<td>Reference is made to the TNP having ‘the force of law’. This statement is unclear and confusing and should be amended to ‘will become a statutory part of the Development Plan’.</td>
<td>“If the majority of those who vote in a referendum are in favour of the draft neighbourhood plan, then the neighbourhood plan must be made by the local planning authority within 8 weeks of the referendum”. (Paragraph 64, Ref ID: 41-064-</td>
<td>Advise amending text to be consistent with the PPG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Advice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 – The Neighbourhood Plan (page 7)</td>
<td>The second paragraph of this section makes the following statement: “This document sets out the aspirations of the community”. The Forum should note that any aspirations related to non-land use matters should be set out in a companion document or annex as stated in the PPG. The final sentence of this section ‘The health and well-being if the residents in reflected throughout….’ is not clear or well related to this section of the plan. There are no further points in the plan where health is mentioned.</td>
<td>Advise either deleting the sentence or provide further explanation which clearly relates to the objectives/policies within the TNP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 – Housing (page 7)</td>
<td>The second sentence refers to ‘History (FBC Emerging Local Plan 2018 – 2036, p.32 policy H1 Strategic Housing Provisions) shows us that approximately 10% of the housing demand will be met by windfall sites (see Glossary p59) within the Borough’. At this juncture, it is not clear how the housing demand will be met from windfall sites. The plan should provide further justification and evidence for the approach taken.</td>
<td>Advise deleting the reference to ‘History’. Advise providing further analysis on the windfall rates in Titchfield to provide a more accurate basis on which to rely upon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Getting Around (page 7)</td>
<td>This section refers to traffic policies and tasks, however, there is no reference to the relevant policies and tasks. It is advised that reference to the policies and tasks in Chapter 10 are included in this section.</td>
<td>Advise adding reference to policies and tasks in Chapter 10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 – Commercial and Economic Considerations (page 7)</td>
<td>Reference is made to ‘Proposals to convert business or commercial premises into residential use will be resisted’. This text sounds like policy wording and is contrary to the GDPO 2015. In addition, there is no further clarification in relation to this sentence throughout the plan and it is recommended that this sentence is removed from the TNP.</td>
<td>Permitted Development: “Development consisting of a change of use of a building and any land within its curtilage from, a use falling within Class B1(a) (offices) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order, to a use falling within Class C3”</td>
<td>Advise deleting sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Historic Titchfield (page 7)</td>
<td>The last paragraph of page 7 in italics does not sit well within this section. In addition, the last sentence of this paragraph is unclear. Suggest moving the last paragraph to section 4.1 of the plan and providing further clarification in respect of the last sentence of the paragraph.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3 – Titchfield Today (page 11)</td>
<td>Reference is made to the Conservation Areas within Titchfield and Listed Buildings. It would be helpful if the Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings were shown on Map 1 in the plan (or a separate map) and then linked to the text in Chapter 3 of the NP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3 – Titchfield Today (page 11)</td>
<td>English Heritage is now known as ‘Historic England’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4 – How the Neighbourhood Plan Developed (Chapter 13)</td>
<td>It is advised that the information set out in Chapter 4 may be better placed in a background document to the TNP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Reference is made in the first paragraph that the ‘Neighbourhood Plan must support the “i.e. the making” Please advise amending this to read “Neighbourhood Plan must support the”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Neighbourhood Plan must be in 'general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority'.

This is not accurate. The Neighbourhood Plan must be in 'general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority'.

5.1 The Plan boundary takes the village as its focus (page 15).

Further clarification should be provided in terms of the status of the protection that these sites have. In addition, it is advised that Map 2 should be more clearly labelled. The current scale of the plan makes it difficult to read.

The second paragraph of section 5.1 makes the following statement 'protected public open spaces such as Chilling Woodland (Thatcher’s Copse) and Titchfield Haven National Nature Reserve'.

Further clarification should be provided in terms of the status of the protection that these sites have. In addition, it is advised that Map 2 should be more clearly labelled. The current scale of the plan makes it difficult to read.

Advise amending the paragraph as follows: ‘Thatcher’s Copse is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and an Ancient Woodland and Titchfield Haven NNR is statutory designated as part of the Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site, and a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)’. Advise providing Map 2 at a clearer scale (see general comments in Annex 2 of this response).
| 5.2 Urban Area Boundary (page 16) | The first paragraph of the section makes the following statement “The NP Policy H.3 recommends extending the existing Urban Area Boundary for Titchfield to include properties along Southampton Hill”. First, the reference to Policy H.3 is incorrect and should be amended to ‘Policy UAB.1. Urban Area Boundary’. Also, the TNP refers to ‘recommends extending the existing Urban Area Boundary’. However, this includes Policy UAB.1 in the plan, which extends the Settlement Boundary, rather than recommending that it is extended.

Furthermore, the proposal for extending the Settlement Boundary is not in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Adopted Local Plan and does not have regard to the NPPF. First, in relation to the 2012 NPPF, the definition of previously developed land excludes ‘land in built up areas such as residential gardens’. Therefore, the extension of the boundary would be treated as ‘greenfield’ as effectively it would be included within the Settlement Boundary (‘built up area’) for Titchfield and therefore contradicts the purpose of including this land for ‘small scale development’. In addition, the proposed extension to the Settlement Boundary includes land to the south of properties 5-21 Southampton Hill. This land is not part of the curtilage of any of the properties on Southampton Hill and including this land as part of the Settlement Boundary is effectively allocating a site for housing. The proposed extension in this case would allow for further housing within the Settlement Boundary for Titchfield. Therefore, housing development on this site would not be considered ‘windfall’ as it would allow housing to come forward on this site. The Council is unclear what the Neighbourhood Forum’s intention is within the Pre-submission Plan as it lacks clarity. If it is the Forum’s intention to allocate a site by amending the DUSB, then additional evidence should be provided to explain the rationale for including this site within the TNP. It would also not be in conformity with the ALP. Please also note that if the Forum submit the TNP under the 2018 NPPF (paragraph 122) there has been a change of emphasis in respect to garden land. | Advise addressing points raised. |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5.3 Strategic Gap (page 17) | The first paragraph of this section makes the following statement 'In effect the gap represents a green jacket around the village'. This statement is unclear and confusing as to its meaning and implications.

It is advised that further clarification is provided on policy CS22 in the Adopted Local Plan in relation to the Strategic Gap. | Advise providing further clarification in relation to references made on the Strategic Gap. |
<p>| Chapter 6 – The Vision for Titchfield (page) | Chapter 6 sets out a vision and core themes for Titchfield. A link should be provided between the vision and the policies in the TNP. | Advise addressing points. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19)</th>
<th>Core Theme 7 refers to ‘promoting a village emblem, supporting the Britain in Bloom village entry’. This core theme goes beyond the remit of planning and may be better placed as a ‘task’ in a companion document or annex.</th>
<th>Advise moving the information under Chapter 7 to the Consultation Statement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7 – Turning the Vision into a Plan (page 19)</td>
<td>The first paragraph of this chapter sets out the key areas that the plan will address and how these areas where devised, i.e. through consultation meetings. It is advised that this information should be set out within the Consultation Statement.</td>
<td>Advise moving the information under Chapter 7 to the Consultation Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) (page 19)</td>
<td>Reference is made to SEA in the first and second paragraph. Although this is useful information it is not understood how this relates to the plan in respect of the basic conditions. In addition, reference is made to the Forum having ‘received the SEA’ is incorrect. The Forum received a Screening Report and Appropriate Assessment, and a Screening Decision from the Council.</td>
<td>Advise that the section on SEA could be moved to the Basic Conditions Statement and explained more fully. In addition, the LPA advise that the statement in relation to receiving the SEA should be amended to ‘The Council provided the Forum with a copy of the Screening Report and Appropriate Assessment, and a Screening Decision Notice’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 The Titchfield neighbourhood Plan, the National Plans and the FBC Plan (page 20)</td>
<td>The first paragraph combines three separate quotes from the NPPF and a Resolution from the United Nations Assembly. Advise that these quotes are separated so they can be read more easily. In addition, the quotes from Paragraph 14 of the NPPF (text box on page 4 of the NPPF) are incorrect and should be amended. Furthermore, the quote from Paragraph 9 should refer to both Paragraph 9 and 10 of the NPPF.</td>
<td>Advise separating quotes so they are easier to read. Advise amending the quotes to accurately reflect the NPPF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1. (pages 20 and 21)</td>
<td>There are several policies within the table where either the policy reference is not consistent with the reference of the policy in the main body of the plan or the policy does not appear to be present in the TNP. Policy references should be reviewed and revised. In addition, the Forum have made reference to chapters within the NPPF as indicators</td>
<td>Advise amending the table so policy references in the plan are consistent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for achieving sustainable development, but has not included chapters 3, 5 or 13. Any explanation of why these chapters have not been included should be provided. Furthermore, there are specific sections on plan-making and decision taking, which makes specific reference to neighbourhood plans. Again, these should be refereed to.

**7.4 Support for FBC Local Plan (page 22)**
The LPA advise that further clarification and explanation should either be provided in this section in relation to how the TNP is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Adopted Local Plan, or in the Basic Conditions Statement which should then be linked to the TNP.

**Table 2. (pages 22 and 23)**
There are several policies within the table where either the policy reference is not consistent with the reference of the policy in the main body of the plan or the policy does not appear to be present in the TNP. Policy references should be reviewed and revised.

In addition, the table only refers to 5 policies in the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (LP1). There appears to be no reference to any of the other strategic policies in the LP1 or any of the policies in the Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies (LP2).

**Chapter 8 – The Structure of the Plan (page 25)**
The last box on the page refers to aspirational tasks. It is noted that the TNP refers to the tasks as mainly aspirations identified by the Forum that relate to non-land use matter. However, the LPA advise that these tasks should be moved to a separate annex or companion document to the TNP.

**Advise that all policies in the TNP are cross referenced in the table.**

**Advise providing further clarification and explanation.**

**Advise amending the table so policy references in the plan are consistent.**

In addition, the LPA advise that the plan should cross refer to strategic policies in the LP1 and LP2 where relevant. The Basic Conditions statement should include a more detailed assessment of how the plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Adopted Local Plan (LP1 and LP2).

**“Wider community aspirations than those relating to development and use of land can be included in a neighbourhood plan, but actions**

Advise moving all tasks to a separate annex or companion document to the TNP.
### Map 5. – Housing (page 26)

The key on the map refers to the ‘built up area’. Although it is understood what is meant by ‘built up area boundary’, the adopted Local Plan refers to this as the Defined Urban Settlement Boundary (DUSB). Therefore, the LPA advise that a note should be included below the map to provide further explanation.

In addition, the key refers to a 'key point of interest within the Plan Area', it is not clear what this is referring to and further clarification should be provided in this respect.

The LPA are concerned that the map could be misread. As it appears (at the current scale in the Pre-submission Plan) that only parts of the Conservation Area for Titchfield can be seen on the map. The LPA advise that this should be amended by clearly defining both the Conservation Area for Titchfield and the Defined Urban Settlement Boundary.

### 9.1. Background and rationale (page 27)

Whilst not a policy, the first paragraph of this section does not provide any clarity for potential planning applications in the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan area. It is advised that further clarification is provided by making specific references to the NPPF and the ALP.

The second paragraph refers to the historic environment in relation to Titchfield. This paragraph should be moved to Chapter 13 of the TNP.

The fourth paragraph of this section repeats the penultimate paragraph in Chapter 3 – Titchfield Today (page 11). Suggest removing the text from Chapter 3. In addition, the Forum could include a link to Appendix 31 in this paragraph.
| 9.2 Meeting future housing needs in Titchfield (page 27) | Update second paragraph to reflect the changes to national policy. I would refer you in particular to the transitional arrangements in the NPPF published on 24th July 2018. These arrangements are found in Paragraph 214 of the NPPF. | Advise updating second paragraph. |
| Section 9.3 – How many additional houses are need in Titchfield? - Section 9.6 | Section 9.3 – 9.6 provides details on the Housing Needs Assessment completed by AECOM for the TNP. Reference is made to Paragraph 20 of the AECOM report which states that,  
“in arriving at a final housing figure, we do not judge there is any justification to make an uplift to the figure beyond 262 dwellings for the Neighbourhood Plan period”.  
Following this statement there are a number of assumptions that are made in these sections as to how the housing requirement figure can be fulfilled. However, there is no reference to how this will be met until section 9.6 (page 30).  
Reference is made to a number of housing completions being counted towards the housing figure being identified for the Titchfield Neighbourhood Area in the AECOM report. However, the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan covers the period 2018 – 2036. Therefore, any housing completions before 2018 cannot be counted towards meeting the requirement up to 2036. Further analysis should be included in an Appendix linked to this section to demonstrate that 10 dwellings would come forward through windfall development in the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan area.  
In addition, the grey box on page 28 sets out the requirement for plan period, i.e. to 2036, not to 2034. The Forum should include an additional two years requirement to cover the TNP period.  
Furthermore, the LPA is concerned in respect of the reference to reviewing the TNP after 5 years. If, the Forum relies on this evidence from the AECOM Housing Needs Assessment, then it would need to be clear how the Pre-submission Plan meets housing need up until 2036.  
The LPA advise that these paragraphs are amended to provide an improved relation | “Neighbourhoods should: Develop plans that support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development”. (Paragraph 16 of the NPPF). | The LPA advise that the Pre-submission plan should provide further justification in Sections 9.3-9.6 as to how windfall development will meet the housing requirement set out for the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan area. This information should be supported by evidence.  
In addition, the LPA advise that the Forum should review the permissions referred in terms of constituting part of the neighbourhood plan area housing figure over the plan period. |
with Policies H.1 – H.3 to provide clarity as to what these policies are trying to achieve, and to provide justification and the rationale for including the policies in the TNP.

| 9.4 Types of dwellings in Titchfield (page 29) | This section refers to 2011 census data in relation to the types of dwellings in the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan area and make comparison to the rest of the Borough and national levels. However, there is no data provided in the TNP to illustrate this comparison.

In addition, there is no information provided in this section to demonstrate that these properties are either rented or owner occupied. Further clarification should be provided in this respect. | Advise providing Borough and national information on types of dwellings. Advise providing clarification as to the split of rented/owner occupied housing. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.5 What sort of dwellings do we need in Titchfield (page 29)</td>
<td>Paragraph 1 of this section refers to ‘social housing’ and ‘affordable rented housing’. Social rent and affordable rent are two different terms, but are both forms of affordable housing. The 2018 NPPF provides up to date definitions of both.</td>
<td>Advise clarifying the types of affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9.6 Where will the new houses be built? (page 30) | Reference is made to paragraph 5.46 of the Fareham Local Plan 2036 and the development opportunities which have been identified in Titchfield. The plan states that the quote is taken from the Draft Fareham Local Plan 2036 which is incorrect, the quote is taken from the Adopted Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2011). The reference should be amended in this respect.

Reference is made to Policy H6 - Brownfield Sites. However, Policy H6 does not appear to be in the TNP. In addition, paragraph 4 of the sections refers to a community consultation where preference was shown for brownfield rather than greenfield sites. A link to the relevant evidence base should be provided in this respect.

In addition, the TNP should provide additional clarity in terms what appears to be a proposed extension to the Settlement Boundary. The proposed extension would allow for potential development within the boundary, which the LPA would not consider to be ‘windfall’ (Please see more detailed comments in relation to section 5.2 above).

Furthermore, the last paragraph of the section is unclear and confusing. The housing allocation (H3) referred to in this paragraph is part of the Draft Fareham Local Plan 2036, and the site is not within the ward boundary for Titchfield. The paragraph should be amended to reflect this. | Advise making suggested amendments. |
<p>| Aim (page 31) | The aim refers to ‘the emerging plan 2036’. It is recommended that this is amended to | Advise amending aim. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective H.1. (page 31)</th>
<th>The objective states ‘New housing should be provided within the revised Urban Area Boundary’. This objective sounds like policy wording. It is recommended that the wording of the objective is reviewed and revised. In addition, the Objective refers to Policy H.3 and this is incorrect and should be Policy UAB.1.</th>
<th>Advise amending Objective H.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective H.2 (page 31)</td>
<td>This objective refers to Policies H.5 and Policies H.6 neither of these appear in the TNP and reference to these policies should therefore be removed.</td>
<td>Advise removing references to Policies H.5 and H.6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective H.3. (page 31)</td>
<td>This objective sounds like policy wording and repeats Policy H.2. The LPA advice that the Objective should be removed.</td>
<td>Advise deleting Objective H.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective H.4 (page 31)</td>
<td>This objective sounds like policy wording. It is recommended that the wording of the objective is reviewed and revised. In addition, the objective refers to Policy H.4 this is not necessary. Consider removing the reference from the objective.</td>
<td>Advise amending Objective H.4. Advise deleting reference to Policy H4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5.2 (page 16) and Policy UAB.1. – Urban Area Boundary (page 31)</td>
<td>Policy UAB.1. reads as more of an objective/introductory text. The policy text also infers that the TNP will review the Urban Area Boundary. However, the TNP appears to be proposing an amendment to the Urban Area Boundary within the Pre-submission Plan as previously mentioned. The policy is contrary to the strategic policies in the ALP and the 2012 NPPF. The policy should be accompanied by proportionate evidence and supporting text that provides justification and rationale for the change to the settlement boundary for Titchfield. In particular, the Council published a Settlement Boundary Review in October 2017. Chapter 4 of the Review provides a number of factors that were used in the assessment of boundaries in the Borough. Also, the reference to ‘page’ should be deleted. The windfall rate that is relied upon does not ‘cap’ site sizes, whereas Policy H1 does cap sites, to 10 dwellings. Further clarification should be provided as to whether a cap applies or not. Also, further evidence should be provided by the Forum to demonstrate that this capping would not restrict windfall. In addition, the Forum should note that the NPPF (2012) definition of previously developed land excludes, ‘land in built-up areas such as residential gardens’. This “Policies should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, previse and supported by appropriate evidence.” (Paragraph 41, Ref ID 41-041-20140306 of the</td>
<td>The LPA advise that additional clarification to the policy should be provided in the TNP. Advise deleting the reference to ‘page’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy H1. – Windfall Development (page 32)</td>
<td>The policy should be accompanied by proportionate evidence and supporting text that provides justification and rationale for the inclusion of Policy H.1 in the TNP. Policy H1 advocates a ‘maximum’ (up to 10 dwellings) dwelling number for small scale infill development. In line with the principles of the NPPF it would be beneficial if the policy was worded in a more positive manner to provide flexibility over the life of the neighbourhood plan. In addition, the term ‘as far as possible’ could not be applied to a planning application with precision. At this juncture, given the lack of proportionate evidence provided, it is unclear how this policy complies with the strategic policies of the ALP.</td>
<td>“Policies should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.” (Paragraph 41, Ref ID 41-041-20140306 of the PPG).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy H.2. Affordable Housing (page 32)</td>
<td>The spirit of this policy is noted; however, the LPA is concerned how this policy would operate in practice. It is suggested that the policy requirement is clarified. As it stands the requirement is unclear and as currently worded would not accord with the requirements of the PPG. The terms ‘should’ and ‘appropriate’ could not be applied to a planning application with precision. In addition, supporting text should be provided to explain the rationale behind the policy. As it currently stands, the TNP does not accord with the 2012 NPPF and detailed guidance in the PPG in relation to affordable housing requirements.</td>
<td>“Policies should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy H.3. Local Need (page 32)</td>
<td>It is not clear if the policies apply to market or affordable housing or both. The policy does not provide sufficient clarification as to the exact mix of units that are required on a new development site. The policy currently reads that all new housing should be ‘smaller dwellings’ which would impact upon development viability. The LPA is concerned that the Neighbourhood Forum has not drawn upon evidence in justifying or testing a proposed specified housing mix. It would be helpful for the Neighbourhood Forum to provide further justification and clear evidence on this policy requirement prior to the submission of the Neighbourhood Plan. Also, the term ‘should’ could not be applied to a planning application with precision. In addition, the consequences of this policy also need further clarification. Restricting the mix of new dwellings to those that are ‘mainly smaller’ dwellings could result in people being forced to move out of the Neighbourhood Plan Area. An Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) should be completed on this policy in this respect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| “Contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1,000 square metres (gross internal area).” (Paragraph 41, Ref ID 41-041-20140306 of the PPG). |

| “Policies should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.” |

| The LPA advise that additional clarification to the policy should be provided in the TNP. |
| Policy H.4 – Quality Design and Local Character (page 32) | There is no evidence provided or supporting text to justify and explain the rationale of Policy H.4. It is suggested that the policy requirement is clarified. As it stands the requirement is unclear and as currently worded would not accord with the requirements of the NPPF and more detailed guidance in the PPG in relation to viability and design. In addition, the | “Policies should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently” The LPA advise that further clarity should be provided on the policy requirements in the supporting text that justifies and explains |
terms ‘respects’ and ‘creates’ could not be applied to a planning application with precision.

Criterion c) of the policy text refers to ‘public and private areas’ and it is not clear as to what this refers to. The LPA would recommend providing further clarification in the policy text to define these terms. In addition, there are two criterion c’s and two criterion d’s and therefore, the policy criterion should be renumbered.

In terms of the reference to ‘views and vistas’ and ‘local landmark’ in criterion d) it would be useful for the TNP to illustrate these views and vistas and local landmarks on a map.

Further explanation is required in the policy text as to what constitutes ‘green technologies’ and ‘local materials’, and how this would not adversely impact on viability of a development.

In addition, you may wish to consider what criterion g) adds to existing local policy prior to the submission of the neighbourhood plan.
| 10.3 – Background (page 33) | Clarification of the history of traffic problems and what has been carried out historically to resolve them would be pertinent to assist readers in understanding what has been completed previously, preferably more recently that the 1930’s A27 works or 1960’s South Street chicanes. Reference should also be made to the significant investment and enhancement to the A27 between Segensworth Roundabout and Titchfield Gyratory (circa £15 million in the Titchfield area) with the aim of ensuring more reliable journey times on the A27 and reducing the need for motorists to seek alternative routes. | Advise providing further clarification and information on historical traffic problems and what has been carried out to resolve them. Advise adding reference to the upgrades and enhancements to the A27. |
| 10.4 – Where we are now (page 34) | A summary of the issues and works undertaken recently should be included in this section, rather than just referencing Appendix 19 (link broken in the Plan document). There is a lack of connectivity within the plan document linking transport requirements and proposals for housing, focusing on the reasons behind the need for improvements to the transport links and how these can be facilitated through new development. Images within Appendix 19 are too small to be of use or legible. The text refers to pinch-points, lack of adequate crossing facilitates and more, which should be noted and locations identified on a larger plan. Indication of where additional facilities could be located for the purpose of further review by the Highway Authority (Hampshire County Council) should also be annotated on a Map in the plan. Appendix 19 also refers to traffic flows on Coach Hill undertaken by the Forum and TVT members, but make no reference to the day(s) or times at which this data was collected. It is therefore suggested that the Forum procure a traffic survey through the Highway Authority to accurately determine the traffic flows and movements through the village to enable informed decisions to be made in the future. The vehicle count data within Appendix 19 is not validated and no evidence of video recording methodology. Vehicle counts required as an appendix, to include who undertook the survey, how this was analysed, the dates and times of the survey. Results should be produced in a tabular format by date and time using 5 minute 'bins' for the count and carried out on multiple days at a neutral time of day, day of week, and month. In addition, pedestrian | Advise including a summary of the traffic issues and work undertaken recently in Section 10.4. Advise improving the quality and size (should be A4) of the images in Appendix 19. Advise providing information on where additional facilities could be located for review by the Highway Authority. This information should be annotated on a Map in the plan. Advise liaising with the Highway Authority to procure a traffic survey |
counts should be undertaken, to give an indication of the levels of demand. Identification of where pedestrians are currently trying to cross would be useful in a pictorial format (mapped). Details should be in an appendix to the TNP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.5 – Pedestrians (page 34)</th>
<th>There is no evidence within the Plan or supporting documentation to support the claim of speeding vehicles, and traffic speed surveys should be undertaken to justify these comments. In reference to the narrow footpaths and crossing points, the TNP is seeking to keep the character and form of the village preserved and seeks development is appropriate and considers this. The narrow footpaths are a feature of the nature of the village. Wider footpaths, although able to cater for all pedestrians would be of detriment to the historic nature of the village and would have the impact of urbanising the area. The addition of numerous signalised or zebra crossing points would have the same effect. This should be recognised within the text of Policy GA1 (Pedestrian Safety) and wording to the effect of ‘appropriate modifications and installation of footways and pedestrian crossing points shall only be considered where appropriate and in keeping with the character of the surrounding areas’. The locations of these crossings would need to be investigated in conjunction with new development. Furthermore, it is unclear what the relevance of the word count in relation to the HCC transport document and the word ‘pedestrian’ in terms of the context of the TNP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 10.6 - Parking | With reference to the meeting with the Hampshire County Council (HCC) representative, FBC suggest the plan should avoid referring to unsubstantiated conversations with individuals. The Highway Authority must be able to comment on this statement. Reference is made to Fareham Borough being second in the county for car ownership, this statement should be supported by evidence through analysis of ONS data sets. |

Advise undertaking pedestrian counts to provide an indication of the levels of demand. This should be included in a separate Appendix with maps to illustrate count locations.

Advise providing further evidence to substantiate the claim made on the image in section 10.5.

Advise adding the following supporting text to Policy GA1 – Pedestrian Safety.

Advise adding date of the meeting with HCC to Section 10.6.

Consider adding evidence to support the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.7 – Car Parks in the Plan Area (pages 35 and 36)</td>
<td>The current parking facilities should be mapped for ease of identification and to assess their accessibility from the Village centre, and the number of spaces should be identified and totalled. This could be provided in a relevant Appendix to the TNP. From the information provided in the section there is a total of 242 off-street spaces within the listed car parks. In conjunction with the on-street provision in the village centre, an assessment is needed on the use of the parking facilities to determine any additional spaces needed or revision of restrictions to increase vehicle turnover, thereby allowing a greater footfall within the village. In addition, the fifth bullet point in this section refers to ‘a car park provided off Cartwright Drive to serve the Country park when the adjacent residential development is complete’. It might be useful to provide a planning application reference number. The final sentence of the section is not clear and should be rephrased.</td>
<td>Advise mapping the current parking facilities in the village centre. Advise providing an assessment of the use of the parking facilities to determine any need for additional spaces. Advise amending the final sentence to ‘Safety concerns have been raised where reduced road widths as a result of parking within the village, may have impacts on accessibility for emergency services’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.8 - Residents Parking (page 36)</td>
<td>There is no FBC policy on the introduction of Residents Parking Schemes. The responsibility for the introduction/modification of on-street parking controls, including residential parking zones, lies with the highway authority, Hampshire County Council and future advice should be sought from them.</td>
<td>Advise contacting the Highway Authority (HCC) in respect of advice on the introduction/modification of on-street parking controls, including residential parking zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10.10 Trains (page 36)</td>
<td>Clarification should be provided that the train stations listed are the nearest to the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan area for accuracy.</td>
<td>Advise providing additional clarification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10.12 – Cycling (page 37)</td>
<td>The first sentence of the section states that ‘cycling in and around Titchfield is difficult and hazardous in most areas’ This statement should be quantified by sourcing accident data from the relevant authorities. The data can then be used to justify the statement</td>
<td>Advise providing additional data on cycling in Titchfield to...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
regarding cyclists and pedestrians using the canal path. Potential cycle routes to key services and facilities should also be reviewed – schools, shops, etc.

The shaded box in section 10.12 states that, “The NP is not in favour of cyclists using the canal path”. The neighbourhood plan should avoid the use of emotive language.

In addition, it is not clear how Map 7 relates to the policies of the TNP further clarification should be provided in this respect. If the proposed cycle route is in aspiration this should be added in a companion document or annex to the plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.13 Footpaths (page 38)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This section goes beyond the remit of planning and the information here may be better placed as a task in a separate companion document or annex to the TNP. Contact with HCC and FBC should also be made in relation to this aspiration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.14 Transport aims, objectives, policies and tasks (page 39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The first paragraph of section 10.14 refers to Policy INF2 from the draft Fareham Local Plan 2036 but then does not provide any further information on this policy. It is suggested that this reference is deleted. The paragraph then refers to a quote from the Fareham Local Plan 2036. However, this quote is taken from paragraphs 4.46 and 4.47 of the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2011).

The supporting text of the TNP seeks to limit the number of vehicles entering the village. However, the aim listed under section 10.14 seeks a traffic and parking environment. The aim is unrealistic and ultimately not achievable due to various polluting sources – cars, buses, delivery vehicles, residential borne pollutants such as open wood or coal-burning fires, businesses with extractors and combustion boilers or equipment. In addition, there is no mention of air quality in the supporting text to justify the aim.

Revise the phrase ‘fit or disabled’ to read ‘all residents and visitors to the village’.

The objectives and policies should be placed within the supporting text so that the objectives and policies can be seen to directly relate to the justification in the text.

Suggest changing the title of this section as the policies and tasks are in section 10.12. The tasks listed in section 10.12 should be agreed with the Highways Authority (HCC). These tasks should be moved to a separate annex or document.

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>justify the statements in Section 10.12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising providing further clarification as to how Map 7 relates to the TNP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise moving these tasks to a separate annex or document and consider contacting HCC and FBC in relation to the aspiration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise deleting reference to Policy INF2. Amend source of quote to the Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise amending the wording or deleting the aim as there is no mention of air quality in the supporting text to justify the aim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise amending the phrase ‘fit or disabled’ to ‘all residents and visitors to the village’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LPA advise considering whether the policies and tasks are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Objective T.2 (page 39)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 10.12. Traffic Policies and Tasks (page 40).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy G.A.1 Pedestrian Safety (page 40)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy G.A.2 Cycle Links (page 40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Tasks T.2.1 – T.2.2. | The Council’s Public and Open Spaces team have confirmed that the Council have no maintenance responsibilities in relation to the canal paths and recreational footpaths and these tasks should be amended to reflect this. | | Advise amending wording as appropriate. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.13 Parking Objective 1 (page 41)</th>
<th>Add to the supporting text to demonstrate the need for additional parking provision and the extent of the required provision. The term ‘adequate’ in Parking Objective 1 should be quantified or deleted.</th>
<th>Advise providing additional supporting text to demonstrate the need for additional parking provision and the extent of the provision required.</th>
<th>Advise deleting the term ‘adequate’.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy P.1 New Development Parking (page 41)</td>
<td>The LPA advise that a revision should be made to the first line to read ’new development within the plan area’ as this covers all development. The policy states that any new development within the Plan area must be completely self-sufficient in terms of off-road parking. This then goes on to state that ‘wherever possible’ they should include the maximum levels defined in the FBC parking standards. These two statements are contradictory. Suggest removing the ‘must be completely self-sufficient’ with ‘must comply with the relevant Parking Standards SPD’. In addition, self-sufficiency of parking may not always be achievable or viable depending on the nature of the development and constraints of the location. Developments should have taken account of current FBC residential and non-residential parking standards, this may not always be maximum levels, again due to site viability or site constraints.</td>
<td>Advise replace ‘any new, expanded, commercial or housing development’ with ‘new development’.</td>
<td>Advise deleting ‘must be self-sufficient’ and replacing with ‘must comply with either the Council’s Non-Residential Parking Standards SPD or the Residential parking Standards SPD’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE. Objective.1. (page 44)</td>
<td>This objective reads more like a policy. It is not clear how this objective has been transposed into a policy.</td>
<td>Advise amending objective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE. Policy 1. – Loss of Retail premises (page 44)</td>
<td>There is a lack of information as to how applicants will provide sufficient information to comply with the policy requirements. It is strongly advised that further information should be provided in the supporting text to justify the rationale behind this policy linking to relevant evidence. Also, CE. Policy 1. states that proposals that result in the loss of retail units in specific locations in Titchfield Village will be ‘resisted’. In line with principles of the NPPF (2012) it would be beneficial if the policy was worded in a more positive manner to provide “Neighbourhoods should plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in</td>
<td>Advise providing further justification and additional clarification as to what the applicant would need to do to comply with the policy requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CE. Policy 2. Accessibility (page 44) | CE. Policy 2 is not in general conformity with a number of policies in the ALP, such as CS5. For example, CE. Policy 2 does not take into account for other transport forms and not focus on walking alone. Accessibility should include cycling, public transport, walking to key trip attractors including schools, shops, tourist destinations, etc.; and should not be based solely around the location on new development. New development should be planned to enable and facilitate access to local services and facilities as well as pedestrian, cycling and public transport routes.

In addition, the policy refers to Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: Transport (2006) as providing defined walking distances in relation to the policy. The PPG13 was cancelled in 2012 and replaced by the NPPF (2012). Therefore, this source can no longer be used to provide a definition of walking distances. Furthermore, the definition of walking distance is unclear and confusing and could not be applied with confidence to a planning application. The Forum may wish to refer to the Council’s Accessibility Study - http://www.fareham.gov.uk/PDF/planning/local_plan/DraftLocalPlanEvidenceBase/EV14-BackgroundPaper-Accessibility.pdf | "Policies should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence" (Paragraph 41, Ref 41-041-001) | The LPA advises that the Neighbourhood Planning Forum revisits this policy prior to the submission of the plan. Advise that the reference to PPG13: Transport is deleted and the Forum consider using a different source in defining walking distance. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 12 – Natural Environment (page 45)</td>
<td>The image of the bird on page 45 is a yellow-throated vireo (a native of North America) and therefore, not likely to be found anywhere near Titchfield. This migratory bird may occasionally get blown off course and turn up in Britain but there have been very rare sightings on the west coast. As Titchfield is such a rich area for wading birds, the LPA suggests that a picture of a wader/wintering bird in the Titchfield area is used.</td>
<td>Advise amending the image to a wader/wintering bird in the Titchfield area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2 The Plan Area (page 45)</td>
<td>Paragraph 3 of this section is currently confusing. Titchfield Haven is a National Nature Reserve and not an organisation, and therefore it is unclear how it could undertake any tasks. Paragraph 5 of this section makes the following statement: 'Neither are there any bridleways'. This statement is incorrect. Hampshire County Council’s Public Rights of Way map identified Bridleway 82 as falling within the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan area.</td>
<td>Advise amending the reference to Titchfield Haven and providing further clarification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3 Care for the Environment (pages 45 and 46)</td>
<td>The first paragraph of the section makes reference to 'energy efficiency measures' and 'housing improvements'. Energy efficiency measures are covered by building regulations. The third paragraph makes reference to 'a culture of a litter free area will be encouraged and support for the FBC vigilant approach to fly tipping should be adopted'. This is an aspiration rather than an objective of the plan and should be included in a separate annex or document to the plan. The explanation of SuDS is incorrect and should be amended from 'sustainable storm water drainage' to 'Sustainable Urban Drainage System'.</td>
<td>Advise amending first paragraph. Advise adding the text as a separate task, which could be included in a companion document or annex to the TNP. Advise amending the explanation of SuDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4 Open spaces (page 46)</td>
<td>The second paragraph of this section makes the following statement 'These spaces are variously owned and maintained by private individuals'. This statement should be amended to 'public and private bodies'. Reference is made to the open spaces and that they 'could be protected under the Assets of Community Regulations 2012. This might be a future development after consultation with residents'. This is an aspiration rather than an objective of the plan and should be included in a</td>
<td>Advise amending statement to 'public and private bodies'. Advise adding the text as a separate task, which could be included in a companion document or annex to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Objective E.1 and Environmental Objective E.2 (page 47)</td>
<td>The Forum may wish to consider whether the open spaces listed in this section may be better included within the TNP as Local Green Spaces providing they fit within the criteria in the NPPF.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy E.1 – New Development (page 47)</td>
<td>The policy text would benefit from a multi-criteria approach. A number of the policy areas covered may fit within the policy in the neighbourhood plan on design. A different title may also be suitable, as “New Development” is quite broad and could cover a number of policy issues. In addition, the policy does not provide sufficient clarity so that it can be applied to a planning application. For instance, the policy text does not clarify how the impacts listed will be ‘assessed’ or ‘considered’. Strong consideration should be given to providing supporting text and evidence to justify the rationale for the policy. Furthermore, it is not clear how the policy relates to the Objectives in Chapter 12, or in the TNP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task E.1 (page 47)</td>
<td>Reference is made to SSSI. This is incorrect and should be amended to ‘SSSI’ (Site for Special Scientific Interest). Reference is also made to the Solent and Brent Geese Strategy 2010 which is due to be updated in 2018 and does not reflect current planning policies or the new site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
classification system currently used by Natural England and LPAs. A more updated document is the ‘Solent Waders & Brent Goose Strategy 2018: Interim Project Report: Year one (October 2017)’. Therefore, the LPA suggests that a reference is made to the Interim Report, new classification system, 2017 current use mapping and the new (draft) Mitigation Guidance which have been considered since March 2018 for decision making by Natural England and Fareham Borough Council.

The note under Task E1 states that ‘leaving the EU may result in changes to these regulations’. It is recommended that the specific ‘regulations’ are stated as for instance Ramsar sites are protected under the Ramsar Convention which is not relevant to the EU and SSSI sites are only protected under national law and not European legislation. In addition, this statement is irrelevant as remaining EU Regulations will be transposed into new UK Regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12.6 Energy (page 48)</th>
<th>It is unclear how the aim listed under this section and Energy Objective EN. 1 have been transposed into a policy.</th>
<th>Advise adding a policy in relation to objective EN.1 or deleting the objective.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.8 Open Spaces (page 48)</td>
<td>It is unclear, what this section adds to the TNP. The Forum may wish to consider whether the open spaces listed in Section 12.4 may be better included within the TNP as Local Green Spaces providing they fit within the criteria in the NPPF</td>
<td>Advise including a Policy on Local Green Space in the TNP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy EN.1 Energy Efficiency (page 48)</td>
<td>The policy reads more like an objective and does not provide sufficient clarity so that it can be applied to a planning application. The policy may fit better as a separate criterion within Policy H.4 of the TNP. Strong consideration should be given to providing supporting text and evidence to justify the rationale for the policy. Is the policy relevant to all new housing development or all development? In addition, it is not clear how Policy EN.1 relates to Objective EN.1 or indeed the aim listed under section 12.7.</td>
<td>“Policies should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence” (Paragraph 41,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advise adding the moving the policy and including it as a separate criterion in Policy H.4 of the TNP. Advise providing further justification and evidence to explain the rationale behind the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.9 Aims, objectives and task (page 49)</td>
<td>It is not clear whether the last box on the page is an aim, objective or task. Further clarity should be provided in this respect. In addition, any tasks in this section should be included in a companion document or annex.</td>
<td>Advise providing further clarification as to whether the last box on the page is an aim, objective or task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task GA.1 (page 49)</td>
<td>The tasks listed where reference has been made to working with HCC should be agreed with the Highways Authority (HCC).</td>
<td>Advise agreeing tasks with HCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 12.10 Footpaths (page 49)</td>
<td>There is no introductory text or supporting text to provide an explanation to this section. In addition, there is already a section on footpaths on page 38 (section 10.13) of the TNP where this information would be more relevant. The text in section 12.10 should be moved to section 10.13 of the TNP.</td>
<td>Advise moving the text in section 12.10 to section 10.13. Advise providing introductory text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 12 – Historic Titchfield (page 51)</td>
<td>There appears to be two Chapter 12’s in the TNP. This chapter should be renumbered to 13. It is recommended that the supporting text within this chapter makes reference to the existing Conservation Area Appraisals.</td>
<td>Advise amending to Chapter ‘13’. Advise making reference to the relevant Conservation Area Appraisals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5 The Great barn (page 52)</td>
<td>The first paragraph of this statement refers to the Barn as being built in the early 14th century. The Historic England heritage listing for the monastic barn of Titchfield Abbey has the Barn as being built in the 15th century - <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1094235">https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1094235</a> The paragraph should be amended for accuracy. In addition, the second paragraph of the section notes that the Barn was ‘acquired by FBC’. This sentence should be deleted as the Barn has never been within the ownership of FBC.</td>
<td>Advise making the suggested amendments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.11 Titchfield carnival (page 54)</td>
<td>This section of the TNP goes beyond the remit of planning and would be better placed as a task or project in a companion document or annex to the TNP.</td>
<td>“Wider community aspirations than those relating to development and use of land can be considered.” Advise including section 13.11 in a companion document or annex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective HT.3</td>
<td>From the information provided it is not clear what criteria would be used to select the sections of the TNP.</td>
<td>&quot;Wider community aspirations than those relating to development and use of land can be included in a neighbourhood plan, but actions dealing with non-land use matters should be clearly identifiable. For example, set out in a companion document or annex&quot; (PPG, Paragraph 4, Ref ID: 41-004-20170728).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These sections of the TNP goes beyond the remit of planning and would be better placed as a task or project in a companion document or annex to the TNP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.13 A wayfarer map - and 13.14 Publications (page 54)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

be included in a neighbourhood plan, but actions dealing with non-land use matters should be clearly identifiable. For example, set out in a companion document or annex" (PPG, Paragraph 4, Ref ID: 41-004-20170728).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties to be included or what a proposed record would comprise. Listed buildings are already included in the Heritage List for England - <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/">https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/</a>. In addition, Hampshire County Council hold the Historic Environment Record for Hampshire, which is where additional research and information about heritage assets and archaeology are deposited - <a href="https://maps.hants.gov.uk/historicenvironment/">https://maps.hants.gov.uk/historicenvironment/</a>.</th>
<th>clarification on this objective.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Objective HT.5**
(page 55) | This objective goes beyond the remit of planning and would be better placed as a task or project in a companion document or annex to the TNP. In addition, further clarity should be provided in relation to the terms ‘presentation’ and ‘promotion’ as the sentence as currently read is unclear. |
| | “Wider community aspirations than those relating to development and use of land can be included in a neighbourhood plan, but actions dealing with non-land use matters should be clearly identifiable. For example, set out in a companion document or annex” (PPG, Paragraph 4, Ref ID: 41-004-20170728). |
| | Advise including objective HT.5 in a companion document or annex. |
| **Policy HT.1**
Preserving Historic Environment
(page 55) | The policy refers to ‘Development proposals that fail to preserve’, consideration should be given as to how this policy wording would accord with paragraph 16 of the NPPF. Furthermore, the scope of the policy as it currently stands is unclear. For instance, the word ‘significance’ is associated with heritage assets in the NPPF, and some heritage assets have ‘significance’ but are not designations. Further clarification should be provided in the policy text. Further information to justify and explain the rationale behind the policy should be provided in the supporting text of the Historic Titchfield section in the neighbourhood plan. |
| | “Neighbourhoods should plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the...” |
| | Advise amending the wording of the policy so it provides a more positive approach, and consider the wording in light of the relevant section of the NPPF (pages 54-57). |
| | Advise moving |
| Policy HT. 2 Archaeological Assessment (page 55) | The requirement for an archaeological assessment to be provided for all new development is onerous. Any requirement for an archaeological assessment is set out on Hampshire County Council’s website - [http://documents.hants.gov.uk/sold-services/sharedexpertise-capabilitystatement-Archaeology.pdf](http://documents.hants.gov.uk/sold-services/sharedexpertise-capabilitystatement-Archaeology.pdf) Hampshire Archaeology are notified of applications where their planning constraint maps show an archaeological alert and so are assessed on a case by case basis. It is unnecessary to include this as a policy in the TNP and as such this policy should be either be deleted or amended to meet the above requirements.

In addition, the term ‘merited’ could not be applied to a planning application with precision. | strategic elements of the Local Plan” (NPPF, Paragraph 16).

“Policies should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence” (Paragraph 41, Ref 41-041-20140306 of the PPG). | reference to the NPPF to the introductory text of the section where relevant.

Advise making the recommended amendments. |
| Tasks HT.2 – HT 5.4 (pages 56 and 57) | If the Forum wish to pursue Tasks HT2.2 and HT 5.1 it is suggested that they contact FBC. In addition, the Forum should note that any aspirations related to non-land use matters should be set out in a companion document or annex as stated in the PPG. Further clarification should be provided on all tasks listed within Chapter 12 – Historic Environment in terms of how these will be delivered. | Advise making suggested amendments. |
| Chapter 14 – Monitoring and review (page 58) | A quote is provided from a Locality document in respect of the implementation of neighbourhood plans. The Council undertakes monitoring of neighbourhood plans following their ‘making’. | Regulation 34(4) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 states that, “Where a local planning authority have made a neighbourhood development order or a neighbourhood development plan, the local planning authority’s monitoring report must contain | Advise that the TNP refers to the LPA undertaking monitoring of the Neighbourhood Plan in the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR). |
| Appendix 18 – The History of Titchfield | There are a number of claims and statements made within this Appendix about the history of people, places and events. The Council's Conservation Officer considers that there should be rigorous evidence to support these claims. | Advise providing evidence to support the claims/statements in Appendix 18. |
| Appendix 35 – Natural Environment | Reference is made to the Solent and Brent Geese Strategy 2010. There is a more recent document that has been published (see comments on Task E.4 above) ‘Solent Waders & Brent Goose Strategy 2019: Interim Project Report: Year one (October 2017)’. Therefore, the LPA suggest that a reference is made to inform of the Interim Report, new classification system, 2017 current use mapping and the new (draft) Mitigation Guidance which have been considered since March 2018 for decision making by Natural England and Fareham Borough Council. Page 3, Paragraph 4 of Appendix 35 refers to ‘seroline’ to be changed to ‘serotine’. The use of ‘pipistrelle’ and ‘long-eared’ should be re-considered. Pipistrelle is a general term used and there are 3 species of pipistrelles including common, soprano and Nathusias. Similarly, long-eared is a general term and there are 2 species including brown and grey long-eared bats. Therefore, long eared and brown long-eared bats cannot be counted as two different species; similarly, pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle cannot be counted as two types of bats. Page 3, Paragraph 5 of Appendix 34 refers to ‘Protected amphibians and reptiles’ to be changed to ‘Protected/notable’ as common frog and common toad do not receive the same level of protection as reptiles and great crested newts (not protected against killing/injuring or habitat destruction). | Advise making reference to the updated Interim Project Report, classification system, current use mapping and new (draft) Mitigation Guidance. Advise amending ‘seroline’ to ‘serotine’. Consider amending reference to the types of bat species. Advise amending ‘protected amphibians and reptiles’ to ‘protected/notable’. |
## Annex 1 – General observations and suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pre-submission Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong></td>
<td>A general issue that has been identified by the LPA is the lack of appropriate evidence which could be linked to the supporting text for the policies of the TNP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>It is considered that the flow of the TNP could be improved to aid clarity and overcome disjointedness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paragraph Numbering</strong></td>
<td>It is recommended that for ease of reference that paragraph numbers are inserted in the TNP prior to submission. This will ensure the plan is clearer for the reader and may ensure that comments received for consultation on the plan are in relation to the relevant areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Capital Letters</strong></td>
<td>There should be consistency throughout the neighbourhood plan in terms of the use of capital letters, such as Country Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The use of Aims, Objectives, Policies and Tasks</strong></td>
<td>The use of aims, objectives, policies and tasks within the TNP without any supporting wording to provide additional clarification is confusing. Policies should be positively worded to ensure accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF. Avoid the use of statements in policies. It is suggested that a short vision statement (couple of sentences) is included in the TNP, which sets out the key policies in achieving this vision, which could be sued in determining planning applications and demonstrates conformity with the strategic policies of the ALP. The PPG sets out that those aspirations that deal with ‘non-land use matters should be clearly identifiable and set out in a companion document or annex’. Therefore, the LPA advises that ‘tasks’ identified by orange boxes in the plan should be moved into a companion document or separate annex to the TNP. In terms of the tasks listed throughout the plan, further explanation could be included on the current status of these</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Photos, Images and Maps

Projects and/or how these will be delivered by the Forum.

Improve the resolution of some of the photos, images maps in the Plan. In addition, all maps should have a key provided and should cover a full size of A4 to provide clarity and precision. This will aid ease of referencing. The maps should be referenced to the supporting text and explained accordingly. All maps, images and photos in the TNP should have titles to clearly define what the map is illustrating and a figure. Furthermore, these should all have sources to provide a reference as to where the photos, maps and images were obtained, and should be clearly linked to the main body of the report.

Hyperlinks in the Plan

Ensure that either hyperlinks to Appendices in the plan operate correctly or remove these (Appendix 16 and Appendix 35).

Typos and Grammar

There are several typos throughout the neighbourhood plan, these should be reviewed and amended prior to the submission of the plan.

In addition, several sentences within the TNP are unclear and confusing and should be revisited prior to submission of the plan.

Glossary of Terms

The references to FBC and TVT are acronyms rather than glossary terms and should be moved to the front of the TNP.

In addition, the Forum may wish to check some of the terms against the definitions in the NPPF.

Appendices

Typos

There are several typos throughout the appendices, these should be reviewed and amended prior to the submission of the plan.

Relevance

There are a number of appendices that do not relate to the TNP or land use matters. Further explanation should be provided as to why these appendices have been included or they should be removed from the plans evidence base.

Consultation Statement

Timetable of Consultation Events

It would be useful if further details are provided in the ‘activity’ column on why the consultation events have been undertaken and what issues were discussed.

General Comments

The LPA would suggest reviewing the statement and ensuring that information is provided on when, how and why the consultation took place. Further information is required to explain the heading ‘developing of vision objectives’.
It would be useful for the statement to include results of any questionnaire/surveys undertaken by the Forum and these should be linked to relevant Appendices.

| Basic Conditions Statement |  
|---------------------------|---|
| General comments          | The reference to the emerging Local Plan consultation and timescales is incorrect and should be deleted. |
Report to the Executive for Decision
03 September 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio:</th>
<th>Planning and Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>Self-Build and Custom House Building Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of:</td>
<td>Director of Planning and Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Priorities:</td>
<td>Providing Housing Choices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose:**
To approve the Self-Build and Custom House Building Action Plan for implementation.

**Executive summary:**
The Self-Build and Custom House Building Action Plan is a result of the Council recognising, along with national Government, that this is an emerging housing sector. This Action Plan sets out the Council’s main aim, which is to ‘positively influence or help secure development opportunities where we can support individuals or organisations to deliver high quality self-built or custom-built homes to meet demand in the Borough’. It sets out the key actions the Council can take to achieve this aim. The working document has seven key sections. The first two introduce and provide background as to why the Council has produced this Action Plan. It then explains what self-build and custom house building are, what responsibilities the Council has for this sector and what has been done to secure it in the Borough to date. The penultimate section explains what the evidence the Council have on the local demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in the Borough indicates, as well as explaining that the Council’s current knowledge is limited. Finally, the document outlines eight key actions which the Council propose to undertake to achieve its aim, including gaining a more detailed understanding of local demand for self-built and custom-built housing in the Borough.

**Recommendation:**
It is recommended that the Executive approves the Self-Build and Custom House Building Action Plan for implementation.
Reason:

To enable the implementation of the Self-Build and Custom House Building Action Plan, and update the Action Plan thereafter.

Cost of proposals:

The costs of producing the Self-Build and Custom House Building Action Plan has been met within existing resources.

Appendices: A: Self-Build and Custom House Building Action Plan

Background papers: None

Reference papers: None
INTRODUCTION

1. This marks the first time the Council has set out its Corporate aims in respect to self and custom build house-building in the Borough. This Action Plan sets out the Council’s aim of ‘positively influencing or helping to secure development opportunities where we can support individuals or organisation in our local communities to deliver high quality self-build or custom house building to meet demand in the Borough’. It sets out the key actions the Council can take to achieve this aim. Whilst the Action Plan sets out the direct actions Council can take itself, it is important to explain that self and custom build housing is not the sole responsibility of the Council. It is for this reason, the Action Plan also sets out the Council’s wider ambitions, where it would like to work with customers and partners to influence and help deliver high quality self and custom build homes.

BACKGROUND

2. As the Action Plan explains, self and custom build housing is very much in its infancy in the UK, and the Council will look to review the document when local experience or national policy necessitates. The Government began to focus on self and custom build housing back in 2011. However, it was not until 2015 that this began to feature in legislation.

WHAT IS SELF AND CUSTOM BUILD HOUSING?

3. The Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016) provides a legal definition of self-build and custom housebuilding:

‘Self build and custom housebuilding means the building or completion by individuals, associations of individuals, or persons working with or for individuals or associations of individuals, of houses to be occupied by those individuals. But it does not include the building of a house on a plot acquired from a person who builds the house wholly or mainly to plans or specifications decided or offered by that person.’

4. Custom build is commonly regarded as where a person who commissions a specialist developer to deliver their own home. Whereas, self-build is where a person is more
directly involved in organising or constructing his or her own home. Both routes require more significant input into the design of their home than other forms of housing. In considering whether a home is a self-build or custom-built home, the Council must be satisfied that the initial owner of the home will have the primary input into its final design and layout.

5. National planning policy increasingly recognises the role self and custom homes had to play in providing for a diverse range of housing needs. Parallel to this (prior to much of this recent legislation) the Council put policies in place to secure self and custom-built homes in the Borough through its Corporate and other strategy documents. For example, the Adopted Welborne Plan looks to secure 1% custom build plots (i.e. homes) on the site.

6. It is important that national policy recognises that some self and custom build products can be secured as affordable housing. Increasingly the Council will look to strategies, such as the emerging Local Plan to both help secure self and custom build housing through local policies and allocations, but also clarify how such policy mechanisms work in more detail.

**LOCAL SELF AND CUSTOM BUILD DEMAND IN THE BOROUGH**

7. A key Council responsibility, required by national legislation, is to keep a register of those seeking to acquire serviced plots in the area for their own self-build and custom house building. The Council are also subject to duties to have regard to this and to give enough suitable development permissions to meet the identified demand.

8. The Self and Custom Build Register was launched on the Council’s website on 21st March 2016. The eligibility criterion for entry onto the Council’s self-build register is established through ‘The Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding (Register) Regulations 2016’. It stipulates that any individual or member of an association that signs up to the register must be aged 18 or older and a British citizen, or a national from an EEA State other than the UK, or national of Switzerland. The individual or member of an association must also seek to acquire a serviced plot of land in the Borough to build a house to occupy as their sole or main residence.

9. As the Executive may recall, it approved an Executive Report agreeing several changes to the register in July last year. This included a charge for applicants joining or remaining on the register. It also introduced a ‘local connection test’. This test means that applicants must confirm they have either lived in the Borough for a minimum of 2 years, or they have been employed in the Borough (for more than 16 hours per week) continuously over the last two years. This means the register now falls into two parts, those with a local connection are in Part 1 and those without a local connection are in Part 2.

**THE COUNCIL’S ACTION PLAN**

10. The Council’s Action Plan has eight key actions flowing from its main aim of ‘positively influencing or helping to secure development opportunities where we can support individuals or organisation in our local communities to deliver high quality self-build or custom house building to meet demand in the Borough’.

11. The first is to explore and implement innovative methods for engaging with customers who are interested in self and custom-built homes in the Borough, such as raising awareness of the grant of suitable planning permissions or suitable Council land
disposals.

12. As previously mentioned, it is important that the Council continues to improve its understanding of those individuals or organisations that are interested in self-build or custom house-building opportunities within the Borough, as well as their ability to afford such housing options. It is for this reason the Council will be undertaking more detailed research on local demand in the Borough.

13. How the Council assesses and allocates land has an important impact on how housing sites in the Borough are developed. The Council therefore will assess sites potential for self-build and custom house-building through the Council’s housing availability assessment (e.g. Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment).

14. It is important that our services are easy for our customers to use, therefore the Council will work with interested parties to produce design and procedural guidance to achieve high quality design on self and custom build developments in the Borough (e.g. design codes, plot passports & standard conditions).

15. As previously mentioned, this is a newly emerging sector, therefore one of the actions is to ensure that any new significant change to, national policy or in evidence on the demand for self and custom-built housing products, should be reflected in reviewing the Local Plan, as well as other strategies.

16. Government and other partners can be a source of funding for self-build and custom house-building, therefore one key action is for the Council to actively work with such bodies to secure funding this type of housing to be delivered.

17. Sharing experience in this emergent sector is vital for all the key players to learn from in order to achieve high quality self-build and custom-build housing to meet local demand. It is for this reason that the final action is in place, which is that the Council will host or facilitate a series of forums or events (such as web-pages, Expos or workshops) to encourage skill and experience sharing with interested parties.

18. Lastly, although not forming an action, it is important to recognise that the Action Plan is a ‘live’ working document, that will be updated when necessary as the Council’s gains experience working with this important sector of housing in an increasingly diverse housing market.

Enquiries:
For further information on this report please contact Claire Burnett (Ext 4330).
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This marks the first document where the Council has set out both its responsibilities and ambitions for self-build and custom house building in the Borough.

Self-build and custom house building has recently received increasing Government attention in the face of meeting the need for housing in the UK.

This action plan sets the background as to why self-build and custom house building has gained increasing focus from Government, which has translated into national legislation, policy, regulations and guidance, as well as local plan policies. This document marks the first corporate action plan that comprehensively covers this issue.

It explains the current and emerging local policies and strategies guiding Council decisions and development in the Borough, as well as the latest evidence the Council has regarding the local demand for self and custom build housing.

The Council recognises that self and custom house building developed in the Borough offers an important potential route to home ownership. This action plan marks the first step in the Council ‘positively influencing or helping to secure development opportunities where it can support individuals or organisations in our local communities to deliver high quality self-build or custom house building to meet demand in the Borough.’

Councillor Keith Evans

Portfolio Member for Planning and Development
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Purpose and Role of Fareham Borough Council’s Self-Build & Custom House Building Action Plan

1.1 The purpose of this action plan is to set out the Council’s own responsibilities and wider ambitions in respect to self-build and custom house building in the Borough.

1.2 The delivery of self and custom house building in the Borough is not the sole responsibility of the Council, it in fact relies heavily on those wishing to and having the means to build houses themselves, organisations who would like to facilitate or deliver self-build plots or build custom built houses and interested landowners and developers promoting sites for such products. Given this context, the Council aims to ‘positively influence or help secure development opportunities where we can support individuals or organisations in our local communities to deliver high quality self-build or custom house building to meet demand in the Borough’.

1.3 This document sets out the Council’s proposed actions to directly meet its own responsibilities to help deliver quality self-build and custom house building in the Borough to meet local demand. It also sets out the Council’s wider ambitions, where we want to work with customers and partners to influence and help deliver such high-quality housing products.

1.4 This action plan will need to be reviewed and updated as and when necessary. This is the Council’s first comprehensive action plan focused on this issue. The Council also recognise that this sector in many respects is in its infancy in the UK, and with increasing experience in the Borough, it is important that lessons are learnt and reflected in future action plans.
2.0 BACKGROUND

Self-Build & Custom House-Building Gaining Increasing Focus from Government

2.1 Back in November 2011 the Government published ‘Laying the Foundations: A Housing Strategy for England’.¹ This national strategy supported many proposals that had been set out in an industry-led Government Working Group Action Plan promoting self-build housing, produced in July earlier that year.² Within the strategy the Government explained how it was intent on doing more than ever to support individuals and communities taking the initiative to build their own homes, which in turn is considered beneficial to the national economy. However, the Government saw that there was a huge untapped potential for custom-built homes, especially when making international comparisons. The Government pledged to enable this housing sector to become mainstream, and to double the number of self and custom-built homes over the next decade. The Government recognised that there were also challenges to self-build and custom house-building, as well as limited information regarding this housing sector.

2.2 In the 2014 March Budget, the Government announced that it would consult on a new ‘Right to Build’ giving prospective custom builders a right to a plot of land from their local council, and established several vanguards to test the practicalities of operating such a ‘Right’ across England. In addition, in March 2014 the Government announced that all new developments by individuals extending or building their own home would be exempt from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). CIL is a planning charge, introduced by the Planning Act 2008 as a tool for local authorities to help deliver infrastructure to support the development of their area. The Housing White Paper in February 2017, which this document mentions later, continues this exemption commitment.

2.3 In October 2014, the Government produced ‘Right to Build: Supporting Custom and Self Build’,³ a consultation document, in which it explained how it intended to further empower aspiring self-builders to build their own home in their local area by bringing legislation through the next Parliament, as well as taking into consideration the experiences from the vanguards and the outcome of the consultation.⁴ This led to the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act (2015).

³ Department for Communities and Local Government (October 2014) ‘Right to Build: Supporting Custom and Self Build’.
2.4 Since this time, several pieces of Government legislation, regulations, policy and guidance have come into force that have placed certain responsibilities on Councils. However, before this document explains these, it is firstly important to define what self-build and custom house building is.
3.0 WHAT IS SELF-BUILD & CUSTOM HOUSE BUILDING?

3.1 The Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016) provides a legal definition of self-build and custom house building:

‘Self-build and custom housebuilding means the building or completion by –

a) individuals,
b) associations of individuals, or
c) persons working with or for individuals or associations of individuals, of houses to be occupied by those individuals.

But it does not include the building of a house on a plot acquired from a person who builds the house wholly or mainly to plans or specifications decided or offered by that person.’

3.2 Whilst legally self-build and custom house building share the above definition, custom build is commonly regarded as where an individual, commissions a specialist developer to deliver their own home. Whereas, self-build is where the individual is more directly involved in organising or constructing his or her own home. Both routes require more significant input into the design of their home than other forms of housing.

Forms of Self-Build and Custom House Building

3.3 Currently there are a variety of ways self-built homes and custom house building are being delivered. Firstly, there are different approaches to the process, some self-builders take forward projects alone, others work in groups. Secondly, the level of self-build can vary, ranging from self-builders carrying out the whole of the construction to custom builders who hire a contractor to carry out the construction through to completion.

3.4 In considering whether a home is a self-built or custom-built home, the Council must be satisfied that the initial owner of the home will have the primary input into its final design and layout.

3.5 Some of the typical approaches to self-build or custom home building are outlined briefly in Figure 1 on the next page. However, it should be highlighted that the housing products listed below are not exhaustive. With this being an emerging sector, it is highly likely that new self-build and custom house building housing products will rapidly change over time.
Figure 1. Examples of Self-Build & Custom House Building Products

Contractor Built One-off Home

The owner manages the design process including finding the land, hiring an appropriate consultant, and securing planning permission and building regulations approval. Often the owner either hires a main contractor to do all the construction work; or they themselves project-manage the construction phase and hire various sub-contractors to do the work. The owner might also undertake some of the simpler tasks, such as decorating, themselves.

Self-Built One-off Home

The owner follows a similar route to above method except that they then undertake virtually all the construction work themselves. This is popular with people who want to take ‘hands on’ approach and who may already have experience of building.

Kit or Package Home

The owner finds the plot of land and then works with a kit home company to finalise design. The kit company then supply and erect the house. Sometimes the owner has a watertight shell built and then carries the fitting out work themselves.

Developer Built One-off Home

Here the owner finds a developer with a site and a design that meets their requirements, and the developer then builds it for them.

Supported Community Self build

This is where a group of people come together to share their skills and build a number of houses collectively. The group will normally all work on everyone’s house until completion. Often these schemes include training to boost the participants’ knowledge of building. Some community groups form themselves and some are coordinated by housing associations or other agencies.

Independent Community Collaboration

Here a group is formed to acquire a larger site that is split into individual plots. They then organise the design and construction of their own home, sometimes collaborating with others to, for example, order materials in bulk.

Developer/Contractor led Group Project

A developer/contractor finds a suitable site then seeks a number of self-build clients and builds the homes to their specification under contract. Often the developer provides an option to just build a watertight shell, so the owner can ‘self-finish’. An alternative arrangement is for the developer to offer serviced plots which are sold ‘off plan’ with a design and build contract.
4.0 WHAT ARE THE COUNCIL’S RESPONSIBILITIES FOR SELF-BUILD & CUSTOM HOUSE BUILDING?

4.1 In the light of national legislation, regulations, policy and guidance the following paragraphs explain what responsibilities Councils have in respect of self-build and custom build homes.

National Legislation

4.2 The Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016) placed a duty that (by 1st April 2016) all local authorities should keep a register of individuals and associations of individuals who are seeking to acquire plots of land for self and custom build housing in the local authority’s area (to build houses for those individuals to occupy as homes).

National Regulations

4.3 The relevant regulations, The Self and Custom Housebuilding Regulations 2016 and The Self and Custom Housebuilding (Time for Compliance and Fees) Regulations 2016, allowed authorities to introduce a ‘local connection test’ and charge applicants a fee to be on the register.

‘Fixing our Broken Housing Market’ Housing White Paper

4.4 In February 2017, the Government published a Housing White Paper entitled ‘Fixing our broken housing market’ 5 which set out the Government’s plans to reform the housing market and boost the supply of new homes in England. Whilst wide ranging in nature, one of its main aims was to diversify the construction sector through supporting custom house building. It also reaffirmed its commitment to support custom-build homes with greater access to land and finance and giving people more choice over the design of their home. Finally, it also commented that ‘If we do not believe local authorities are taking sufficient action to promote opportunities for self and custom house-building, we will consider taking further action including possible changes to legislation.’

5 MHCLG (7th February 2017) ‘Fixing our broken housing market’.
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

4.5 In July 2018, the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework, which sets out national planning policy. Under the section entitled ‘Delivering a sufficient supply of homes’, the Government makes it clear that to boost supply, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, and that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. Furthermore, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies ‘including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing, families with children, older people, students, people with disabilities, service families, travellers, people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes’.

4.6 The footnote to this paragraph reminded authorities that they are required to keep a register of those seeking to acquire serviced plots in the area for their own self-build and custom housebuilding. They are also subject to duties to ‘have regard’ to this and to give enough suitable development permissions to meet the identified demand.

4.7 The footnote also explained that self and custom-build properties could provide market or affordable housing. This is reinforced in the glossary of NPPF - ‘Self-build and custom-build housing: as housing built by an individual, a group of individuals, or persons working with or for them, to be occupied by that individual. Such housing can be either market or affordable housing.’

4.8 Furthermore, importantly the NPPF now requires on applications of 10 homes of more that at least 10% of the homes are available for affordable home ownership. However, there are exemptions, one of which is where 100% of the site is proposed for people wishing to build or commission their own homes.

National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

4.9 It is envisaged that National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG), which provided guidance on policy in the previous NPPF, will be updated to reflect the recent changes to the new NPPF in terms of local housing need. However, it is helpful to highlight that the NPPG that supported the previous NPPF advised that authorities, when assessing the housing and economic development needs of their area, can supplement data from their register with secondary data sources to obtain a robust assessment of demand for this type of housing in their area. Examples of secondary data sources listed in the guidance include building plot search websites, ‘Need-a-Plot’ information available from the Self Build Portal; and enquiries for building plots from local estate agents and local planning
It also provided guidance on matters such as administering the self-build and custom house building registers, the duties (i.e. giving suitable permissions) and where exemptions to such duties apply.

4.10 The following section will look at current local policy context and local evidence of demand for self-build and custom house building in the Borough from the register.

---

5.0 WHAT HAS THE COUNCIL DONE TO SECURE SELF-BUILD AND CUSTOM HOUSE BUILDING TO DATE?

5.1 The Council has already put strategies and plans to facilitate self-build and custom house building in place. These are detailed in the following paragraphs; however, the situation is evolving to reflect more recent Government legislation, regulations, policy and guidance.

Corporate Strategy

5.2 The Corporate Strategy, entitled ‘Fareham: a prosperous and attractive place to be’, sets out the Council’s priorities for the next few years, from 2017 to 2023. It shows how the Council has planned to ensure that Fareham remains a prosperous, safe and attractive place to live and work. It explains that one of the Council’s key aims is ‘Providing Housing Choices’, and ensuring everyone has somewhere to live is one of the Authority’s vital roles. Working against the backdrop of a national shortfall in housing and accommodation, it explains that the Council has worked hard to develop key strategies that will enable the Council to ensure there are housing choices for people in Fareham.

5.3 This work is continuing largely through three main strands. The first is through the Adopted Local Plan. The Council is in the process of preparing a new Local Plan that will plan for the provision of new homes across the Borough up to 2036. The second is enabling the delivery of a new Garden Village community at Welborne of up to 6,000 homes. The third is preparing and implementing a new Affordable Housing Strategy, which will determine the Council’s future role in the provision of affordable housing.

Adopted Local Plan

5.4 The Adopted Local Plan is a document that sets out policies that guide future development in Fareham and is used to help determine planning application decisions. In the context of self-build and custom house building, it is important to understand that existing local planning policies were developed and adopted as part of the Local Plan, prior to the recent Government legislation. There are three parts of the current Adopted Local Plan; the Core Strategy, the Development Sites and Policies Plan and the Welborne Plan.

Adopted Local Plan: Part 1 - Core Strategy

5.5 The Core Strategy was adopted in August 2011. It identifies the Borough’s overall development needs up to 2026 and how they will be met. A number of strategic objectives set out how the strategy will be delivered including ‘Strategic Objective 6’. This identifies the need to ‘provide a range of dwelling sizes and tenures which take into account existing and future housing needs.’ Strategic policy (CS2) on ‘Housing Provision’ indicates that development in the
Borough will achieve a mix of different housing sizes, types and tenures that will be informed by the Housing Market Assessment and the Council's Housing Strategy. In addition, another strategic policy (CS18) on the 'Provision of Affordable Housing' outlines the requirement for development proposals to provide a mixture of dwelling types, sizes and tenures reflecting the identified affordable housing needs of the local population.

**Adopted Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Sites and Policies Plan**

5.6 The Development Sites and Policies Plan, which was adopted in June 2015, provides further detail of the specific sites (except the Welborne site) and local policies which will deliver the strategic objectives of the Core Strategy. It outlines the Council's support for self-build housing, encouraging those wishing to build their own houses where the opportunity arises. For example, Policy DSP7, highlights there are opportunities for small scale residential infill development which could help support self-build schemes (paragraph 5.167). It further indicates that the Council will continue to review the demand for self-build and custom house building in the Borough, and through the review of the Local Plan, will explore making land available for such products should future demand exceed the land made available for self-build in the Borough (paragraph 5.168).

**Adopted Local Plan: Part 3 - Welborne Plan**

5.7 The Welborne Plan, a bespoke plan for the new community north of Fareham, was adopted in June 2015. Welborne is a new community of up to 6,000 homes. It will create c. 5,735 new jobs on approximately 97,250 sqm of new office, light industrial and warehouse floorspace. Welborne will provide a new village centre and two local neighbourhood centres, providing a new secondary school and up to 3 new primary schools. New community and health facilities will be an integral part of the new community, along with c.108 ha of natural green space, play areas, leisure and sports facilities. With a new bus rapid transit transport system serving the community and wider area, Welborne will be accessed by an ‘all moves’ junction 10 on the M27.

5.8 The plan makes provision within the Welborne development for custom and self-build housing through a specific policy (WEL21) on Custom Build Homes. The policy requires that a proportion of homes be delivered as dwelling plots for sale to individuals or groups of individuals wishing to build their own home. This policy requires that the number of custom build homes (i.e. plots) in any each residential phase should reflect up-to-date evidence of demand, coupled with the need to ensure that the character and nature of that phase are not compromised. Overall, however, the policy states that it is expected that not less than 1% of all homes at Welborne should be delivered as custom-build plots.
Local Plan Review

5.9 The Council has committed to a review of its Local Plan to reflect emerging housing and employment needs until 2036. The new plan looks at a timeframe of up to 2036, in line with the existing Adopted Welborne Plan. This new Local Plan, once adopted will fully supersede Parts 1 and 2 of the Adopted Local Plan, and update delivery timescales in the Welborne Plan (Part 3). The new plan is currently at draft stage, and the following paragraphs detail the current draft policies that the Council have consulted on last year (25 October-8 December 2017).

Emerging Local Plan: Draft Fareham Local Plan 2036

5.10 The new draft plan has a specific policy (H7) on ‘Self and Custom Build Homes’ that supports such provision in principle as long as a number of criteria are met. It also looks to sites of 100 dwellings or more to provide 5% of the overall dwellings as plots for self or custom-built homes, with the exception of sites in Fareham Town Centre or a specific draft allocation (H3: Southampton Road). In combination, this draft policy and the allocations provide suitable provision for self or custom build (partly or wholly on sites) to meet local demand.

5.11 Lastly, it is important to highlight that the Draft Fareham Local Plan 2036 was published before the new NPPF issued, therefore it was based on the previous national policy (NPPF) and associated guidance (NPPG). The Council needs to assess whether there are any implications of these recent changes to national policy on the plan’s content and progression.

5.12 The following paragraphs explain the local demand for self-build and custom house building based on the latest register information.
6.0 LOCAL SELF-BUILD AND CUSTOM HOUSE BUILDING DEMAND IN FARHAM

Fareham’s Self-build and Custom Build House Building Register

6.1 The Self and Custom Build Register was launched on the Council’s website on 21\textsuperscript{st} March 2016. The eligibility criteria for entry onto the Council’s self-build register is established through The Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding (Register) Regulations 2016. It stipulates that any individual or member of an association that signs up to the register must be aged 18 or older and a British citizen, or a national from an EEA State other than the UK, or national of Switzerland. The individual or member of an association must also seek to acquire a serviced plot of land in the Borough to build a house to occupy as their sole or main residence.

6.2 To better understand local demand for self and custom build plots in the Borough, the Council has included additional questions, researching the preferences of those on the register. This includes locations within the Borough they would prefer, the type of self or custom build property they are interested in building and the number of bedrooms they are seeking.

6.3 Since then, this information indicates that there are 58 individuals interested in self and custom build (21\textsuperscript{st} March 2016 up until 6th August 2018). In terms of the type of self and custom build those on the register are interested in, the highest preference is for detached houses (88%), followed by those seeking a detached bungalow (31%). There is a very low demand for other types of housing. The locational preferences indicate that the highest demand is in Stubbington/Hill Head (69%), then followed by Warsash (66%), dropping to the lowest in Portchester (29%). Finally, in terms of preferences for the number of bedrooms spaces, demand ranges with 4 bedrooms the highest at 60%, closely followed by 3 bedrooms at 51%, with 1 bedroom demand being the lowest at 2%.

Charging & Local Connection Test

6.4 The Council approved several changes to the register in July last year. This included a charge for applicants joining or remaining on the register. It also introduced a ‘local connection test’. This test means that applicants must confirm they have either lived in the Borough for a minimum of 2 years, or they have been employed in the Borough (for more than 16 hours per week) continuously over the last two years. This means the register now falls into two parts, those with a local connection are in Part 1 and those without a local connection are in Part 2. Of the 58 individuals registered, 55 meet the local connection test.
6.5 This register information is reported in the Authority Monitoring Report on an annual basis. The following section outlines the actions that the Council, working with other interested parties, can take in meeting its duties.
7.0 THE COUNCIL’S SELF-BUILD & CUSTOM HOUSE BUILDING ACTION PLAN

7.1 Given this national and local context, the Council’s objective is to: ‘positively influence or help secure development opportunities where we can support individuals or organisation in our local communities to deliver high quality self-built or custom-built homes to meet demand in the Borough’. This section of the action plan sets out what actions can be taken to achieve this.

Engaging with Self-build & Custom Build Customers

7.2 The Council is proposing further measures to improve its services to different customers, such as notifying those on the register when planning permission is granted for self-build and custom-built homes (having regard for data protection) and publishing local demand and delivery evidence through the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR).

7.3 In line with the Council’s continuing service improvement (through ‘systems thinking’), which ensures a 'customer focused' approach to service delivery and the quick resolution of problems. The Council will aim to update its website with useful information for those interested in self-build and custom house building in the Borough, such as producing guidance for applicants and headline information on permissions.

Action 1. Explore and implement innovative methods for engaging with customers who are interested in self-build and custom house building in the Borough and raising awareness of the grant of suitable planning permissions or suitable Council land disposals.

Understanding Local Demand for Self & Custom House Building

7.4 Importantly, the Council need to first understand more about the nature of demand for self-build and custom house-building in the Borough. Whilst the existing register is a helpful guide, it relies on individuals and organisations’ knowing the register exists. Through undertaking research, the Council will be able to get a realistic understanding of local demand, but also their ability to afford available options. The Council will also need to understand whether there are any barriers to those individuals or organisations that can afford self-build and custom housebuilding, and whether the Council can play a role in preventing these barriers from occurring.
Action 2. Continue to improve the Council's understanding of those individuals or organisations that are interested in self-build or custom housebuilding opportunities within the Borough (as well as their ability to afford available options) by undertaking detailed research.

Opportunities for Self & Custom House Building in the Borough

7.5 Next, it is important we engage with those who have the means to assist individuals or organisations interested in self-build and custom housebuilding. In its simplistic form, to make self-build and custom housebuilding a reality for those who desire it, it requires the provision of suitable land and finance, the skills and materials to build it, as well as suitable utility and public highway access provision. It is important that the Council understands how all these interested parties can work together, to help those who are interested in self and custom build.

7.6 Turning to the first, available land. The Council has a direct role where it is a landowner itself, to establish if the land is suitable for self-build and/or custom-built homes. This can be exercised through its land disposal, regeneration or housing functions.

7.7 Secondly, using its planning functions, the most appropriate route for the Council is to approach landowners or relevant parties with land suitable for development to meet local demand for self and custom-built housing, is through Council’s housing availability assessment, commonly known as the ‘Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment’ (SHLAA). A SHLAA is a technical exercise to determine the quantity and suitability of land potentially available for housing development. A SHLAA should be updated on an annual basis. Another example is when pre-application inquiries are made to the Planning Service for self-build and custom-build homes.

Action 3. Assess sites potential for self-build and custom house building through the Council’s housing availability assessment (e.g. Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment).

7.8 With the backdrop of the Government looking to boost house building, Councils like Fareham are looking at an increasingly diverse range of housing products, such as self-build and custom-build homes to meet local housing demand. Therefore, it is appropriate that when sites are promoted to the Council, these local needs (including self-build and custom house building) are part of the
initial site assessment. Furthermore, the Council will also assess the potential for self-build and custom housebuilding on its own land assets, in the context of the Corporate and Housing Strategies, as well as the current (adopted) and emerging Local Plan.

Achieving High Quality Design

7.9 Where sites have already been identified for self or custom-built housing, such as Welborne, the Council will endeavour to ensure its services, such as planning and building control, help deliver high quality self and custom-built homes. Taking Planning Services, there are different ways the Council can help ensure this type of house building is high quality, this can be an area of concern as self and custom build can potentially lead to a huge degree of variation with so many parties involved, which risks undermining design quality.

7.10 One such mechanism is the use of overarching design codes for developers of large sites with phases of different housing products, including self-build or custom house building, to ensure design quality is maintained throughout the site. The use of plot passports for individual plots to ensure that, for example, self-builders understand what they can or cannot build within their plot is also a helpful mechanism for securing high quality self-build and custom-build homes.

7.11 Plot passports aim to produce important information on means of access, available services, what they have permission to build (i.e. the rules of the build) or what they need to do to gain it. Often such passports set out information on what options they have with regard to which materials to use for different aspects of the home, and the physical limits of the home within the plot. It is for these reasons it is important that the Council work with interested parties to produce design guidance on how to produce design codes and plot passports for self-build and custom house building developments.

Action 4. The Council will work with interested parties to produce design guidance to achieve high-quality design on self and custom build developments in the Borough (e.g. design codes/plot passports).

7.12 Furthermore, self and custom build development pose new challenges for the planning, and it is important that the Council can make good decisions on such applications appropriately and swiftly. The use of procedural advice when submitting a planning application for self-build and custom-build housing is likely to be beneficial to both the applicant and the Council. It could include helpful information on matters such as the level of detail required for outline, full, hybrid and reserved matters applications, as well as how to claim CIL exemption and the use of standard conditions or clauses for s106 agreements.
Action 5. The Council will work with interested parties to produce procedural guidance on how to apply for planning permission for self-build and custom house building developments in the Borough (e.g. standard conditions).

7.13 For both, actions 4 and 5, the Council will aim to involve experienced applicants in helping define what the Authority’s design and procedural guidance should cover, as well as provide helpful feedback to the Planning and Building Control Services for continuous service improvements. This is in line with the Council’s Vanguard approach, as previously mentioned, which puts the customer at the centre of Council services.

7.14 It is important to explain that serviced plots for self-build are defined by national legislation as a parcel of land with legal access to a public highway, and at least water, foul drainage and electricity supply available at the plot boundary. It is also desirable that plots have surface water drainage, telecommunication services, and gas (or district heating) where available. The Council will seek to work with utility companies and the highway authority (Hampshire County Council) to understand how best utilities and public highways can be delivered to self-build plots or custom house building sites in the Borough to inform the Council’s design and procedural guidance.

Update Relevant Corporate Strategies

7.15 Whilst both the adopted and emerging Local Plan have specific provisions for self-build and custom house building, any new significant change in evidence on local demand for these housing products will need to be reflected in the review of the Local Plan. Furthermore, with the Government confirming in the recent NPPF for example, that self and custom-built housing can include both market and affordable housing, it is important that the Council are clear how this distinction is made in the emerging Local Plan.

Action 6. Any new significant change to national policy or in evidence on the local demand for self-build and custom house building, should be reflected in reviewing the Local Plan, as well as other emerging strategies.
Financing Self & Custom House Building

7.16 Ultimately, the personal financing of self-build and custom house building is largely a matter for interested individuals and the organisations involved. The Council will work to secure funding streams, such as the Home Building Fund currently available from the Government; to enable self-build and custom-build homes to be delivered.

Action 7. The Council will actively work with Government and other partners to secure funding to enable self and custom-build housing to be delivered.

Sharing Experience

7.17 When it comes to the skills and materials to develop self-build and custom-build homes, the Council are keen to work with all relevant partners to help facilitate investment in construction skills and support economic activity of this sector. The Council are keen to encourage the sharing of skills and best practice in self and custom house building. Hosting or facilitating a series of events that share good practice and skills will help increase collective awareness of all the parties involved.

Action 8. The Council hosting or facilitating a series of events or forums, such as Expos, workshops and webpages, to encourage skills and experience sharing with interested parties.

Monitoring & Review

7.18 The Council will look to continually monitor this action plan. If circumstances change significantly, the actions are not appropriate or not working to achieve the Council’s objective, the Council will look to update this action plan. This is the first action plan the Council has ever produced on self-build and custom house building, a relatively new housing sector, therefore it likely it will need to be updated to reflect local experience over the coming years.
Report to the Executive for Decision
03 September 2018

Portfolio: Policy and Resources
Subject: Locks Heath Memorial Hall Progress Report
Report of: Head of Leisure and Corporate Services
Corporate Priorities: A dynamic, prudent and progressive Council

Purpose:
To update the Executive regarding a proposal from St John’s Church Locks Heath regarding the future of Locks Heath Memorial Hall.

Executive summary:

At the September 2017 Executive meeting, members considered a report regarding the future of Locks Heath Memorial Hall.

The Council had, in January 2016, been made aware that the Locks Heath Community Association only had one remaining trustee who, at that time, wanted to stand down from the position. The implication for this was that the Association would be in default of the lease and there would be nobody to operate and manage the building.

Following unsuccessful efforts to find new trustees, arrangements were made to relocate the remaining user groups.

After considering the report, the Executive agreed that the Hall was surplus to the Council’s requirements and was to be placed on the open market for sale.

Since the Executive agreed to dispose of the Locks Heath Memorial Hall, St John’s Church has come forward and stated that its interest in the Hall was not considered. The purpose of this report is to provide an opportunity for that interest to be considered now, including its future business plan.

Recommendation:
To consider the business plan for Locks Heath Memorial Hall proposed by St John’s Church and, in light of this, to consider if the previous decision made by the Executive to sell the site on the open market, should be reconsidered.
**Reason:**
St John’s Church feels that its interest in the Hall was not considered at the time when the Executive made its decision to dispose of Locks Heath Memorial Hall and, when the Planning Committee granted planning permission for redevelopment.

**Cost of proposals:**
There is a significant capital value attributable to this site. Best and final offers are to be submitted to the Council.

**Appendices:**
- **A:** Report & Briefing Paper to the Executive. September 2017 - Locks Heath Memorial Hall Asset Disposal Report
- **B:** Business Plan prepared by St John’s Church (to be tabled at the meeting)

**Background papers:** None

**Reference papers:** Planning application P/18/0246/D4
INTRODUCTION

1. The purpose of this report is to set out the background regarding the Executive’s decision in September 2017 to dispose of Locks Heath Memorial Hall, on the open market, and to provide an opportunity for members to consider a proposal put forward by St John’s Church.

BACKGROUND

2. Locks Heath Memorial Hall, and the land it sits upon, is owned by Fareham Borough Council. The original build is dated to 1922 and the property was purchased by the Council from the Church in 1966. The hall is served by WCs, a small kitchen, storage facilities and a secure outdoor space, but is in poor condition overall.

3. In January 2016, the Council was made aware that the Locks Heath Community Association only had one remaining trustee, who wanted to stand down. The implication for this was that the Association would be in default of the lease and there would be no one to operate and manage the building.

4. The Locks Heath Community Association had been experiencing ongoing issues with its governance arrangements, which had resulted in limited use of the facility and a deterioration of the internal fabric of the Hall.

5. The Council had an arrangement with “One Community”, an organisation which provides help and support to community and voluntary organisations, and One Community was asked to take on a temporary administrative role to keep the facility open.

6. While assisting in this capacity, One Community also sought to recruit new trustees for the Community Association to enable it to continue to function.

7. A meeting took place on 16 November 2016 with the existing user groups to establish if they would consider standing as trustees, but there was no interest, and as a result the Association folded.
8. The Church were not invited to attend the user group meeting as they were not a group that used the hall.

9. The property was, and still is, in poor condition, not fit for purpose and would require a significant amount of capital investment to bring it up to an acceptable standard.

10. As the Association had defaulted on the lease, the practical responsibility for the building fell to the Council. In the circumstances, the Council had no option but to identify alternative accommodation for the existing users of the Hall.

11. All the user groups were helped to find suitable, alternative accommodation, in other nearby community facilities, offering a far better standard of facility for them to deliver their groups and activities from.

12. Neither the Council nor One Community has received any direct enquiries from anyone wishing to book the Hall since the Association handed the building back to the Council.

**DISPOSAL OF THE ASSET**

13. In September 2017, the Executive was asked to consider a report on the future of the Memorial Hall. (A copy of the report has been attached at Appendix A). It was vacant, in poor condition and not fit for purpose. The Executive approved the following recommendations;

- (a) the Locks Heath Memorial Hall is declared surplus to the Council’s requirements;
- (b) an outline planning application is submitted for residential use of the site;
- (c) subject to the receipt of planning consent, the site is placed on the open market for potential purchasers to submit offers on a competitive basis; and
- (d) acceptance of an offer is delegated to the Director of Finance and Resources following consultation with the Executive Leader.

14. No deputations were made and the Executive agreed the recommendations.

**PLANNING**

15. Following Executive approval, officers began the process of preparing an outline planning application for the redevelopment of the site for residential purposes.

16. Subject to planning consent being obtained, the site was to be placed on the open market by the Council’s retained agent so that maximum market coverage could be achieved with offers sought from interested parties on a competitive basis to achieve best value to the Council.

17. Following the standard public notice process on the 23 May 2018, the Planning Committee considered a planning application for the construction of a single dwelling on the site of the Locks Heath Memorial Hall.

18. One of the considerations taken into account was the loss of a community facility. The Council’s Local Plan has a policy that effectively protects community facilities from being lost unless it can be demonstrated that; new or extended facilities have been provided on the site, or at a suitable alternative location, or; that there is no demand for continued community facilities at the proposed location and, that it can be satisfactorily
shown that the site was marketed effectively for such use for at least one year.

19. The Planning Committee’s decision was to grant planning permission for a single storey dwelling.

**PROPOSAL BY ST JOHNS CHURCH, LOCKS HEATH**

20. When One Community was seeking to recruit new trustees for the Community Association to enable it to continue to function, Reverend Foster from St John’s Church Locks Heath, expressed an interest in acquiring the site. There was no indication of any commitment to become a trustee for the existing Community Association. The interest was to utilise the building for church based activities.

21. Although this was not in line with the Council’s objective, Reverend Foster was asked to submit his proposals so that they could be considered by the Council. This was not forthcoming.

22. When the Executive agreed to dispose of the Memorial Hall, no proposals had been submitted by the Church and, in subsequent correspondence when Reverend Foster was asked again to submit proposals for how the Church intended to use the site and how the project would be funded, no proposals were received.

23. However, St John’s Church have since indicated that it feels that its interest in the Hall was not considered at the time when the Executive made its decision to dispose of Locks Heath Memorial Hall.

24. Since planning permission was granted and the Executive resolved to sell the land, the Church has prepared a business plan that it would like to be considered by the Executive. The Executive Leader agreed to this request. The proposal is to be tabled as Appendix B.

**ASSET OF COMMUNITY VALUE**

25. Following the Executive decision to dispose of the Hall, St John’s Church also put forward a request for the property to be registered as an Asset of Community Value.

26. After extensive research by officers into the usage, significance and condition of Locks Heath Memorial Hall, and taking into account the Localism Act 2011, Regulations and Guidance, and taking advice from the Solicitor to the Council, the Church was recently advised that the Council is unable to agree to register Locks Heath Memorial Hall as an Asset of Community Value.

27. This decision was taken for the following reasons:

   (a) Usage was low before the closure of Locks Heath Memorial Hall in 2017, being mainly occupied by Jigsaw Nursery from Monday to Friday each week during term time, between the hours of 8.30am and 3.30pm, some usage was apparent on weekday evenings, and only two hours of usage on a Saturday morning. Taking all of the usage into account, and based on opening times of 8.30am to 9pm, the Hall was actually used for approximately 30% of the reasonable times available for hire per annum.

   (b) The condition of the Hall is poor, which is a salient factor, and whether or not it could reasonably be put back into community usage has to be considered and given due weight. A condition survey in 2016 identified the need for significant investment
(circa £60,000 at that time) to bring the building up to a good, useable standard. As it is now two years on from that condition survey, it is probable that even more investment would now be needed to ensure safe usage of the Hall, as the fabric of the building will have deteriorated further since its closure in 2017.

(c) Finally, all users who occupied the Hall before its closure in 2017 have been successfully relocated to alternative sites, within close proximity to the hall, and appear to be content to stay at their new locations, which provide better conditions than Locks Heath Memorial Hall did. There are also several other, underutilised community centres, within the Western Wards which could accommodate user groups from the local area.

28. Following detailed research, the overall conclusion was that Locks Heath Memorial Hall has very limited value as a community asset, and after taking all matters into account should not be registered as such.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

29. There is a significant capital value attributable to this site, and interest is anticipated to be high. Best and final offers are to be submitted to the Council.

30. Members are reminded that when the Council decided to build a new swimming pool and fitness facility in the western wards (Holly Hill Leisure Centre), it was agreed that any funds raised from the sale of land or property assets in the western wards would be used to help fund the construction costs of the new Leisure Centre. This of course, is a benefit enjoyed by all members of the local community. If Locks Heath Memorial Hall is sold, then the funds would be used for this purpose.

31. At the time of preparing this report the proposals to be submitted by the church have not been received so cannot be given any professional examination or costing. Officers estimate that simply to return the Hall to being “fit and proper” would be in excess of £60,000. No budget for this sum has been allocated.

CONCLUSION

32. The Council has followed the correct procedures with regard to making a decision on the future of Locks Heath Memorial Hall. All reports to the Executive and Planning Committee were published in accordance with the law. However, St John’s Church has requested an opportunity to put forward its proposals before the site is disposed of. Members are asked to consider any business plan put forward by the Church and to indicate whether or not they wish to review the current resolution to dispose of the site on the open market, realising a significant capital sum.

Enquiries:
For further information on this report please contact Lindsey Ansell, Ext 4567.
Report to the Executive for Decision
04 September 2017

Portfolio: Policy and Resources
Subject: Locks Heath Memorial Hall - Asset Disposal
Report of: Director of Finance and Resources
Strategy/Policy: Asset Management Plan
Corporate Objective: A Dynamic, prudent and progressive Council

Purpose: To obtain the approval of the Executive to the sale of the Locks Heath Memorial Hall site.

Executive summary: The Locks Heath Memorial Hall is vacant, in poor condition and not fit for purpose. This report asks the Executive to declare the Locks Heath Memorial Hall surplus to requirements and seeks approval to dispose of the asset and obtain a capital receipt for the Council.

Recommendation/Recommended Option:
It is recommended that the Executive agrees that:

(e) the Locks Heath Memorial Hall is declared surplus to the Council’s requirements;

(f) an outline planning application is submitted for residential use of the site;

(g) subject to the receipt of planning consent, the site is placed in the open market for potential purchasers to submit offers on a competitive basis; and

(h) acceptance of an offer is delegated to the Director of Finance & Resources following consultation with the Executive Leader.
**Reason:**
To obtain the approval of the Executive to the sale of the Locks Heath Memorial Hall site.

**Cost of proposals:**
The sale will secure a capital receipt for the Council. Initial marketing costs will be required when the site is placed in the open market.

**Background papers:** None

**Reference papers:** None
INTRODUCTION

33. Locks Heath Memorial Hall is owned by Fareham Borough Council and leased to Locks Heath Community Association. The Association holds a 20-year lease on the property which expires in March 2018. Appendix A shows the land that is included within that lease.

34. The original build is dated to 1922 and the property was purchased by the Council in 1966 for the sum of £2,200. The hall is served by WC’s, a small kitchen, storage facilities and a secure outdoor space.

35. The Association has experienced ongoing issues over recent years with its governance arrangements which have resulted in limited use of the facility and a deterioration of the internal fabric of the building.

36. Despite efforts from the Council and from One Community, the organisation funded by the Council to provide support for community and voluntary organisations, the Association has now folded.

37. The vacant property is in poor condition and not fit for purpose and is therefore surplus to requirements. This report seeks approval to dispose of the asset and obtain a capital receipt for the Council.

BACKGROUND

38. In January 2016, the Council was made aware that the Locks Heath Community Association only had one remaining trustee who wanted to stand down. The implication for this being that the organisation would be in default of the lease and there would be nobody to operate the building.

39. The Council has an arrangement with One Community, an organisation who provide help and support to community and voluntary organisations. One Community were asked to take on a temporary administrative role in order to keep the facility open.
40. While assisting in this capacity, One Community also sought to recruit new trustees for the Community Association to enable it to continue to function. A meeting was organised with the existing user groups to discuss them standing as trustees, but there was no interest.

41. One Community's Volunteer Centre produced a flyer, asking for volunteers, including the role of secretary and caretaker, but unfortunately nobody came forward. The Charity Commission was informed of the situation and without any remaining trustees the process of closing down the charity was instigated.

42. The Chief Executive of One Community acted as interim Treasurer to handle the affairs of the Charity in the short term to coordinate the closure of the Charity and to ensure all income and expenditure is dealt with appropriately.

43. As the Association has defaulted on the lease, the responsibility for the building falls to Fareham Borough Council. The property is in poor condition and not fit for purpose and would require a significant capital investment to bring it up to an acceptable standard.

44. In the circumstances, the Council had no option but to explore alternative accommodation for the existing users of the building and all these user groups have been found alternative accommodation in nearby community facilities.

PLANNING ADVICE

45. Advice was sought from the Head of Development Management on the use of the site redeveloped for residential use. The following advice was received.

46. The size of the site and the character of development within the area (in particular the bungalows on either side of the site) would inform the scale and design of any replacement buildings.

47. The area is characterised by regularly spaced, detached buildings which adhere to a uniform building line. As the dwellings on either side are bungalows, it would be expected that any replacement building to be of a similar height. It is therefore unlikely that a two-storey development in this location would be acceptable, although chalet style development (i.e. rooms within the roof space) may be acceptable. The provision of one building designed to look like a house but, in reality, containing two flats may be an option. But it is unlikely that more than two units could be provided given the policy requirement to respect the character of the area, provide car parking, amenity space etc.

48. The advice received and maximum number of units suggested will prevent the site being retained by the Council and redeveloped for affordable /social housing. Therefore, a sale to a private developer is proposed.

DISPOSAL OF THE ASSET

49. There were covenants on the property when it was purchased by the Council. However, these covenants are not particularly onerous and would not preclude redevelopment of the site. They relate to such things as not building within 30 feet of the road, not using the land for gravel or sand extraction or as a burial ground and not selling or manufacturing alcohol.

50. It is proposed that the Council submits an outline planning application for the redevelopment of the site for residential purposes. Subject to planning consent being
obtained the site will be placed in the open market by the Council's retained agent so that maximum market coverage can be achieved with offers sought from interested parties on a competitive basis. This will achieve best value.

51. Interested purchasers will submit offers based on what they will want to build on the site. The offers are expected to be conditional on the successful applicant receiving detailed planning consent. The Council will not bind itself to accept any of the offers received. It is suggested that the acceptance of any offer is delegated to the Director of Finance & Resources in consultation with the Executive Leader.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

52. The sale will secure a capital receipt for the Council. Initial marketing costs will be required when the site is placed on the open market.

CONCLUSION

The Locks Heath Memorial Hall is vacant, in poor condition and not fit for purpose. This report asks the Executive to declare the Locks Heath Memorial Hall surplus to requirements and seeks approval to dispose of the asset and obtain a capital receipt for the Council. The Executive are therefore requested to agree the recommendation set out in the report.
### Report to the Executive for Decision
**03 September 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio:</th>
<th>Policy and Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>Business Rate Retention Pilots 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of:</td>
<td>Director of Finance and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Priorities:</td>
<td>A dynamic, prudent and progressive Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose:**
To advise members on the proposal to participate in a 75% business rate retention pilot for 2019/20.

**Executive summary:**
On 24th July, the Government published an invitation to councils to apply to participate in a 75% business rate retention pilot scheme, with bids to be submitted to Government by 25th September. The scheme is designed to give local authorities greater control over money raised locally and increase the overall level of business rates retained by local government.

This report sets out the proposal for the Council to participate in the 75% business rates pilot collaboratively with other councils in Hampshire. The pilot is an opportunity for councils to retain a greater share of business rate growth in their area but they will also be exposed to a higher level of business rate risk in 2019/20.

The pilot will help inform the Government on how different local arrangements, including governance and information systems, work in relation to 75% business rates retention, in order to introduce the reforms across local government in 2020/21.

Discussions with other Hampshire councils have been positive to date and each council will consider if they wish to submit a joint bid to Government. It is likely that a joint county and all districts bid would be seen more positively from Government when assessing bids.

**Recommendation:**
It is recommended that the Executive:

a) agrees in principle to participate in the submission bid for Fareham to be part of a Hampshire-wide 75% business rate retention pilot; and

b) delegates the agreement of the final submission to the Leader and the Director of Finance and Resources.
Reason:
To participate in a Hampshire-wide 75% business rate retention pilot which would increase business rates retained by the Council. It has the potential to provide for additional one-off funds to the Council, other districts and the County Council, as well as a ‘strategic share’ across Hampshire.

Cost of proposals:
There are potential costs as the Government will provide no support for losses. All losses will be shared across the Hampshire-wide pilot authorities.

Appendices: None

Background papers:

Reference papers: Government prospectus for the 2019-20 pilots:
INTRODUCTION

1. Since 2013 the Government has changed local government finance so that there is less money coming directly from central government and more money coming directly to local authorities through business rates collected across the country.

2. At the moment, although this Council collects all the business rates due for the Borough, we only retain an initial 40% with 9% going to Hampshire County Council, 1% to the Hampshire Fire Authority and the other 50% paid over to Central Government.

3. Recently, the Government had been investigating increasing the level of business rates retained by local government from the current 50% to 100%. To test how this would work, pilot bids were invited for 2018/19 of which there were ten successful bidders, including a Solent bid (Portsmouth, Southampton and the Isle of Wight Councils).

4. However, in December 2017, the Government announced the aim of increasing the level of business rates retained by local government to 75% in April 2020.

5. To test increased business rates retention and to aid understanding of the transition into a reformed business rates retention system in April 2020, the Government published on 24th July, an invitation to local authorities to apply to become 75% business rates retention pilots in 2019/20. This will focus on the learning necessary for transition to the proposed new scheme in 2020/21 and resulting in a smoother transition to full implementation.


THE INVITATION TO AUTHORITIES

7. The Government is interested in exploring how 75% rates retention can operate across more than one authority to promote financial sustainability and to support coherent strategic decision-making across functional economic areas.

8. The Government would like to see authorities form pools with agreement in place from
all participating authorities, to apply jointly for pilot status. They expect a proposed pool to comprise of a county council and all of the associated district councils; a group of unitary authorities; or a two-tier area and adjoining unitaries.

9. The Government will use the 2019/20 pilots to deepen its understanding of how different local arrangements, including governance and information systems, work in relation to 75% business rates retention. Participating authorities are expected to work with Government officials on the system design of the new business rates retention system and share additional data and information, as required.

10. The proposal will need to show that all participating authorities have agreed to become part of the suggested pool and share additional growth as outlined in the bid. The Section 151 Officer of each authority will need to sign off the proposal before its submission.

11. Pilot areas will be expected to operate under the arrangements that currently determine safety net payments for pools. Each ‘pool’ will have a single safety net threshold determined on the basis of the pool’s overall baseline funding level and business rates baseline. However, the pool’s safety net threshold will be set at 95% of its baseline funding level, instead of the current 92.5%, to reflect the additional risk of 75% retention.

12. The Government has agreed that a ‘no detriment’ clause will not be applied to the 2019/20 pilots (this was applied to the pilots in 2018/19). ‘No detriment’ ensured that the members of the pilot would be no worse-off in the pilot than they would have been in the 50% scheme. Instead, selected areas will test a 95% safety net to reflect increased risk in the proposed increased business rates retention system. Applying a ‘no detriment’ clause to the pilots would not be reflective of the reformed business rates retention system that the Government aims to introduce in 2020/21.

THE PROPOSAL

13. Hampshire is proposing to make a bid to be one of the 2019/20 75% business rate pilots with Winchester City Council being the lead authority. The proposed Hampshire pilot would include Hampshire County Council, Hampshire Fire Authority, and all the district councils within the county: Basingstoke and Deane, East Hampshire, Eastleigh, Fareham, Gosport, Hart, Havant, New Forest, Rushmoor, Test Valley and Winchester.

14. Hampshire’s pilot would exclude Solent (Portsmouth, Southampton and Isle of Wight), which are assumed to be re-bidding for 2019/20 separately.

15. There are two main reasons for submitting a bid to be included within the pilot:

1) Firstly, the bid will demonstrate cross county working and sharing of the risks and rewards of business rates to enable a sharing of any financial benefit (or financial loss) through the pilot scheme. In a time of reducing financial resources across the county, the bid proposes to provide some funding for social care pressures across the county as well as supporting individual council’s financial position and delivering a cross county strategic share to enable larger scale infrastructure projects.

2) Secondly, as the Government will be rolling out a 75% retention scheme across the country, it is helpful to be part of a pilot to help shape the scheme when it is rolled out. Also, to understand how this will work locally, whether there is any benefit or downside of pooling with the other Hampshire councils, and what the key risks are as part of the scheme. Ultimately the Government is considering a move to a 100% retention scheme linked to reductions in a number of grants to joint working at this
point will help with future changes.

16. There are a number of different ways of sharing growth from the business rates pilot and the exact split is still being discussed across the Hampshire group. The agreed split will mitigate any potential losses to individual authorities and to provide an incentive for growth, no matter how large or small an individual authority’s existing business rates payable is. The growth share split will be over the following areas:

   a) An amount to be set aside for a strategic share across the county for major infrastructure projects to be enhanced or delivered more quickly.

   b) An amount to be aside to provide specific project support to the County Council's social care function.

   c) An amount be retained by the individual authorities.

17. The growth to individual authorities will be shared on the basis of ‘percentage of above baseline growth’ with a no individual authority loss clause. This gives equal incentive to all authorities and ensures that if overall growth is achieved then no authority will lose out from joining the pilot (i.e. they would receive the same as if they had continued under the existing 50% scheme).

18. Modelling of the financial benefits of a Hampshire pilot is currently being undertaken by Pixel, specialist consultants in local government finance and funding. The Council is also engaging its own specialist consultants to model the effects for Fareham.

RISKS

19. The participating Hampshire councils will be exposed to a higher level of business rate risk in 2019/20 only as there will be “no detriment” support from Government. The risks are:

   a) There will be a higher share of any losses, 75% rather than 50%.

   b) Greater cash loss on safety net than under the current system (under the existing 50% retention system each authority has its own safety net threshold, so losses are supported separately rather than collectively).

   c) Based on 2018/19 business rate estimates and based on the proposed 95% safety net, the maximum loss shared amongst all authorities would be approximately £8.4m.

20. In order to minimise the risk to individual authorities it is proposed that:

   a) If resources allow, each member will have a Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) that is equivalent to either their financial position in the pool or in the main 50% scheme.

   b) Funding for the MFG will come from the other members of the pilot, with payments being made pro rata to the funds that each member has available.

   c) If this is insufficient to make up to MFG, then losses will be distributed proportionately.

NEXT STEPS
21. Discussion with other Hampshire local authorities have been positive to date. It is for each local authority to consider if they wish to submit a joint bid to Government. However, it is likely that a joint county and all districts bid would be seen more positively from Government when assessing bids.

22. The Hampshire councils included within the bid will be seeking views on the modelled proposals and chief finance officers have authority to submit to be part of a bid to Government. Subject to the Hampshire authorities approving the bid, the submission will be made on 25th September with expected successful bidders announced before or alongside the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement in November.

23. If the bid is successful then the Council will need to factor this into the Medium Term Financial Strategy as well as consider with the other councils the strategic share top slice amounts as the year progresses.

CONCLUSION

24. This report outlines the Government’s invitation to participate in a 75% business rate retention pilot for 2019/20. The pilot will give local authorities greater control over money raised locally and the overall level of business rates retained by local government.

25. The pilot will aid the Government’s understanding for the transition to the proposed new scheme in 2020/21.

26. Hampshire is proposing to make a bid to be one of the 2019/20 75% business rate pilots. Participants include Hampshire County Council, Hampshire Fire Authority and all the Hampshire district councils, with Winchester City Council being the lead authority.

27. The participating Hampshire councils will be exposed to a higher level of business rate risk in 2019/20 and measures will be put in place to minimise the risk to individual authorities.

28. Discussions are still underway with the Hampshire pilot on the agreement of the growth share split between the strategic share, social care and individual authorities.

29. Subject to the Hampshire authorities approving the bid, the submission will be made on 25th September with expected successful bidders announced before or alongside the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement in November.

Enquiries:
For further information on this report please contact Caroline Hancock (Ext 4589)
Purpose:
The purpose of this report is to advise members of a proposal to erect a landmark piece of public art, known as a Gate Guardian, by the Peel Common roundabout at Daedalus. It will then seek approval for funding of the project through developer contributions.

Executive summary:
Since the purchase of Daedalus from the Homes and Community Agency in 2015, the site has become the largest employment site in the area and is a hub for aviation, education, engineering and innovation. There has also been growing community involvement at the site.

As part of IFA2 project National Grid agreed to fund a package of community facilities at Daedalus, such as a play area and a large area of open space, known as Daedalus Common. In addition to attracting businesses, this open space will provide many benefits for the local community to enjoy.

These developments are giving Daedalus a unique character, and public art is a proven way to provide a landmark that encapsulates the character of a site and promotes its brand. It can also help to attract businesses and enrich local communities.

A contribution of £100,000 has been secured through the Section 106 Agreement with the National Grid for the provision of large pieces of public art, known as gate guardians.

There is now an opportunity to create and site a large gate guardian, on Daedalus Common, in a visible position, by the busy Peel Common roundabout.

The guardian would be on land that would accommodate public open space, so would be accessible to all. A proposed design, based on the Greek myth of Daedalus has been developed. The design complements the Daedalus brand, and would provide an inspiring landmark that would be associated with the site for generations to come.
**Recommendation/Recommended Option:**
It is recommended that the Executive agrees:

a) to erect a large and distinctive piece of public art known as a ‘Gate Guardian’ at Daedalus; and

b) a budget of £100,000, to be paid by developer contributions from National Grid.

**Reason:**
To create a distinctive landmark, that would promote the unique Daedalus brand to visitors, businesses and residents.

**Cost of proposals:**
The total cost of the project would be £100,000. Funding would be provided by National Grid as part of package of community facilities at Daedalus.

**Appendices:**
A: Proposed Project Budget

**Background papers:** None

**Reference papers:** None
INTRODUCTION

1. This report outlines the proposal to erect a landmark piece of public art, known as a Gate Guardian on Daedalus Common by the Peel Common roundabout at Daedalus. It will then seek approval for funding of the project through developer contributions.

Background

2. Since the purchase of Daedalus from the Homes and Community Agency and the adoption of the Council’s Vision for Daedalus in 2015, the site has become the largest employment site in the area. It is now arguably the premier centre of excellence for aviation, aerospace, marine and advanced engineering businesses in the south.

3. The number of businesses located at the site continues to grow. An important attraction to employers and their workforces is the upcoming provision of an area of public green space in the northern most part of Daedalus, known as Daedalus Common. National Grid was granted planning permission on 17 November 2017 for the provision of this open space, as part of a package of community focused improvements linked to the IFA2 (interconnector) project.

4. In addition to attracting businesses, Daedalus Common will provide many benefits for the local community to enjoy. Landscaping will help screen the views of key buildings using leftover spoil from the construction project. In addition to that, 30,000 native trees, both new and mature, are being planted, and new footpaths and cycle-ways will allow connections with the Alver Valley.

5. These developments are giving Daedalus a unique character and brand. It has become not only a renowned hub of aviation history, but a site of continued innovation, educational excellence and economic success. These elements have also contributed to an increasing level of community involvement with the site, as evidenced by the sell-out Daedalus 100 celebrations in 2017 and the planned D-Day 75 commemorations taking place in the Solent Airport at Daedalus in 2019.
6. There is now the opportunity to celebrate and promote the site by creating a landmark that symbolises its unique character and brand, and provides visitors, residents and businesses with a sense of arrival at Daedalus. An effective and proven way to do this would be through the creation of a large and distinctive piece of public art.

7. Ambitious public art is seen by many as a key component of placemaking, encouraging people to visit, gather and socialise in public spaces. Good public art can also improve the aesthetics of an area and enhance a sense of community pride, ownership and a unique sense of place.

8. Examples such as the Angel of the North and the Spinnaker Tower have become internationally recognised landmarks. Whilst they may have been considered controversial by some early on, they have become well loved by residents and are symbols of their communities, of which they are proud.

9. A similarly ambitious project at Daedalus could come to symbolise the site’s history, success and ambition with the potential to become a nationally recognised landmark for the whole of Fareham for generations to come. A contribution of £100,000 was secured through the Section 106 Agreement with National Grid for the provision of large outdoor sculptures, known as gate guardians. The specific aim of this funding is to promote Daedalus as an attractive site to businesses.

10. Considering this unique opportunity, Officers approached several local artists requesting designs for a large gate guardian. It would be installed on Daedalus Common next to the Peel Common Roundabout (see image below). This location was chosen as it is the main ‘entrance’ to Daedalus and has thousands of vehicles passing by it daily.

11. When developing their proposals designers were asked to take into account a number
of considerations:

- **Setting**: Daedalus Common is a large area of open space that will be landscaped to appeal to walkers, cyclists, families and visitors interested in viewing aircraft. This area is visible from Peel Common roundabout and, for people travelling from the direction of Fareham, it will be the first part of Daedalus they will see. Height will be particularly important as the sculpture will need to stand tall so that it is easily visible from the road.

- **The Daedalus Brand**: The new sculpture would have to reflect the site’s new identity and, at the same time, provide a visual reference to the Council’s vision for Daedalus.

- **Story**: The sculpture should provide a story that is easily relatable but which also respects Daedalus’ position as a hub for innovation, engineering and aviation.

- **Safety**: As the sculpture is intended to be publicly accessible then safety would have to be incorporated into the designs. It would also have to be constructed of materials that would not create any glare for passing aircraft from the air, or vehicles on the road. It would also need to be robust enough to deal with the windspeeds on site.

- **Longevity**: The designs would need to be maintenance free and constructed in a material able to withstand the elements and still look good for generations to come. The site’s coastal location also needed to be considered, particularly how that might affect the longevity of the sculpture and potential layers of dust and dirt caused by busy roads.

- **Audiences**: The design would also need to consider the different people who would view the guardian:
  - Members of the public of all ages who may be passing through or staying for a period
  - Visitors who are considering relocating their business to Daedalus
  - Visitors who are considering start-up premises at the Fareham Innovation Centre
  - Interested parties connected through Enterprise Zone status
  - Parents of and potential students at the college
  - Residents in the area

12. Overall, the gate guardian would need to instil pride in the community, be aspirational and be in keeping with its surroundings.

13. **The preferred design**

14. A number of proposals were received, however there was only one that was considered by officers to have met all the criteria outlined above. The preferred design was provided by artisan blacksmith Peter Clutterbuck and his designer Nigel Searle who have worked with the Council on a number of successful projects including the Falklands Arch in the town centre and the Vannes 50th Anniversary Twinning sculpture in Westbury Manor.

15. The designer has provided a description of the inspiration behind the design, which is based on the Greek myth of Daedalus.
16. “Daedalus made wings for his son, Icarus, and himself so that he could escape the island of Crete, where he was being held captive to prevent him from revealing the secrets of the labyrinth that he had designed. As we know, the ill-fated Icarus flew too close to the sun, fell into the sea and drowned, but Daedalus flew to safety. Daedalus was grief stricken at the loss if his son, but the goddess Athena was impressed by his ingenuity and courage and gave him real wings with the power of flight….

17. The sculpture represents Daedalus about to take flight for the first time. The figure is poised, muscles taught, ready to leap and spread its wings, his head lifted, with eyes toward the sky. The sculpture also pays homage to the airfield itself. The wings are spread in symmetry and are partially constructed to represent the framework of an aircraft wing. Smooth sheet metal tightly covers the top of the wing, creating a streamlined profile that suggests flight may be possible, but the sculpture’s wings remain firmly grounded in the earth in contrast to the figures pose to take flight, reminding us of mans’ struggle to take to the air and the inability of man, himself, to fly. The sculpture also represents hope and a new beginning for the old airfield, after all, Daedalus has new wings and is about to fly for the first time!”

18. The above description could also be at the site of the gate guardian to help visitors to understand the thinking behind the design below.

19. The guardian would be eye-catching and imposing in size and clearly visible from the Peel Common roundabout. The guardian itself would be approximately 3m high and is drawn above next to an average sized man for scale. It would sit on a large grass mound, most likely made from leftover spoil from the converter station. It would complement the open space setting well and by the key point of interested within it.

20. Constructed of galvanised steel, it would be both strong and able to withstand the elements, whilst also being aesthetically pleasing. The steel would also help ensure
that there was no glare to distract pilots flying overhead on sunny days. The guardian would be secured to the mound using steel and concrete foundations.

21. The guardian would be in a public open space and people would be able to reach it and interact with it via a pathway. Therefore, safety has been incorporated into the design, with no sharp edges and wings set at a steep angle to make climbing difficult.

22. It is clear that the design has an emotional impact and interesting backstory. It also matches the Daedalus brand and reflects the Council's commitment to aviation, innovation and engineering at the site. The scale, story and inspiring design of the proposed gate guardian would help it become a nationally recognised landmark allowing visitors to know that they had arrived at Daedalus.

23. **Project Budget**

24. The total cost of the project would be £100,000 (see appendix A for more detail). As mentioned earlier in the report, National Grid is funding a package of community facilities at Daedalus, and the gate guardian project would form part of this package.

25. **Next Steps**

   If approved, more detailed designs would need to be worked up, and planning permission would then need to be sought. The timescale for the construction and installation of the gate guardian will be dependent on the progression of the creation of Daedalus common. Early works have started on the site and are predicted to be completed by the end of 2020.

---

**Enquiries:**

For further information on this report please contact Lindsey Ansell (Ext 4567)
## Appendix A: Proposed Project Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale design drawings and 1 metre high prototype model</td>
<td>£10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel and concrete foundations</td>
<td>£15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>£8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final construction “facilities rented”</td>
<td>£6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport lifting “crane hire”</td>
<td>£4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galvanising</td>
<td>£5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section bending and fabrication labour</td>
<td>£52,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£100,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report to the Executive for Decision
03 September 2018

Portfolio: Policy and Resources
Subject: Review of Policy Development and Review Panels and Scrutiny Board meetings
Report of: Head of Democratic Services
Corporate Priorities: Dynamic, Prudent and Progressive Council

Purpose:
The Council's constitution provides that the Executive and Scrutiny Board must be invited to comment on any changes to the provisions of the constitution before they are considered by the Council. The Executive is therefore invited to comment on proposed revisions which will affect the way in which the Scrutiny Board and the Policy Development and Review Panels operate.

Executive summary:
This report provides the details of the Vanguard Intervention review of Committee Services, focussing on the work of the Policy Development and Review Panels and the Scrutiny Board.

The Scrutiny Board has been consulted on the proposals for changes to the Council’s committee structure and has made no amendments to the proposals.

The Executive is now invited to provide comments on the proposals before being put to Council for decision at its meeting in October 2018.

Recommendation/Recommended Option:
It is recommended that the Executive:

(a) comments on the proposals which have been considered and endorsed by the Scrutiny Board and are to be put forward for decision by Council that:

(i) the Policy Development and Review Panels be dissolved;
(ii) a Scrutiny Panel be created for each of the 6 Executive portfolios;
(iii) subject to (i) and (ii) above, the current Scrutiny Board be dissolved;
(iv) each Scrutiny Panel be scheduled to meet 4 times per municipal year, with additional meetings created if necessary;

(v) subject to (iv) above, the revised schedule of meetings for the remainder of the municipal year 2018-19 be approved, as set out in Appendix A;

(vi) the Deputation scheme be amended to allow members of the public to apply to give a deputation on any subject to the relevant Scrutiny Panel, in addition to Council or any Committee;

(vii) subject to (i), (ii) and (iii) above, a revised allocation of seats be approved, as set out in Appendix C (with the nomination of councillors to seats being presented to Council in October);

(viii) subject to the agreement of the changes, an amendment to the current Members’ Allowances Scheme be presented to Council for approval, as set out in paragraph 58 of the Executive briefing paper; and

(ix) subject to the agreement of the changes, delegated authority be given to the Council’s Monitoring Officer to review and amend the Constitution to:

1) create the new functions of the Scrutiny Panels;

2) amend the Call-In procedures to reflect the changes to Portfolio Scrutiny Panels;

3) to review and amend the Constitution with regard to the Deputation Scheme; and

4) to make any other minor or ancillary changes arising required to give effect to this report;

(b) makes final recommendations on the proposals; and

(c) subject to (a) and (b) above recommends the proposals to Council for decision.

**Reason:**
The Council’s constitution provides that any changes made to it should be considered by the Scrutiny Board and the Executive before being determined by Council.

**Cost of proposals:**
There will be no additional costs arising from implementation of these proposals.
Appendices:
A: Revised Meeting Schedule 2018-2019
B: Proposed Work Items – Scrutiny Panels
C: Revised Committee Allocations

Background papers: None

Reference papers: Minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Board held on 28 June 2018
Executive Briefing Paper

Date: 03 September 2018
Subject: Review of Policy Development and Review Panels and Scrutiny Board meetings.
Briefing by: Head of Democratic Services
Portfolio: Policy and Resources

INTRODUCTION

1. The purpose of this report is to outline the results of a review into the effectiveness of the Council’s Policy Development and Review (PDR) Panel and the Scrutiny Board, using the Vanguard methodology, and to put forward proposals for new arrangements.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND & SCOPE

2. The Localism Act 2011 amended the Local Government Act 2000, allowing Councils to choose to operate under either executive arrangements, a committee system or arrangements prescribed by the Secretary of State. On 21 June 2012, the Council resolved to retain its executive arrangements using the leader and cabinet executive model. Meetings of the Executive are outside the scope of this report.

3. Where a local authority chooses to operate under executive arrangements, it must provide for the appointment of one or more overview and scrutiny committees. As a minimum, the Council must retain a scrutiny function to be responsible for holding the Executive collectively and individually to account. At present, the Council meets this requirement through the Scrutiny Board and 5 PDR Panels.

4. The Council is also required by the Licensing Act 2003 to appoint a committee to undertake certain licensing functions and therefore the Licensing & Regulatory Affairs Committee is outside of the scope of this report.

5. The Council is also required to appoint such committees as it considers necessary to carry out the non-executive functions of the Council. The Planning Committee is appointed to deal with the functions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and is therefore outside of the scope of this report.

6. The Audit and Governance Committee is appointed to oversee and assess the Council’s risk management, control and corporate governance arrangements and to lead on the Council’s duties under chapter 7 of the Localism Act 2011 to review the standards of ethics and probity of councillors. This committee is therefore required to continue.
7. Finally, the Appeals Committee is appointed to determine appeals from Senior Officers under the Council’s procedures relating to disciplinary action, salary grading and unresolved grievances. This function is therefore required to continue.

**ORIGINAL PURPOSE OF PDR PANELS**

8. The PDR Panels were created in 2009 to focus on policy development work and to support the Executive in researching options for improving and developing the Council’s services. The intention was that after researching all the facts and discussing possible options, the Panels would produce reports for consideration by the Executive.

9. It was expected that such an approach would ensure that those Councillors with seats on the PDR Panels would be engaged in challenging and interesting work which would support the work of the Executive in delivering the Council’s priorities.

10. The work of the Panels would also include monitoring progress on strategies and action plans previously agreed by the Executive.

**PERFORMANCE / PURPOSE**

11. The first stage in undertaking a Vanguard intervention is to undertake a review of the performance of the Panels against “purpose”.

12. With this in mind, the work output of the PDR Panels was analysed for 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17. During this period, each Panel was scheduled to meet 6 times per municipal year, unless the meeting was cancelled with the agreement of the Chairman. This occurred 9 times over the period.

13. Out of a total of 297 items discussed by the Panels, only 5.7% (17) resulted in recommendations being made to the Executive for decision. There is an evident decline in the number of items being recommended to the Executive year by year:

   - 2014/15 – 102 items, 11 recommendations (10.7%);
   - 2015/16 – 91 items, 4 recommendations (4.3%);
   - 2016/17 – 104 items, 2 recommendations (1.9%)

14. Of these, just four items were in relation to policy decisions, all of which were from the Planning & Development Panel.

15. Of the 81 meetings held over the three-year period, there was a relatively low level of public engagement with 6 deputations and 2 petitions reviewed. 3 deputations were made to the Leisure & Community Panel, 2 regarding play areas and 1 on Locks Heath Football club. 2 deputations were made to the Public Protection Panel on taxi licensing and animal welfare. 1 deputation was made to the Planning & Development Panel on coastal defences. The petitions were regarding a skate park and Portchester Village plans.

16. The average duration of the 81 panel meetings was 1 hour 20 minutes, with an upper limit of 1 hour 55 minutes and a lower limit of 50 minutes. The lowest average duration was Streetscene (1 hour 9 minutes) and the highest average was Planning and Development (1 hour 26 minutes).
17. The Vanguard review also noted that if the purpose of the PDR Panels is to review and develop policies, there would be a real danger of organisational “initiative overload”. If each of the five Panels were to work on one policy per meeting cycle, this would result in 30 policy reviews per year.

**WHAT WE LEARNT / WHAT WE THOUGHT**

18. An important part of the Vanguard methodology is to compare “what we think” happens in the work flow against “what actually happened”. The following section highlights some examples of this type of comparison using anonymous quotations from Officers to exemplify the gap between assumptions and current reality.

19. When the PDR Panels were created, the intention was for the Panel to focus on policy development work and to support the Executive in researching options for improving and developing the Council’s services. The intention was to ensure that those Councillors on the PDR Panels would be engaged in challenging and interesting work which would support the work of the Executive in delivering the Council’s priorities.

20. In reality, nearly 90% of the items presented to PDR Panels are reviewing work which has already been delivered by the relevant service. This leaves little time or focus on genuine policy development.

> “The reports for review are ‘Noted’ by the Panel but then nothing goes forward from there to improve the work being carried out or to make changes to it. It therefore seems to be a waste of time preparing the report in the first place.”

21. There have recently been 7 Member Working Groups convened to deal with specific corporate priorities as “task and finish” groups. (Daedalus MWG, Holly Hill Leisure Centre MWG, Constitution Review MWG, Housing Strategy MWG, Local Plan Review MWG, Strategic Air Quality MWG, Daedalus Anniversary Events MWG). It should be noted that the original intention was that the PDR Panels would be asked to carry out “task and finish” work.

> “What hinders the development work is the formality of being dressed up as a public meeting.”

22. The content of the PDR Panels is set up via the Annual Work Programme from which each Panel’s agenda is created. The theory is that the content of the Work Programme is contributed to by Members requesting items via their discussions at the Panel meetings.

23. In reality, the creation and maintenance of the Work Programme for each PDR Panel has become a key driving factor in deciding the content of the Panels. It is felt that because there are 6 Panel meetings per year with the dates pre-set by Council in the preceding municipal year, the task is to fill the meetings with work items. In Vanguard terms, this is the “work driving behaviour”.

> “In January of each year we ask what ideas have Members got for next year’s Work Programme. Very little comes back from the Panel so it’s usually the Officers who decide what goes forward.”

> “We struggle to find enough work items to fill the Work Programme and therefore an agenda”
24. A number of Panels receive progress reports on action plans as part of their monitoring role. The action plans outline the steps taken to meet strategic objectives but this monitoring can be duplicated as it is also a function of the Scrutiny Board.

25. There is a trend for some Panels to have external organisations addressing the Panel to provide service updates. For example, the Clinical Commissioning Group addressed the then Health & Housing Panel whilst the Leisure & Community Panel has received presentations from SLM, Hampshire Cultural Trust, Y-Services, CAB and One Community. Whilst this interaction is positive, this external review work could be duplicated, as it is a function of the Scrutiny Board.

26. There has been very low public engagement across the PDR Panels with just 6 deputations delivered across a 3-year period. This may be adversely influenced by the constitutional rule that Panels can only receive deputations on subjects which appear as an agenda item.

“Mr x waited 9 months before having his say on taxi ranks – this shouldn’t have taken so long but because it wasn’t on the agenda he couldn’t address the meeting.”

**EFFORT / VALUE**

27. When analysing work flow under a Vanguard review, a key step is to identify “value demand” against the “purpose” and maximise the benefits. Equally, it is necessary to identify waste work and remove it. Two key question posed are “How much resource is used?” and “What value is created as a result?”

28. The estimated resource time for the preparation and delivery of each PDR Panel meeting over one municipal year with six meetings is: Member 150 hrs, Service Officer 150 hrs, Committee Officer 80 hrs.

29. This appears disproportionate to the time spent at the meeting of an average of 1 hr 20 mins per attendee (total of 14 hrs 40 mins for the year).

30. The estimated hours are split between the following tasks:

- Preparation of the Work Programme
- Reports and presentations
- Chairman’s briefing
- Attendance at the meeting
- Post meeting administration
- Portfolio Holder meeting

31. In assessing the output value of the Panel meetings, the question “what value is created as a result” was posed against the following groups:

**Residents / customers**

- Nothing discernible
- Confidence in the democratic process?

**Officers**
- Creates unnecessary work
- Seen as necessary evil

**Members**

- May help Members become better informed

**VANGUARD REVIEW SUMMARY**

32. The conclusion of the Vanguard review was that the current system appears to be a “find work/make work” style and approach, possibly caused by the inherent assumptions created by a formal committee setting.

33. It is suggested that it is possible to create a better system, but this must be focused on a clearly defined purpose, followed by everyone involved working to that new purpose.

**NEW DESIGN**

34. In acknowledging that the current system of PDR Panels is not delivering against its original purpose and, taking into account the multiple organisational changes which have been implemented along with Vanguard method reviews, the following recommendations are made. That:

(a) the current Policy Development and Review Panels are dissolved;

(b) a Scrutiny Panel is created for each of the 6 portfolios:
   - Health & Public Protection Scrutiny Panel
   - Housing Scrutiny Panel
   - Leisure & Community Scrutiny Panel
   - Planning & Development Scrutiny Panel
   - Policy and Resources Scrutiny Panel
   - Streetscene Scrutiny Panel

(c) subject to the above, the current Scrutiny Board is dissolved;

(d) each Scrutiny Panel is scheduled to meet 4 times per municipal year, with additional meetings created if necessary. A revised schedule of meetings for the remainder of the 2018/19 municipal year is attached as Appendix A; and

(e) the Deputation Scheme is amended to allow members of the public to apply to give a deputation on any subject to the relevant Scrutiny Panel.

35. In suggesting these changes, the following factors have been considered:

**Policy Formulation**

36. By creating themed Scrutiny Panels linked to Executive portfolios, it enables a shift in focus to encourage involvement in Council Corporate Priorities and the Improvement Actions identified in the Corporate Vision 2017-2023.
37. The Corporate Vision Improvement Actions can be assigned to the relevant Scrutiny Panel to input to the work in delivery of the action. For example:

- Priority two – Protect and Enhance the Environment, the corporate action to ‘Increase Recycling Rates and Reduce the amount of household waste’ would be assigned to the Streetscene Scrutiny Panel.

- Priority five – Leisure Opportunities for Health and Fun, the corporate action to ‘Develop long term plans aimed at bringing the Ashcroft Arts Centre and Ferneham Hall together into a new and exciting single arts and entertainment venue’ would be assigned to the Leisure & Community Scrutiny Panel.

38. An example of the proposed Work Programme items for each Scrutiny Panel is set out at Appendix B.

39. The reduction in the number of scheduled meetings per year to 4 would reduce the resource time needed to prepare the work and should ensure a more focussed approach on work output. The current over-reliance on work programmes to manage the workload should become an enabling tool rather than being a drain on resources.

40. Ward Members would be more able to directly support local projects and initiatives by ensuring that these are taken into account at the policy development stage.

**Policy Scrutiny**

41. The allocation of Corporate Strategy priority actions would not only enable Scrutiny Panels to input to the work but also to hold the Executive Portfolio Holder and Senior Officer to account in delivery of the action, thus strengthening the scrutiny function.

42. The addition of a specific Policy & Resources Scrutiny Panel provides additional focus on the budget setting process and recognises the ongoing challenges of meeting budget pressures. It would also support the Corporate Priority of ‘A Dynamic, Prudent and Progressive Council’.

43. The existing functions of the Scrutiny Board and PDR Panels, as detailed in Part 2 Chapter 3 of the Constitution would continue to be in effect and would be covered by each Scrutiny Panel in turn. However, the Monitoring Officer will review the functions and update the constitution accordingly.

44. Any Executive decisions subjected to Call-In would be dealt with by the relevant Scrutiny Panel based on the portfolio.

**External Scrutiny**

45. The Scrutiny Panels would continue to invite external organisations operating within the Borough to attend meetings to present information and respond to questions as part of the Scrutiny function.

46. It is suggested that the Deputation Scheme be amended to allow the Scrutiny Panels to hear a deputation on any matter on which the Council has powers to act, thereby removing the constraint which results in deputations only being allowed on agenda items. This would increase the opportunity for public participation via the Scrutiny Panels.
MEMBER WORKING GROUPS

47. Member Working Groups have proven to be an effective and efficient way to manage short term projects as task and finish groups where the intention is that Members and officers attend meetings to “roll up sleeves” and work together on specific items.

48. The convening of the Member / Officer working groups, including the appointment of Members to that group will continue to be agreed by the Executive with the relevant Scrutiny Panel scrutinising their work.

49. The working groups are not formal meetings held in public and therefore are not constrained by the legislation set by the Local Government Act for formal committees. Similarly, there is no requirement for the working groups to be politically balanced. However, a working group protocol could be drawn up to provide guidelines for the conduct of the meetings.

50. As these are not formal decision-making meetings, there is no need for support from the Democratic Services team, however Heads of Service would ensure that any clerical tasks are carried out and a record of meetings and the attendance by Members would be noted.

51. The output and findings of the Member Working Groups could be reported (in the absence of the PDR Panels) via officer reports to the relevant Scrutiny Panel. All reports recommending policy amendments or development would be referred to the relevant Scrutiny Panel before being recommended to the Executive.

52. This approach will ensure that the policy development work carried out by the working groups receives an appropriate amount of attention by a formal committee meeting before the recommendations are passed to the Executive for decision or for onward recommendation to Council.

COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS

53. A projected recalculation of committee allocations based on the change to PDR Panels is attached as Appendix C.

54. The calculation is based on the deletion of 9 Scrutiny Board seats, this being replaced by 7 Policy & Resources Scrutiny Panel seats. The revised total number of seats is reduced from 79 to 77.

55. If it so decides, Council could increase the number of seats on any of the remaining committees to provide more seats to be allocated following the political balance calculations.

ROLE OF OPPOSITION GROUPS

56. The change from Policy Development and Review Panels to Scrutiny Panels must not stifle or suppress the voice of opposition Members. The suggested changes instead provide the prospect of more meaningful opposition through the more focussed Scrutiny Panel meetings, including the introduction of a Policy and Resources Scrutiny Panel.

MEMBERS’ ALLOWANCES
57. Following any decision to implement these changes to the committee structure, the Members’ Allowances Scheme would require a slight amendment.

58. The following roles would therefore be recommended for review (shown with existing or projected points):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>REMOVE</th>
<th>NEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Scrutiny Board</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chairman of Scrutiny Board</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of PDR Panel</td>
<td>125 x 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chairman of PDR Panel</td>
<td>15 x 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Scrutiny Panel</td>
<td></td>
<td>125 x 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairman of Scrutiny Panel</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 x 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59. It is recommended that the PDR Panels become Scrutiny Panels and therefore the Special Responsibility Allowance for the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of Scrutiny Panels should be the same as is currently awarded to PDR Panels.

60. If approved, there is a total deletion in SRA payments of 855 points and an addition of 840, resulting in a net reduction of 15 points (2018/19) value of 1 point = £57.87 and therefore an estimated saving of £868.05.

**RISK ASSESSMENT**

61. There are no significant risk considerations in relation to this report.

62. The opportunity exists for the work of Panels to be more focussed around work contributing to the Corporate Priorities of Fareham Borough Council.

**CONCLUSION**

63. The Executive is invited to comment on the proposed recommendations following the Vanguard Intervention in Committee Services. All comments will be put forward along with the report to Council for a decision at its October meeting.

**Enquiries:** For further information on this report please contact Leigh Usher (Ext 4553)
### PROPOSED SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Bank holiday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A&amp;G = Audit &amp; Governance Committee (4)</td>
<td>L&amp;C = Leisure &amp; Community Scrutiny Panel</td>
<td>LRA = Licensing and Regulatory Affairs Committee (6)</td>
<td>H&amp;PP = Health &amp; Public Protection Scrutiny Panel</td>
<td>PC = Planning Committee (12)</td>
<td>P&amp;D = Planning &amp; Development Scrutiny Panel</td>
<td>App = Appeals Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Meetings of the Licensing Panel and of the Appeals Committee will be arranged as and when required.
## COMMITTEE STRUCTURE – SCRUTINY PANELS

### PROPOSED WORK PROGRAMME ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streetscene</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>Q &amp; A session with Executive Member Any Call In referred to Scrutiny Panel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate Priorities</td>
<td>Daedalus Open Space Country Park at Titchfield Recycling Rate Holly Hill Cemetery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning &amp; Development</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>Q &amp; A Session with Executive Member Any Call In referred to Scrutiny Panel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Buckland Development Solent Coastal Partnership PUSH Transportation Companies (Rail /bus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate Priorities</td>
<td>Welborne Local Plan Coastal Scheme at Portchester Regeneration of Fareham Town Centre Redevelopment of Portchester District Centre Highways Major Schemes (J10, Newgate Lane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy &amp; Resources</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Q &amp; A session with Executive Member Any Call In referred to Scrutiny Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Officer:</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Shopping Centre Management Solent LEP HCC Economic Development Chamber of Commerce &amp; Federation of Small Businesses Solent Airport Management Oxford Innovation – Daedalus Portchester Crematorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Finance and Resources</td>
<td>Corporate Priorities</td>
<td>Innovation Centre 2 Daedalus A-level course provision within the Borough Vanguard Civic Offices redevelopment Review of Council land and buildings Balanced Budget (A Dynamic, Prudent and Progressive Council)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leisure &amp; Community</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>Q &amp; A session with Executive Member Any Call In referred to Scrutiny Panel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Officer:</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Holly Hill and Fareham Leisure Centres Hampshire Cultural Trust (Museum) Citizens Advice Bureau One Community Y Services Community Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Leisure &amp; Corporate Services</td>
<td>Corporate Priorities</td>
<td>Future of Ferneham Hall Improvement to facilities at Cams Alders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Public Protection</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Q &amp; A session with Executive Member Any Call In referred to Scrutiny Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Officer: Head of Environmental Health</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Police Fire &amp; Rescue Service Clinical Commissioning Group QA Hospital Building Control Partnership SCC Emergency Planning Fareham Community Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Priorities</td>
<td>Community Safety Air Quality Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>Q &amp; A session with Executive Member Any Call In referred to Scrutiny Panel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Officer: Head of Housing &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Housing Associations 101- Two Saints Private Landlords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Priorities</td>
<td>Housing Strategy New build Council Housing Lettings Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projected Committee Seat Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seats to be allocated</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>Lib Dem</th>
<th>Independent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59.61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Split</td>
<td>77.42</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy &amp; Resources Scrutiny Panel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Community Scrutiny Panel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Dev Scrutiny Panel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Public Protection Scrutiny Panel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Scrutiny Panel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscene Scrutiny Panel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing &amp; Regulatory Affairs Committee</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Committee</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit &amp; Governance Ctiee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of ctee seats allocated</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment Required?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

(a) Under the calculation, the Conservative Group has notionally been allocated 57 seats on committees which is 3 short of the strict entitlement of 60 and therefore a manual adjustment of +3 is required.

(b) The Liberal Democrat Group has notionally been allocated 11 seats on committees which is 1 short of the strict entitlement of 12 and therefore a manual adjustment of +1 is required.

(c) Whilst there is a UKIP councillor, a group cannot be formed by a single member and so for the purposes of these calculations, the UKIP councillor will be treated as an independent member.

(d) Therefore, there are 2 independent councillors who do not represent any political group. There is no strict entitlement calculation applicable to an independent member however, following the calculations and allocation of seats to political groups, the Council must appoint the non-group members to any seats not otherwise allocated. In doing this, the Council may allocate seats from those committees requiring a balancing adjustment.