

Matter 8B /South East England Regional Assembly



South East England Regional Assembly • Berkeley House, Cross Lanes, Guildford GUI 1UN
T: 01483 555200 • F: 01483 555250 • E: secretariat@southeast-ra.gov.uk • W: www.southeast-ra.gov.uk
Chairman: Councillor Keith Mitchell • Chief Executive: Paul Bevan

SEERA Ltd, Registered in England and Wales (No. 4070332). Registered office – Berkeley House, Cross Lanes,
Guildford, GUI 1UN

Matter 8B: South Hampshire Sub-regional Strategy

8Bi Strategy and Economy

8Bi.1 Does the sub-regional strategy provide a positive steer that will achieve the proposed increase in GVA of 3.5% per annum, while taking account of the environmental assets of South Hampshire and its surroundings?

8Bi.2 Is there sufficient guidance about what action needs to be taken by LPAs to assist the achievement of this GVA growth rate, in term of identification of employment land and of priorities for employment sites?

8Bi.3 Does the proposed strategy adequately reflect the role and potential of Southampton and Portsmouth, including Southampton Airport and Southampton Port?

8Bi.4 Is there sufficient focus on the needs and potential of the city centres? Are the proposals for office development appropriate and properly justified, having regard to the guidance in PPS6 (Policy SH8¹)?

1. The process of developing the sub-regional strategies has been undertaken by the principal authorities. The South East England Regional Assembly commissioned Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council and Southampton City Council to provide this advice for the South Hampshire sub-region to the Regional Assembly. These three authorities decided to undertake the work through the aegis of the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) which includes all eleven councils which comprise the strategy area: East Hampshire District Council, Eastleigh Borough Council, Fareham Borough Council, Gosport Borough Council, Hampshire County Council, Havant Borough Council, New Forest District Council, Portsmouth City Council, Southampton City Council, Test Valley Borough Council and Winchester City Council.
2. The Regional Assembly response to Matter 2A.4 sets out the background as to the development of sub-regions contained within the South East Plan. This reiterates that distinct sub-regions will only be defined in the Plan where a defined area requires a co-ordinated set of policy responses across administrative boundaries in order to address a specific policy deficit.
3. RPG9 identified that the Priority Areas for Economic Regeneration in South Hampshire, Southampton and Portsmouth required tailored strategies, supported by appropriate resources, to address their problems and maximise their contribution to the sustainable development of the region.

¹ Note that a revised form of Policy SH8 is given in the PUSH rep 7138

Therefore, the brief for the sub-region embraced this, also recognising the broadening of the geographic area that should be targeted as a result of the work being taken forward jointly by the PUSH local authorities.

4. The initial sub-regional strategy work led to the setting the overall aim of the sub-region within the Plan (Section C para 4.6.5):

“To foster and encourage increased levels of development over the Plan period in order to try to realise the potential of the sub-region to improve its sustainable economic performance through increased levels of development over the Plan period, addressing the needs of significant areas of social deprivation, particularly in areas of Southampton and Portsmouth”.

5. The policies within Section E1 concentrate on the overall aim of the sub-regional strategy, set within the context of the regional level policies, which together set out a coherent and focused framework for the development of Local Development Frameworks and other policy documents. The Regional Assembly supports the work of the PUSH authorities in developing the strategy, and believes it provides the most appropriate balance for the development of the sub-region. The framework provides sufficient detail to enable LDFs to develop coherent and outcome driven development documents, without addressing issues which are more appropriately addressed at the more local level. The Assembly welcome the joint working that the PUSH authorities are seeking to take forward in this respect.

8Bii Housing and Countryside

8Bii.1 Is the proposed housing provision figure for the sub-region at the most appropriate level, taking account of social, environmental, economic and other factors (Policy SH12)?

8Bii.2 Is the level of affordable housing justified and capable of being implemented (Policy SH13)?

8Bii.3 Are the proposals for the SDAs justified and appropriate (Policy SH2)? How will they contribute to meeting the need for socio-economic regeneration of parts of the sub-region, particularly in its urban centres? In the absence of detailed assessment, is the specificity about the SDA locations appropriate? Is the approach to phasing set out in paragraph 2.6 realistic and achievable?

8Bii.4 In all other respects, is the proposed apportionment of the overall housing provision figures to the Districts at the most appropriate level, taking account of the balance between brownfield/ greenfield, and other socio-economic and environmental factors?

8Bii.5 How should the relationship between employment growth and release of housing land be managed (Policy SH5)?

8Bii.6 Is the policy for Strategic Gaps properly justified (Policy SH3)?

1. The Regional Assembly supports the work of the PUSH authorities in developing the strategy in relation to policies SH12: Scale and Location of Housing Development and SH13: Affordable Housing.
2. The Assembly responses to Matter 1H and Matter 4 set out the rational and reasoning for the overall housing provisions set out in the Plan.
3. The Assembly response to Matter 4A sets out the Assembly view of affordable housing. Bearing in mind the detailed level of work which has been undertaken in determining the sub-regional strategy, the Assembly supports the proposed target of 30-40% of housing on new development sites should be affordable housing as set out in policy SH13.

8Biii Infrastructure and Implementation

8Biii.1 Have the water supply and waste water treatment, flood risk, and transport implications of the growth proposals been adequately considered (Policies SH10 and SH14)?

8Biii.2 Are the proposals in the Implementation Plan² (including for social and green infrastructure) clear, justified and well related to the spatial strategy? What are the priorities?

8Biii.3 Will the proposed mechanisms for implementation be effective (Policies SH4 and SH11)? Would it be appropriate to include a requirement for a tariff-based approach to be applied to all new development in this sub-region?

1. The Assembly responses to Matter 1D and Matter 10A set out how infrastructure requirements have been considered and how the proposals in the Implementation Plan are related to the spatial strategy. For the first time at the regional and sub-regional levels the Implementation Plan specifically identifies the roles, responsibilities and actions required by specified organisations and other key stakeholders to deliver the objectives and policies in the Core Strategy and Sub Regional Strategies. These will be a mixture of investments, policy decisions and behavioural change.
2. The Assembly has worked closely with principal authorities to develop the sub-regional infrastructure investment frameworks (SRIFs), which identify the sub-regionally significant infrastructure investments required to deliver the spatial strategy. They have been prepared in liaison with the relevant statutory infrastructure providers, including the Environment Agency, energy

² Updated by SEERA prior to EiP and available online at <http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/southeastplan/key/infrastructure.html>

and water utility companies, the Highways Agency and Network Rail. The SRIFs indicate whether the need for infrastructure is prior to or alongside development set out in the sub-regional strategy.

3. As a framework this provides a context within which detailed proposals for infrastructure requirements at the local level can be prepared through the local development framework process.