

## **EHDC Local Plan – Large Development Sites Consultation**

### **Q1: Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?**

#### **Whitehill & Bordon (WB)**

The site offers an excellent balance of additional homes (plus some sites for the travelling community), employment and SANGS that will make the area attractive to live, work and take recreation within. The increased population will draw in more retail opportunities, encouraged by the potential large local footfall and thus many people should not need to drive out of the area in order to find work, important as we try to address climate change by minimising car use.

#### **Northbrook Park (NBP) near Bentley**

This site offers to establish a real new community with unifying assets at its heart while also providing employment opportunities close by but just separated enough from the housing not to impose upon the nature of a village community. Again the balance of housing, employment and leisure facilities seems sound.

#### **Land East of Horndean Extension (Hazleton Farm) (HD)**

- a. This is a large area of mostly housing to be tacked onto a proposed development (LEOH) that is still beset with planning issues and yet to be approved, with a few more shops and services but with no obvious heart and with a great reliance on facilities elsewhere outside the development to support the very considerable increase in population. It is in effect much more of a dormitory area without any real opportunities within it to be employed, so that most of the residents will need to leave the area to seek work elsewhere.
- b. The Information Pack for this site states that the Southern parishes must make a significant contribution towards housing (and employment) provision, especially in the context of the Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH) strategy for growth (see note HD1.1). The PfSH Position Statement (June 2016) (see note HD1.2) does identify a shortfall in housing provision in this area but the Sustainability Appraisal of the emerging EHDC Local Plan (interim) dated December 2018 (see note HD 1.3) acknowledges that the current Local Plan is aiming to identify supply over-and-above that in the PfSH Position Statement and that there could be further opportunities to release public sector land, such as Ministry of Defence sites that lie within the PfSH area but outside of East Hampshire. This demonstrates that there is no evidence from PfSH of the need to provide 1,000 more dwellings within its Southern Parishes sub-region.
- c. The new homes on this site would be more likely than other sites being considered to support commuting to jobs and training opportunities elsewhere (in Havant, Portsmouth and the wider Solent area) rather than providing substantial opportunities to address job/training needs internally within East Hampshire, and so it would have less economic and employment-related benefits for the local area.
- d. The plan in the Information Pack proposes that the gypsy and traveller pitches and travelling showpeople plots would be within about 250m of the Solent Special Protection Area 5.6km buffer zone, so compliance with paragraph S22.1 in Policy S22: 'Solent special protection areas' in the emerging Local Plan would have to be considered. The 'EHDC Meeting the Accommodation Needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Background Paper' (2018) acknowledges that proximity to a Special Protection Area is a constraint (see Note HD1.4). The pitches and plots would be immediately adjacent to the Havant Thicket SINC and the access road to the proposed Havant Thicket reservoir

- e. Is there really the need for such extensive housing plans in the PUSH / Southern Parishes area? Housing demand is suppressed at present as evidenced by the slowing of the Montague Green build in Rowlands Castle and houses for sale there and in the village remain so for extensive periods. The real need is for first time housing / retirement housing so any planning on this scale should emphasise this element of the market. Whilst EHDC aspire to 40% affordable housing, the execution of this policy appears patchy and ill defined.
- f. Land allocated for community use – what evidence is there of real demand for another centre for local use? Rowlands Castle – just under two miles – away has ample under-utilised community facilities. Whilst these are a car ride away, there is a risk of oversupply and underuse subsequently.
- g. Travellers' pitches. What evidence is there of demand for these in this location? Are these the result of consultation with the travelling community – or a random but uniform requirement of all the large settlement plans?

**Notes:**

**HD1.1**

The Information Pack for this site states:

'The site falls within the Southern Parishes and within the South Hampshire sub-region. This is important as the Southern Parishes are required to make a significant contribution towards housing (and employment) provision, especially in the context of the Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH) strategy for growth'.

**HD1.2**

The PUSH (now PfSH) Position Statement (June 2016) records in paragraph 3.6 Table 1 that the objectively assessed housing need (2011 to 2036) in the part of EHDC which is within PUSH is 1,750.

**HD1.3**

The Sustainability Appraisal of the emerging EHDC Local Plan (interim) dated December 2018 states in paragraph 5.16:

The PUSH Position Statement (2016) identified a shortfall of supply, against housing needs as understood at that time; however, since 2016 work has been ongoing to identify additional capacity, and indeed this current Local Plan is aiming to identify supply over-and-above that taken into account by the PUSH Position Statement (2016). The PUSH authorities, including East Hampshire, recognise a need to continue investigating all opportunities in order to avoid a shortfall; for example, there could be further opportunities to release public sector land, such as Ministry of Defence sites that lie within the PUSH area but outside of East Hampshire.

**HD1.4**

The EHDC Meeting the Accommodation Needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Background Paper (2018) states in paragraph 6.3:

The LAA concludes that at present, there is insufficient developable land to meet the need for Traveller accommodation in the area. There is one particular constraint to development that is a significant contributing factor to this outcome. That is the proximity of available land to the Wealden Heaths Phase II Special Protection Area (SPA).

**Q2: What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision.**

- a. **General comment.** Large developments of new homes need considerable local employment opportunities together with sufficient retail, leisure and entertainment provision that residents

do not have to travel elsewhere too often. In addition the provision of public transport, both bus and rail, is important so that residents can travel out of the district if work or leisure interests require it. Both for WB and NBP there is sufficient infrastructure proposed and available already to support the developments. By contrast HD needs work done to improve the local B road and connections to it, additional bus services and sustainable southbound as well as northbound, together with sustainable on-site retail opportunities that will, however, be challenged by the proximity of existing retail in the local area that is not necessarily convenient and will require increased car usage to access

**HD specific comments follow:**

- b. New vehicular access via the B2149. The Information Pack states on page 8 that the site has an opportunity to create a new vehicular access via the B2149, and the plan on page 6 shows only one access, but this would be inadequate for a site with 1,000 dwellings. It would also have to provide access to the employment park. The road layout proposed in the outstanding outline planning application 55562/005 for the current LEOH site includes an access road to its employment area which is separate from roads accessing the residential areas, which is to the benefit of the residents. This new access would have to be used to travel to and from the 6 gypsy and traveler pitches and the 12 travelling showpeople plots.
- c. Minimal upgrade to road infrastructure is a well documented but key concern. The scale of traffic using Rowlands Castle Road and Havant Road appears grossly underestimated & these proposals will lead to a significant increase in car journeys both to Rowlands Castle (whether for shops, doctors' surgery or station) and through Rowlands Castle to Chichester (Woodberry Lane) or Havant Road to Whichers Gate Road / Durrants Road and then south to Havant or Emsworth linking with the A27. The local road infrastructure must be fit for purpose and will require proper review and money spent to ensure they can cope with the increased traffic.
- d. The pack also states only that there is an opportunity to create vehicular and pedestrian connections to the allocated development site to the north. There would be very few, if any, areas through which such connections (especially for vehicles) could be created. Along the southernmost boundary of the 'site to the north', there is a row of 8 oak trees subject to TPO (EH963) (dated 23/07/2015) and the root protection zones around those trees would have to be avoided. At the south-west corner of the 'site to the north', there is a large wooded area which it is planned to retain.
- e. If it were possible to locate a position where such connections could be made, this would require significant changes to the layout proposed in the planning application 55562/005, perhaps resulting in a reduced number of dwellings, and there is no indication that the applicant has made a commitment to consider such changes.
- f. In proposing any new access or accesses to the B2149, it must be recognized that planning application 55562/005 proposes three additional roads (including a new roundabout) connecting with the B2149, and a new road connecting with the existing Dell Piece East roundabout. These are in addition to the Pyle Lane Junction. Havant Thicket Reservoir will provide another new access onto the B2149 to the south of the HD site. It must be ascertained if it is viable and safe to provide so many accesses along 0.7 miles of the heavily used B2149. Also it must be recognized that turning right out of the development to travel south along the B2149 would be greatly aided by providing mini-roundabouts at exit points. The considerable increase in traffic on the road from developments to the south will make it very hard to turn out across a stream of traffic in peak hours particularly but not exclusively. An integrated design of all proposed access road junctions with the B2149 would be required.
- g. Additional primary school places must be provided. The proposal for the LEOH site includes a primary school to meet the needs of that site and already identified needs elsewhere. 1,000 extra dwellings could require 300 additional primary school places. The site is within the

catchment area of Rowlands Castle St. John's CEC Primary School which is already full, and eventually it will be able to accommodate only children from the existing houses and those already under construction within the Parish. The site is about 2 km from this school, and no footpath is proposed along Havant Road.

- h. GP surgery facilities must be provided. The site is within the catchment area of the Rowlands Castle Surgery, but it is at about 2.3 km travelling distance, and has very limited car parking provision. The Surgery already covers a large population, many of whom are elderly and thus needing more medical care than a more age-balanced population.
- i. To encourage the use of sustainable methods of travel, improved access to and parking at the nearest railway station, which is in Rowlands Castle, must be provided. The station at Rowlands Castle has very limited parking facilities which are fully utilised on most weekdays by 7am. This will lead to additional parking in the village – or more likely additional car journeys to Havant or Petersfield for onward travel. With new development on this scale, input should be sought from South Western Railway on the scope for increasing the frequency of stopping services both to London and to Portsmouth.
- j. Bus travel – no detail is provided as to frequency / destinations served. The key will be to establish from the outset a routine of bus usage to Rowlands Castle & Havant, also to Horndean & Petersfield etc. If the bus links aren't available from the start then driving patterns will be established immediately by new residents. More detail is required urgently on this front.
- k. Policy S2 'Managing land release via phasing' in the emerging Local Plan must be observed when considering the allocation of this site. As stated in this policy, allowing the release now of all additional sites allocated within this Plan could undermine delivery if it were to result in the rate of new development outstripping an area's ability to provide new infrastructure. This is allowed for in the following policies relating to Rowlands Castle:
  - Site SA39 - Land at Oaklands House (50 dwellings) – 2033/34
  - Site SA40 - Land North of Bartons Road – (50-60 dwellings) - between 2034/35 and 2035/36
  - Site SA41 - Land South of Little Leigh Farm (110-115 dwellings) – between 2033/34 and 2035/36.

The table below demonstrates the very significant actual and forecast rate of new development in Rowlands Castle parish which must be supported by new infrastructure.

	Housing stock	Reason for increase	Increase from 2011
2011 (Census data)	1,255		
2015	1,297	Completion of 'Land at Oaklands House' planning application 30016/014	3%
2019	1,497	Completion of houses allocated in current Local Plan and Large Urban Potential site (Keyline)	19%
2030	1,697	Completion of houses in area of LEOH in RC Parish	35%
2033-2036	1,922	Completion of houses on 3 sites allocated in emerging Local Plan	53%
2036	2,922	Large site extension of LEOH	133%

There would be a corresponding increase in the population of the Rowlands Castle Parish, which would require infrastructure such as GP surgery, schools etc.

**Q3: Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site? Please provide detail and evidence.**

- a. For WB and NBP there are no known or obvious constraints to developing those sites.

**HD specific comments follow:**

b. Highways impacts

- 1) The impact of the additional traffic arising from this proposed extension and the other site allocations and committed developments both in EHDC and Havant Borough Council adopted and emerging Local Plans, on the B2148, B2149 and adjoining roads in Rowlands Castle, must be assessed for viability and mitigation measures should be implemented.
- 2) As noted in RCPC's response on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2019 to the EHDC Pre-decision Amendment to planning application 55562/005 for 800 dwellings etc. on Land East of Horndean (Policy HN1 in adopted Local Plan), there would be an increase in traffic of at least 13% along Havant Road south of the southernmost access to the site. It could be assumed, that pro-rata, the extension site would give rise to a further 16%, resulting in a cumulative increase of at least 29%.
- 3) The East Hampshire Local Plan Interim Transport Assessment (TA) – February 2019, considers only the sites allocated in the adopted Local Plan Allocations (April 2016) and not the allocated development sites in the emerging local plan. Therefore, it does not consider the proposed increase on the LEOH site from 700 (Policy HN1) to 850 dwellings (Site SA33). The impact of a further 1,000 dwellings at Halzeton Farm must also be considered.
- 4) This TA acknowledges two 'hot spots' at the mini-roundabouts on the B2149 (see note HD3.1 below); the capacity of those roundabouts would be further exceeded by the addition of 150 dwellings to the LEOH site and 1,000 dwellings on the extension site:
- 5) The EHDC Local Plan Interim TA considers only sites allocated in the adopted Havant Borough Council (HBC) Allocation Plan (April 2014). Therefore, it does not consider the impact of traffic on the B2148 and B2149 in Rowlands Castle arising from sites allocated for 2,400 dwellings up to 2036 and a further 1,000 thereafter, in the emerging HBC Local Plan. Traffic from these sites will use these roads when travelling to and from destinations (including the A3(M) Junction 2) to the north of Rowlands Castle.
- 6) The impact of increased traffic from the extension site and the LEOH Site (SA33) on the junction of Manor Lodge Road (a continuation of Havant Road) and Mallard Road must be assessed. The EHDC Interim TA acknowledges this is a 'hotspot' even without considering the additional 150 dwellings on the LEOH site (see note HD3.2).
- 7) The impact of increased traffic from the extension site and the LEOH Site (SA33) on the junction of Castle Road and Havant Road must be assessed. Some traffic from both of these sites would be very likely to use Castle Road to access the Rowlands Castle railway station, the Rowlands Castle GP surgery, and places such as Chichester which are further to the east. Vehicles are parked along most of the length of this road, making it very difficult for other vehicles to pass along it. Any increase would exacerbate this problem. The exit from Castle Road at its junction with Havant Road (B2149) already presents safety issues.

An alternative route into Rowlands Castle using Rowlands Castle Road, Treadwheel Road, Woodhouse Lane and Bowes Hill is similarly unsuitable for a significant growth in traffic and requires a right turn at a dangerous junction by the railway bridge in the centre of the village for the shops and Surgery and a sharp, unsighted left hand turn for the railway station.

c. Landscape setting and capacity

The following assessment of the constraints on this site in the EHDC Landscape Capacity Study (Part 2) must be considered:

- Visual Sensitivity: Medium
- Wider Landscape Sensitivity: Medium/High
- Landscape Sensitivity - High
- Overall Landscape Sensitivity: Medium/High
- Landscape Value: Medium
- Landscape Capacity: Medium/Low

The combined Horndean development will completely change the rural nature of the Horndean / Blendworth community and encourage a move towards the eventual linking of Havant / Rowlands Castle / Horndean as a suburban housing site but without a true core.

d. Water quality impact

This site occupies Blendworth Common and the Rowlands Castle Landscape Character Assessment (2012) (see Note HD3.3) shows that it lies within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1. It further states that Blendworth Common has features including swallow holes which provide direct access of surface water to a major groundwater aquifer providing drinking water via the Havant and Bedhampton Springs. The site is also in close proximity to the proposed Havant Thicket reservoir. Therefore, any development would have the potential for causing significant adverse effects on water quality. Drainage would need to be very carefully assessed given the need for ongoing management of the systems – particularly if the choice was to use SUDS which may well not be adopted by Southern Water. This would be too big a scheme to leave in the hands of a private management company not subject to sufficient public scrutiny.

e. Environmental impact

The environmental impact of the large increase in traffic on the B2149 referred to above, must be evaluated and mitigated if possible. Blendworth Common on which the HD site will be built provides an excellent environment for plants, animals and birds that need a poor quality landscape to live in, undisturbed by humans. The open ground balances the woodland area of Havant Thicket to the south. With the loss of open space to the south of the Thicket for the new reservoir the wildlife will need the quiet, human-free, open space of Blendworth Common as the only useful open space for a considerable distance. Any proposed wildlife corridors within the new development would be a very poor substitute for the existing rough and wild area of the Common.

**Notes:**

**HD3.1**

The East Hampshire Local Plan Interim Transport Assessment (TA) – February 2019 states on page 31:

- Junction 42 - Durrants dual mini roundabouts [SOUTH]: on the Manor Lodge Road [NW] approach arm, this junction is forecast high delays of 126s in the PM period, as well as a high Volume/Capacity ( V/C) of 101% in the AM and IP (inter-peak) periods and 106% in the PM period.
- Junction 43 - Durrants dual mini roundabouts [NORTH]: on the Manor Lodge Road [NW] approach arm, this junction is forecast a moderately high 86% V/C in the IP period. On the Manor Lodge Road [SE] approach arm, this junction is forecast high delays of 88s with 104% V/C in the AM period, and high V/C ratios of 100% and 102% in the IP and PM periods, respectively

### **HD3.2**

The East Hampshire Local Plan Interim Transport Assessment (TA) – February 2019 states on page 31:

Junction 44 - Manor Lodge Rd / Mallard Rd: on the Manor Lodge Road [NW] approach arm, this junction is forecast high delays of 83s with a 91% V/C in the AM period, and of 94s with 93% V/C in the PM period

### **HD3.3**

The Rowlands Castle Local Landscape Character Assessment (2012) page 20, 'Area 10a ii Sink Hole Belt – Manor Lodge Road and Blendworth Common' states:

1. A NW to SE trending band of land, between 0.4 and 1.2km wide, characterised by an unusually high density of circular surface depressions (20-50 per sq. km) of up to 30m in diameter and 10m in depth, formed by erosion and dissolution of the underlying chalk, and sinking of the overlying clays and sands. The belt extends well to the west and south of Manor Lodge Road.

2. Many of the depressions act as swallow holes and provide direct access of surface water to a major groundwater aquifer providing drinking water via the Havant and Bedhampton Springs. Most of this belt is considered a high groundwater pollution risk zone and is classified by the Environment Agency as Source Protection Zone 1 – the highest level of risk (see note below).

Note: The 10a ii area is characterised by a high density of shallow circular depressions variously called dolines, sink holes or swallow holes. By way of clarification, 'dolines' are natural cone or bowl shaped closed hollows of small dimensions occurring in chalk areas. When located on a soil outcrop above the chalk, away from the edge of the chalk itself, they are called 'sink holes'. A 'swallow hole' is a potentially more active feature in chalk areas as there can be direct flow of surface water into the chalk. A detailed discussion of the nature, location and environmental significance of these features is provided in the paper by McDowell et al (2008).

#### **Q4: What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring? Please explain how.**

For both WB and NBP these are obvious, major new employment opportunities, a range of leisure and retail facilities appropriate to the site size and the development of housing in areas where the residents can, if they wish or need to, access London and more local towns easily for work or other requirements. In WB's case the benefits include the re-use of former MoD land than is being developed in a sympathetic way rather than being left idle and for NBP the creation of the village trust and the whole concept around the development will give a sense of well-being and a sense of belonging; this can also be applied to WB of course on a larger scale. For HD there are no obvious benefits other than just more housing.

#### **Q5: What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?**

**HD specific comments follow.**

- a. Assessment is required of the impact on the Havant road network of the additional traffic from this proposed site. The responses to Q3 show the large increase in traffic which would use the B2149 south of the proposed site. The large part of this traffic would be travelling to and from the direction of Havant Borough using the B2148 or B2149.

- b. The Havant Borough Council Local Plan Final Transport Assessment (February 2019), which is evidence for the emerging Havant Local Plan, does not consider sites proposed for allocation in the emerging EHDC Local Plan. It considers only the sites in the EHDC Allocations Plan (2016) which includes policy HN1 for 700 dwellings, and does not consider Site SA33 which is for about 850 dwellings, and, of course this extension site if it were to be allocated'
- c. With regard to PfSH, see comments on Q1.
- d. Secondary education – are there sufficient facilities for a population increase on this scale. The nearest secondary schools with spaces may be in Havant.
- e. The very large increase in residents in the area will require additional infrastructure improvements across the board from transport to schools, retail and medical support. This will require a proper coordinated approach from councils at different levels to overcome the pressures resulting from residential expansion. This pressure can only be overcome by a top-down approach and willingness across public organisations to work together on these issues.

**Q6: Is there any reason that this is not achievable?**

- a. For both WB and NBP these sites should be easily achievable, there is no obvious reason why not.
- b. The following comments indicate why, for the HD site, this proposal would not be deliverable by 2036:
  - 1) The Information Pack for this site states:  
 'It is recognised that if development is approved it is likely to follow after development of the LEOH site to the north. In this context, development of the site can readily accommodate housing (and employment) requirements during the period of the emerging Local Plan, i.e. up to the year 2036.'  
 Unlike Information Packs for other large sites, this one does not provide a phased delivery schedule which would indicate the number of dwellings that could be provided by specific dates. Therefore, there is no firm indication of how many dwellings would be constructed during the plan period.
  - 2) The EHDC Land Availability Assessment (LAA) (December 2018) gives the indicative phasing of this proposed extension to the current LEOH site as 400-500 dwellings within 6-10 years, and 400-500 within 11-15 years. This implies that development would have to start in 2021 if the whole proposal were to be delivered by 2036. This would require that, contrary to the Information Pack, the development of the extension would not follow the development of the LEOH site which will not be complete by 2021.
  - 3) There are four very differing forecasts of when the development of the current LEOH site would be completed (see note HD6.1). The dates range over 8 years from 2028 to 2036. These forecasts would require permission for the current LEOH outstanding Outline Planning Application 55562/005, and any subsequent Reserved Matters application to be granted by, say, end of 2020. Before any development could start on the extension site it would have to be included in the Local Plan (planned for adoption in Q1 2021) and have been granted planning permission (e.g. outline and reserved matters). In considering these factors, and the indicative phasing (up to 15 years) of this extension site, it would not be possible for this site to be completely delivered by 2036.
  - 4) It is essential that, as stated in the Sustainability Appraisal of the emerging EHDC Local Plan (interim) dated December 2018 (see note HD 6.2), if this site were to be allocated, it and the already allocated site would be a coherently planned eastward extension to



Horndean and that it would not be a large-scale development that is unsustainable in landscape/townscape terms. In other words the 2 developments must become a sprawling development that lacks a defined centre and therefore a sense of place. However, the Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that because the two sites are at very different stages in the planning process and there is no firm commitment on the part of the development interests to reconsider the area as a whole, there is a high risk that such a coherent plan would not be achieved.

5) If a coherent and integrated design of the two sites was to be agreed, this would delay the start of the current LEOH development that, in turn, would delay the start of this proposed extension, thereby making it even less likely than referred to above, that this extension site would be delivered by 2036. Delaying the start of the current LEOH development would have an adverse impact on the EHDC Five-year housing supply forecasts.

6) The long planning history (first application submitted in October 2014) and current status of planning applications for the current LEOH site, and its six owners (of whom the owner of the proposed LEOH extension is only one), change of developers, and now two developers, must be considered. There are three planning applications outstanding for the current LEOH site (Policy HN1), and they do not yet provide a consistent and coherent design.

7) Allowance must also be made for the length of time of the planning procedure that would have to be followed to ensure that the outstanding application 55562/005 which is in accordance with policy HN1 in the current Local Plan, would be amended and a revised application covering the original and extended site in accordance with the new Local Plan (planned for adoption in Q1 2021) could be submitted.

## **Notes:**

### **HD6.1**

- The Design and Access Statement (December 2018) submitted by Bloor Homes for outline planning application 55562/005 for 800 dwellings etc on the Land East of Horndean site, on page 45 describes 'Phasing and Delivery' of the proposed development. This indicates that Phase 3 (the final phase) during years 7 and 10 of the development, the homes in the southwest area (adjacent to this proposed site) would be constructed.
- The emerging Local Plan states for Site SA33 (Land East of Horndean) that, based on current evidence, it is anticipated that housing completions will begin in 2020/21 and finish in 2027/28.
- EHDC Land Availability Assessment (LAA) (December 2018) gives the indicative phasing of the current LEOH site as 100 dwellings within 6-10 years, and 50 within 11-15 years.
- The East Hampshire Five Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement (for the period 2019/20 to 2023/24) (dated July 2019) projects that (only) 150 of the proposed 800 dwellings on the Land East of Horndean site will be completed by 2024. This indicates that even without amending the currently proposed design to integrate it with the proposed extension, EHDC is expecting the housing to be delivered at a slow pace, and that not much of this housing on this site to be delivered in the near future. This also indicates that if this new proposed development would not start until the current proposed LEOH development is complete, it would be very unlikely that this site would be (fully) delivered by 2036, given the indicative phasing described in the EHDC LAA.

### **HD6.2**

The Sustainability Appraisal of the emerging Local EHDC Local Plan (interim) dated December 2018 states:

- Paragraph 5.52  
Another consideration is the possibility planning for a comprehensive 'East of Horndean' scheme including the current Local Plan Part 2 allocation (i.e. joint planning for the two adjacent sites). This could achieve a more coherently planned and designed extension to Horndean.
- Paragraph 7.10  
The allocated site and the newly promoted extension might not be developed to provide a coherently planned eastward extension to Horndean, because these sites are at very different stages in the planning process and there is no firm commitment on the part of the development interests to reconsider the area as a whole, to achieve the most sustainable new settlement option. Unless and until this context for development changes (e.g. through consultation responses to the draft local plan), the Council considers that the risk of a large-scale development that is unsustainable in landscape/townscape terms – i.e. a sprawling development that lacks a defined centre and therefore a sense of place – is prohibitive for advancing with this Option.

**Q7: Is there any other Large Development Site that could deliver over 600 homes and other supporting uses by 2036, that is not included in this consultation?**

Not considered as the PC has no feel for any other potential Large Development Sites

**Q8: Do you have any comments on the assessment of Large Development Sites, as set out in the Council's background paper?**

No comments

**Q9: Do you have any comments on the relationship between Large Development Sites and the draft Local Plan (2017-2036), particularly in relation to what other policies and proposals the draft Local Plan should contain?**

No comments

**Q10: Is there any feedback you would like to give us about this consultation?**

It was important to undertake the consultation if there was a feeling that more information needed to be gathered but it was not clear to members of the public that the public events would just be facilitated by EHDC with all the speaking done by the developers.