RECOMMENDATIONS

Hedge End, West End and Botley Local Area Committee:

It is recommended that:

the development brief is updated in accordance with the changes specified in Appendix One; and

Cabinet be recommended to adopt the subsequent revised development brief for Moorgreen Hospital and the adjoining field as a supplementary planning document and, in relation to land at Moorgreen Dairy Farm, to adopt the brief as non-statutory guidance

Cabinet:

Subject to any further modifications requested by the Hedge End, West End and Botley Local Area Committee, it is recommended that the development brief for Moorgreen Hospital and the adjoining field be adopted as a supplementary planning document and, in relation to land at Moorgreen Dairy Farm, adopt the brief as non-statutory guidance

Summary

This report relates to land at Moorgreen Hospital, the adjoining field and Moorgreen Dairy Farm in West End. It is recommended that the development brief in relation to Moorgreen
Hospital and the adjoining field the subject of policy 187.IN of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001 – 2011) be adopted by the Council as a supplementary planning document (SPD), following amendments proposed following public consultation. The brief also addresses the development potential of land at Moorgreen Dairy Farm, West End. The development of this part of the wider site is not provided for in the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001 – 2011) and therefore the guidance issued in this document in respect of this land can only be approved for use on a non-statutory basis.

The brief sets out design principles and planning requirements for the development of the site. It describes the main constraints and opportunities relating to the site and specifies a phasing programme for its development. A full statement of consultations is attached as Appendix A. The original consultation draft development brief is attached as Appendix B.

Statutory Powers

Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
Localism Act 2011

Introduction

1. A draft development brief was approved by the Hedge End, West End and Botley (HEWEB) Local Area Committee and by Cabinet on the 8 and 11 December 2014 respectively for consultation. The consultation ran from 19 December 2014 to 30 January 2015 and included two staffed exhibitions held at West End Parish Centre from 7.00pm - 9.00pm on Friday 23 January and 10.00am - 12.30pm on Saturday 24 January. In total, approximately 130 local people visited the events.

2. This report brings before Members the results of the consultation exercise on the draft brief and resulting amendments to the brief for approval in order that the final version of the brief can be adopted.

Vehicular route connection to Monarch Way

3. The issue of most concern to local residents is the proposal to create a general vehicular link between Monarch Way and the phase three area (see ‘Plan 18: Transport Framework Plan’ on page 52 of the brief). This link was originally promoted in the brief for the following reasons:

- To improve general accessibility for the existing estate and proposed development. Traffic calming, a dog-leg in the route, plus existing congestion around St James School at pick-up and drop-off times should have minimised the risk of it being used as a ‘rat run’.
- To improve access for emergency vehicles and bin lorries to Monarch Way.
To provide an alternative route under the road or associated footway into the estate for underground services provided by the statutory service providers. This may have reduced the cost of providing improved links to the existing Monarch Way service network.

4. However, although there were a majority of Monarch Way residents in favour of a proposed pedestrian and cyclist link, there was a very large and strongly felt response against a proposed vehicular link. Whilst in theory an alternative access to and from the site would be good practice in movement network terms, the constraints of Monarch Way are such (with a narrow width and congestion at drop off and pick-up times around the school) that taking the risk of extra vehicle movements may not be appropriate. Accordingly it is recommended that the brief be amended to downgrade this link to provide links for pedestrians, cyclists and underground services only. The fire service will still have relatively easy access through the removal of lockable bollards.

Health service issues

5. Another issue that also caused large numbers of residents to comment was concern regarding a perceived cut-back in NHS services and a call for an increase in health facilities on the site. The NHS has already sold off the phase 1A area (the western third of the site bordering Moorgreen Road) as surplus to its requirements (see also 'Plan 19: Development Phasing' on page xx of the brief). The NHS has yet to indicate how it proposes to deliver a modern model of healthcare and make the best use of the land remaining in NHS ownership. However, it is likely to involve the development for health uses of the field to the north of Dawson Lodge, known as the Donkey Field (see 'Plan 1: Existing layout' on page 3 of the brief), which would potentially free up land for much-needed housing. The Council has a responsibility to plan for the use of land which is no longer needed for health uses, if there is evidence that they are no longer needed. The brief makes it clear that the Council will require substantive evidence to be submitted alongside any relevant planning application on any part of the site to demonstrate that the land subject of proposals is no longer needed for health uses.

6. In its consultation response on the draft brief, NHS West Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group has advised the Council that in the short term, it will maintain the existing services on site. In the medium term, it plans to provide more clinical services on this site whilst reducing its administrative functions. This would mean using a similar floorspace of building to the present provision to deliver increased clinical services on the site. At the same time, more land could be released for housing beyond the land already sold to the Homes and Communities Agency. Should the NHS decide to retain its current administrative function within the site, or decide to increase clinical services beyond the increase already planned, then it would be free to retain its landholding for this purpose.

7. During the consultation period the issue of creating a GP unit integrated with other health services was raised. Co-locating the surgery and local community
(non-in-patient) health facilities at the Donkey Field in the future could be of significant benefit to the local community. Communication between the GP surgery in primary care and others in the community teams would be improved and, if ‘hospital’ outpatient services were ever to start, clinical care would improve, as cases could easily be discussed with the GP’s secondary care colleagues. If the surgery was to be in the same building as the community facilities, there could be flexible use of clinical space. There may also be other advantages that are not apparent at the present, but will be obvious in 5 to 10 years to come, depending on the future model for primary care delivery.

8. It is not yet possible to confirm the deliverability of this proposal. Therefore it is proposed that the draft brief be amended to continue to provide for the expansion of the existing GP surgery to address increased demand in the short and medium term, whilst advocating a longer term strategy of co-location of the surgery with the health facilities re-provided on the Donkey Field. This will help to ensure that extra capacity at the GP surgery is provided for in the short to medium term.

9. Should the GP surgery come to be moved from its existing site, then its land holding could be released for housing development. The brief is proposed to be amended to ensure that, as far as possible, the approved layout of the phase 1A site which bounds the surgery site on two sides facilitates expansion in the long term onto the surgery site.

10. Another issue raised during the consultation was the potential to use some of the site not used for NHS health facilities, or for housing, for a modest horticultural therapy facility. Horticultural therapy uses gardening to bring about positive changes in the lives of people who are living with disabilities or ill health, or are isolated, disadvantaged or vulnerable. This process is known as social and therapeutic horticulture.

11. West End Parish Council already supply one allotment locally free of charge to the charity Eastleigh Borough & Romsey MENCAP. Although it does not describe its work as horticultural therapy, the charity works with adults who have learning disabilities and this can include people with autism or Aspergers who may have associated learning disabilities or communication issues. Its aim is to provide outdoor activity, which includes physical exercise through horticulture, so members have the opportunity to learn about horticulture and to grow their own food.

12. The charity has indicated that it would welcome the expansion of the existing project onto the Moorgreen site. The brief will be amended to indicate that the Council, together with its partners, will work to investigate the potential for supporting this existing facility through planning gain, either by providing a facility within the phase two or three area or by other support to the existing site. Alternatively a project with another charity could be conceived for horticultural therapy on the site, again underpinned through planning gain.

**Status of this development brief**
13. Since the publication of the consultation draft of the development brief, the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029 has been rejected by the Planning Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to examine the soundness of the Plan. This judgement means that the 2011 - 2029 Local Plan can no longer be adopted by the Borough Council as its ‘Development Plan’. Consequently the extent of the site covered by this development brief, which previously aligned closely with the site proposed to be allocated through policy WE5 of that Plan, can no longer be adopted as a supplementary planning document.

14. Recognising the value of an adopted supplementary planning document to guide development, this report recommends that the Council adopts as a supplementary planning document the brief in so far as it relates to the land identified for development in saved policy 187.IN of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001 – 2011). The guidance offered in this brief in relation to all other land within the wider site can only be adopted on a non-statutory basis.

Other issues arising

15. Foreman Homes has requested that the site area of the brief be increased to include the full area of its 2013 planning application for the Moorgreen Dairy Farm site. This is recommended for inclusion in the brief, subject to an increased requirement for screening alongside the countryside edge. This small additional parcel of land is not considered to contribute significantly to the strategic gap between West End and Hedge End. The capacity figure for this phase will be increased by 3 units to 23 homes.

It has also been suggested that a small (c.280m²) retail convenience store is provided for on part of the site. Given the site’s distance from existing local centres, the amount of existing and proposed housing in the vicinity and its proximity to large crowd-generating facilities at the Ageas Bowl, a small convenience retail facility in this location is considered to be acceptable in principle. It is recommended that the draft brief be amended accordingly.

16. A full list of the significant issues raised in the consultation is attached as Appendix A. Changes to the brief in response to the points are described. Further minor changes will be made as necessary for purposes of clarification and correction. The consultation Draft Development Brief is available on the Council’s website; [www.eastleigh.gov.uk/moorgreen](http://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/moorgreen). The final version will incorporate the changes set out in this report.
Financial Implications

17. The cost of publication of the planning brief will be met from existing resources held by the Head of Regeneration and Planning Policy. The cost of issuing hard copies will be recouped by charging for them.

Risk Assessment

18. The risk of not proceeding with a development brief for this site is that development takes place in a piecemeal fashion and that some of the Council’s aspirations for the site are more difficult to achieve or do not take place.

Equality and Diversity Implications

19. The Equality Act is not relevant to the decision in this report as the decision does not relate to eliminating discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity, or fostering good relations between different people. An Equality Impact Assessment has not been carried out.

Conclusion

20. A successful formal consultation process has taken place. Whilst the changes proposed to the brief do not have a major impact on the overall proposals, the changes to the access arrangements are considered essential. The reassurances and clarification about the Council’s position regarding the health service offer on the site, and the additional ideas to improve the health offer are also very important. Once the development brief has been adopted, the document will provide more detailed guidance on the Council’s objectives for this site, helping to achieve a greater level of control over future development than currently exists. This will result in higher quality development, reflecting the needs of the community.

PAUL RAMSHAW
Head of Regeneration and Planning Policy

Date: 17th February 2015
Contact Officer: Mark Waller-Gutierrez
Tel No: 023 8068 8164
e-mail: mark.waller-gutierrez @eastleigh.gov.uk
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Report Number: RPP508

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - SECTION 100D

The following is a list of documents which disclose facts or matters on which this report or an important part of it is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. This list does not include any published works or documents which would disclose exempt or confidential information.

No background papers submitted.