



Report to the Partnership for South Hampshire Joint Committee

Date: 25 October 2021
Report of: Claire Upton-Brown, Chairman PfSH Planning Officers Group
Subject: Statement of Common Ground 2021 – Revisions and Update

SUMMARY

This report sets out proposed updates and revisions to the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG), first formally agreed in September 2020, to enable it to be signed as a formal SoCG by the PfSH authorities.

RECOMMENDATION

It is RECOMMENDED that the Joint Committee APPROVES the content of the Statement of Common Ground, attached at Appendix 1 to this report, that will lead to the production of a PfSH Joint Strategy.

INTRODUCTION

1. The Joint Committee agreed a draft framework for the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) at its meeting in October 2019. The Joint Committee subsequently agreed a formal SoCG in September 2020. The SoCG sets out the key strategic cross-boundary planning issues and the programme of work that will lead to a new Joint Strategy, replacing the PfSH Spatial Position Statement 2016.

PROGRESS MADE ON STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

2. Stantec and ITP were appointed in June 2020 to undertake the potential Strategic Development Opportunity Area (SDOA) comparative assessments and transport impact assessments and modelling. The work is well underway - with the transport impact assessment, sustainability appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment of individual potential SDOAs, leading to the identification of three alternative development strategies complete. The three alternative strategies are now being further assessed through transport modelling, sustainability appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment.
3. Unfortunately, the timetable for this part of the Study has been delayed due to issues concerning the use of the Solent Sub-Regional Transport Model. The most lengthy delay was caused by the need to update the model baseline from 2015 to 2019, but it was considered that the benefit of ensuring the model is up to date, and the evidence base robust, outweighed the delay this would cause.
4. Stantec were also appointed to carry out the Economic, Employment and Commercial Needs (including logistics) Study. This Study was completed earlier this year, reported to the Joint Committee in March, and is now published on the PfSH website.
5. Progress has been made with the 'Green Infrastructure needs and consideration of mechanisms on how to achieve Green Belt designation' workstream. Following the agreement of a tender brief for the evidence base study, procurement is underway and expected to be complete in mid-November

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

6. The government issued a new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in July 2021. The changes do not have consequences for the work being undertaken under the PfSH SoCG. However, members' attention is drawn to amended paragraph 22 which now states:

Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption, to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities, such as those arising from major improvements in infrastructure. Where larger scale developments such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns form part of the strategy for the area, policies should be set within a vision

that looks further ahead (at least 30 years), to take into account the likely timescale for delivery.

7. Transitional arrangements apply for local plans that had reached Regulation 19 (pre-submission) stage at the time of publication of the new NPPF. The government has indicated that it intends to issue further guidance in the form of Planning Practice Guidance, although at the time of writing this has yet to be published.

REVISIONS AND UPDATES TO THE STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

8. The main changes to the SoCG 2020 are set out below:
 - Updates to the timetable for completion of the evidence base workstreams.
 - To reflect the completion and publication of the Economic, Employment & Commercial Needs (including logistics) Study.
 - Inclusion of employment land/floorspace need/supply information.
 - Updates to references to: HCC strategic natural environment and infrastructure work; Greenprint and nutrients/water quality.
 - Updates to reflect progress on the Fareham Local Plan.
 - Updating the housing need and housing supply information to reflect the recently published affordability ratios, 35% standard method uplift for Southampton and estimated supply from 2021 to 2036.
 - Changes to the membership of the Joint Committee (signatories).

Timetable

9. As referenced above, the timetable has been delayed due to delays in being able to undertake the transport modelling work. It is now anticipated that the final report on comparative assessment of the SDOAs will be presented to Joint Committee in Q3 2022.

Publication of the Economic, Employment and Commercial Needs (including logistics) Study

10. The completion of the Study is a significant milestone in the work set out under the SoCG. This means that this workstream can be deleted from the SoCG. The updated SoCG includes qualification on how the study should be used (including the interconnected nature of the FEMA) (para 3.10). The SoCG now includes information on the need for and supply of employment land/floorspace, including information on need from the Study and supply provided by the constituent Local Planning Authorities (LPAs). It concludes that there is no general employment land/floorspace issue to address at the sub-regional level given that there is currently sufficient land allocated within South Hampshire (para 3.45).

Updates to housing need and supply information

11. The constituent LPAs have updated their housing need calculations according to the standard method by applying the latest affordability ratios that were published earlier this year. The housing need figure for Southampton has

increased due to the need to apply a 35% uplift to the twenty largest cities in England.

12. The constituent LPAs have also updated their housing supply figures to take account of completions up to April 2021 and making any necessary adjustments to the amount of supply beyond this date.
13. The outcome of using the latest housing need and supply figures is that the current level of unmet need is some 13,000 dwellings up to 2036 (compared to 10,750 in the 2020 SoCG. There are a range of different factors that drive an increase or decrease in unmet need. These are summarised as follows:

Increase to unmet need

- Southampton's housing need increasing as a result of being subject to the 35% uplift.
- New Forest housing need increasing as local plan housing need cap considered inappropriate to project forward to 2036.
- Decreases in supply in most LPAs.

Decrease to unmet need

- Annual need projected forward for 15 years rather than 16 years.
- Increase in supply in Fareham due to publication of reg 19 Local Plan with housing allocations.
- Increase in supply in Southampton due to a revised Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA).

NEXT STEPS

14. Subject to the Joint Committee agreeing the recommendation to approve the content of the SoCG, each individual Local Planning Authority and the County Council can then sign the document (subject to their own governance or delegation arrangements) and it can be published on the website. This will ensure that an up to date SoCG is available to help Local Planning Authorities in demonstrating constructive and positive cooperation on strategic matters at local plan examinations.
15. At its meeting in September 2020 the Joint Committee received a summary of proposals that were included in the Planning White Paper in relation to strategic planning and agreed that PfSH should respond to the consultation. Whilst the government had proposed an ambitious timetable to introduce new legislation for producing local plans and a new standard method for assessing housing need, it is clear that the government now intends to revisit the original proposals and that a new white paper will need to be prepared. It should be noted that the purpose of the new planning system was to ensure delivery of 300,000 homes a year nationally and it is therefore unlikely that any new system will see a reduction in the scale of development and the unmet housing need to be planned for in South Hampshire.

RECOMMENDATION

It is RECOMMENDED that the Joint Committee APPROVES the content of the Statement of Common Ground, attached at Appendix 1 to this report, that will lead to the production of a PfSH Joint Strategy.

Appendices:

Appendix 1 – Partnership for South Hampshire Statement of Common Ground 2021

Background Papers: None

Reference Papers:

[Economic, Employment and Commercial Needs \(including logistics\) Study](#)

Enquiries:

For further information on this report please contact:-

Claire Upton-Brown, Chairman PfSH Planning Officers Group

T: 02380 285588

E: claire.upton-brown@nfdc.gov.uk

Partnership for South Hampshire – Statement of Common Ground

1. Introduction

2. Background

3. Content

a. a short written description and map showing the location and administrative areas covered by the statement, and a brief justification for these area(s);

b. the key strategic matters being addressed by the statement, for example meeting the housing need for the area, air quality etc.;

c. the plan-making authorities responsible for joint working detailed in the statement, and list of any additional signatories (including cross-referencing the matters to which each is a signatory);

d. governance arrangements for the cooperation process, including how the statement will be maintained and kept up to date;

e. if applicable, the housing requirements in any adopted and (if known) emerging strategic policies relevant to housing within the area covered by the statement;

f. distribution of needs in the area as agreed through the plan-making process, or the process for agreeing the distribution of need (including unmet need) across the area;

g. a record of where agreements have (or have not) been reached on key strategic matters, including the process for reaching agreements on these; and

h. any additional strategic matters to be addressed by the statement which have not already been addressed, including a brief description how the statement relates to any other statement of common ground covering all or part of the same area.

4. Signatories

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH) – formerly the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) – was originally formed in 2003. It is a partnership of district and unitary authorities, together with a county council and national park authority, working together to support the sustainable growth of the South Hampshire sub-region. Whilst the membership has altered slightly over the years, the core membership has remained broadly consistent.
- 1.2. The Partnership has a strong track record in collaborative working to achieve common goals in South Hampshire. The Partnership was heavily involved in the production of a sub-regional strategy for development that formed part of the South East Plan. This strategy was tested through public examination and when adopted by the Secretary of State, formed part of the development plan at that time, which subsequently informed the production of local plans.
- 1.3. The ethos of collaborative cross boundary working has continued, and the Partnership has a successful track record in providing effective strategies for sub-regional planning. As well as joint working between member authorities, PfSH works with partner agencies in the sub-region as well as key Government departments to deliver joint strategies and pool resources.
- 1.4. Local planning authorities are being required to resolve cross-boundary strategic planning issues through their local plans. Complying with the ‘Duty to Cooperate’ (National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 24) is a fundamental requirement for local plans to successfully be found sound through public examination.
- 1.5. In 2016 the PfSH authorities produced a framework, namely the [PUSH Spatial Position Statement](#), to guide future local plans and housebuilding and development in the sub-region. However, since then the NPPF has been significantly revised, and a standard method for the assessment of housing needs has been issued by the Government. In line with the aim of addressing the national housing crisis, the Government has made clear that strategic policies within development plans should provide for unmet needs in neighbouring authority areas, unless this would contravene specific national planning policies, or these policies taken as a whole. Significantly boosting the supply of housing has been at the centre of all four versions of the NPPF.
- 1.6. PfSH has agreed that there is a need for its constituent authorities to work together to seek to produce a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) and to explore the production of an Infrastructure Investment Plan. At its meeting on 31 July 2019, PfSH approved the commissioning of a number of evidence work streams to inform the production of a PfSH Joint Strategy. In October 2019 PfSH agreed a draft framework SoCG. This document was subsequently revised and updated to form an initial Statement of Common Ground in September 2020. It has been further revised and updated and sets out the programme of work that will be undertaken and will be updated again as the evidence workstreams progress.

2. Background

- 2.1. In 2016 PUSH published a Spatial Position Statement to help inform Local Plans and assist individual Councils in meeting the Duty to Cooperate. It was developed as a non-statutory document to inform long-term decisions about the level and distribution of development across South Hampshire. The Position Statement resulted in all needs being met to 2026 and the majority of needs being met through to 2034, with the rate of delivery for new homes being increased by approximately 34%.
- 2.2. The Position Statement included a number of spatial principles that underpinned its development, a series of key principles that were applied through the evolution of the spatial approach and a suite of policies that form the spatial approach. These include housing distribution; strategic development locations; distribution of additional employment floorspace; strategic employment locations; waterfront sites of sub-regional significance; retailing and town centres; green infrastructure; strategic countryside gaps; environment; encouraging modal shift; highway improvements; social infrastructure; and utilities infrastructure.
- 2.3. Time has moved on since the production of the Spatial Position Statement and there is a clear need to review and update it. Standardised assessments of housing need (objectively assessed need) indicate a need to significantly increase housing provision, there is a need to extend the period covered by the Position Statement beyond 2034 and in particular, to address cross-boundary environmental issues such as the impact of development on water and air quality and on protected sites of international nature conservation importance. In planning for major development, it is also important to maintain and enhance a coherent pattern of town and countryside, to protect towns and villages with a distinct identity and appropriate countryside gaps.
- 2.4. In December 2018 PUSH agreed that the rationale and justification for a possible Green Belt designation be included as part of any joint work taken forward under the Duty to Cooperate initiative. Potential Green Belt designation should be considered alongside the role for green infrastructure, both to serve recreational needs of residents and provide environmental mitigation and enhancement, especially for likely adverse impacts on the integrity of European Nature Conservation sites. In particular, cross-boundary (e.g. catchment-wide) mitigation measures may need land to be allocated to deal with recreation pressures and water and air quality issues, depending on the results of the Habitat Regulations Assessment and Appropriate Assessment. This could also help meet some of the policy aims around climate change (a number of local authorities have declared climate emergencies) and health and wellbeing.
- 2.5. Government policy has also evolved and some strategic issues to be addressed through planning policies, particularly through the location and form of development, have gained greater priority. Issues such as climate change, health and wellbeing, biodiversity and natural capital and environmental net gain have all increased in prominence within public consciousness. All of these issues will affect the location and design of new development in the future.

2.6. National planning policy provided through the latest NPPF, published in July 2021, makes it clear that Local Plans should contain strategic policies that, as a minimum, meet their own needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas, unless there are strong reasons to restrict the growth in the plan's area (as set out in para 11 of the NPPF and the accompanying footnote).

2.7. The NPPF (para 20) states that,

'Strategic policies should set out the overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for:

- a) housing, employment, retail, leisure and other commercial development;*
- b) infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat);*
- c) community facilities (such as health, education and cultural infrastructure); and*
- d) conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation.'*

2.8. Whilst the application of the standard method for assessing local housing need is now established in the NPPF (para 61), the sub-regional need for other forms of development and the opportunities to meet those needs were still to be established. PfSH has commissioned and published the Economic, Employment & Commercial Needs (including logistics) Study and further information on the need for, and supply of, employment land is set out in paras 3.42 & 3.43 of this SoCG.

2.9. This Statement of Common Ground sets out the workstreams for which PfSH will commission evidence to help lead towards the review of the Spatial Position Statement and the production of a Joint Strategy. The three remaining workstreams are:

- Strategic Development Opportunity Area (SDOA) assessments (including traffic modelling and transport impact assessments for the SDOAs)
- Joint Strategy Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), Sustainability Appraisal (SA), Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and Appropriate Assessment (AA)
- Green Infrastructure Needs and Consideration of Mechanisms on How to Achieve Green Belt Designation.

2.10. The SoCG has been prepared against the headings set out in national planning practice guidance (Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 61-011-20190315).

2.11. It should be noted that the SoCG is intended to deal with strategic cross-boundary matters at a sub-regional scale and it does not negate or supersede any existing SoCG either between the PfSH and individual authorities or between individual authorities, within or outside the PfSH area.

2.12. The Joint Strategy will again be a non-statutory high-level strategic plan which can inform Local Plans and assist the Local Planning Authorities in meeting the Duty to Cooperate.

3. Content

a. a short written description and map showing the location and administrative areas covered by the statement, and a brief justification for these area(s)

3.1. The PfSH area has changed over the years, although the core membership, including the County Council and unitary authorities, has remained constant. The Partnership for Urban South Hampshire was formed in 2003 and evidence secured to inform preparation of the South East Plan helped to establish it as an appropriate sub-region for the purpose of strategic planning.

3.2. The following local authority areas are fully within the PfSH boundary:

- Eastleigh Borough Council
- Fareham Borough Council
- Gosport Borough Council
- Havant Borough Council
- New Forest District Council
- Portsmouth City Council
- Southampton City Council

3.3. The following local authority areas are partly within the PfSH boundary:

- East Hampshire District Council
- Hampshire County Council
- New Forest National Park Authority¹
- Test Valley Borough Council²
- Winchester City Council

The SoCG includes the whole of the New Forest District Council, Test Valley Borough Council and the New Forest National Park Authority area (within Hampshire).

3.4. PfSH is a mature partnership with a lengthy track record of cooperation and collaboration on strategic planning issues and can work with flexible boundaries where necessary (e.g. Bird Aware Solent). PfSH has continued to secure evidence and propose solutions to meeting the need for development and investment in infrastructure.

3.5. The evidence base collated over recent years supports the definition of the South Hampshire sub-region for strategic planning purposes, whether it relates to the two closely linked housing markets around Portsmouth and Southampton, the functional economic market area across the whole sub-region or the physical


¹ The New Forest National Park Authority is not a local authority but is a local planning authority with plan-making responsibilities. A small part of the New Forest National Park is in Wiltshire.

² Please note that whilst only part of Test Valley Borough Council area falls within the PfSH boundary, the evidence base studies referenced in this report will cover the whole Borough, unless the Council determines otherwise.

geography of an area located between the South Downs and New Forest National Parks and the coast with islands and peninsulas interspersed with harbours and rivers.

3.6. There is common agreement amongst partner authorities that the PfSH area is an appropriate geography on which to prepare a Joint Strategy to deal with cross-boundary strategic planning matters and support the production of local plans. An extensive evidence base has identified the housing market areas and the need to plan at the South Hampshire scale has previously been considered. Significant information is included within the 2014 GL Hearn [Strategic Housing Market Assessment](#) and previous evidence base work related to the physical environment has demonstrated the synergies for collaborative planning in South Hampshire. It is not intended to revisit the definition of the sub-region as part of the work identified in this SoCG. However, it is acknowledged that there will be some strategic issues that need to be considered in the context of a wider geographical area than that within the PfSH boundary.

3.7. The map below shows the extent of the Partnership for South Hampshire.



b. the key strategic matters being addressed by the statement, for example meeting the housing need for the area, air quality etc.

3.8. Regard has been had to advice in the NPPF in defining the strategic matters to be addressed as set out below:

- Housing need
- Employment land
- Infrastructure investment
- Biodiversity net gain, environmental enhancement and avoidance and mitigation of environmental impacts
 - This strategic matter will consider climate change and health and wellbeing and include the need for sub-regional green infrastructure and strategic habitat mitigation and consideration of potential green belt designation where this wouldn't unnecessarily limit the sustainable growth and opportunity in the region.

3.9. The housing needs for each local authority area are calculated using the government's standard method for assessing local housing need and are set out in Table 2 below. The identified objectively assessed housing need is accepted as the correct level to test and to plan for strategically in accordance with government policy, to inform housing targets to be set in local plans. PfSH will address the issue of unmet housing need through the Joint Strategy as set out later in this SoCG.

3.10. PfSH has commissioned evidence with regard to employment land needs. The [Economic, Employment and Commercial Needs \(including logistics\) Study](#) sets out the overall need for industrial land and office floorspace for South Hampshire and each local authority area within the South Hampshire Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA). It should be noted that need identified for each local authority area could be met across South Hampshire, given the interconnected nature of the FEMA. In particular, it should be noted that the need for industrial floorspace reflects where provision has previously been made rather than any geographically specific demand led factors. Furthermore, it is considered that the need for office development would be more likely to be met within the city or town centres as part of comprehensive mixed-use schemes, especially where there is good accessibility to public transport.

3.11. The Study has concluded that there is significant headroom within the standard method housing figures to accommodate substantially more new jobs than the forecasts suggest are needed³. This means that potential nationally significant investments such as the expansion of the Port of Southampton or the successful development of a Freeport would not generate a need for additional housing.

3.12. Infrastructure investment is a major priority for PfSH, both in terms of identifying the infrastructure needed to deliver development that represents 'good

³ Analysis is contained in Section 9 Labour Supply and the Standard Method and conclusions at paragraphs 11.38 – 11.42

planning' and working together to secure investment in the sub-region. PfSH authorities and the Solent LEP have a good track record in successfully obtaining funding and investment for South Hampshire. Hampshire County Council, working closely with the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Planning Officers Group (HIPOG), is commissioning a county-wide study focusing on strategic natural environment and infrastructure opportunities in the period to 2050. This piece of work will provide a framework to guide environmental and infrastructure opportunities across Hampshire and provide a high-level vision to guide infrastructure planning and funding bids in the future. Hampshire County Council has determined that in order to inform any Hampshire-wide strategy documents, it is necessary to produce a series of documents that examine the state of: [The Natural Environment](#); [Economy](#); [Society](#) (all published January 2021); and [The Built Environment and Infrastructure](#) (expected to be published later this year). These follow on from the findings and recommendations of the [Hampshire 2050 Commission of Inquiry](#), which concluded in September 2019.

- 3.13. A long standing and continued objective of PfSH is to focus development within the major urban areas, cities and towns first. Our cities and towns form the economic and social heart of South Hampshire. Focussing major development in these locations will enhance economic synergies, the vibrancy of places, support regeneration, social inclusion and the effective use of existing infrastructure, focus people close to jobs, services and public transport (reducing our need to travel more by car), and protect more of our countryside. It is important to recognise that our need for homes and jobs will need new development and infrastructure in a range of locations both within and around our towns and villages, and a balanced investment strategy is needed to deliver development in our cities, towns, villages and new areas of growth.
- 3.14. PfSH has a strong track record in providing strategic environmental mitigation. As part of the formulation of the South East Plan it was identified that new development could lead to increased recreational pressure on the coast with the resultant disturbance of birds. As this could have had a negative impact on a statutorily protected habitat, PfSH led on the development of a strategic scheme of mitigation and then subsequently its implementation. This Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy has now been branded as 'Bird Aware Solent' and has enabled residential development to continue whilst protecting the natural environment from harm. PfSH continues to carry out a governance role in setting budgets, approving the business plan, monitoring the strategy and determining the funding of infrastructure improvements from developer contributions. The scope and extent of the Bird Aware Solent Strategy will need to be reviewed as part of the Habitat Regulations Assessment of the new Joint Strategy, as it currently deals with development to 2034, as identified in the Spatial Position Statement (2016).
- 3.15. Similar recreational disturbance issues affect protected species in the international nature conservation sites within the New Forest National Park. Development currently contributes to various mitigation schemes prepared by individual planning authorities, albeit that this only applies to some planning authorities in the west of the sub-region. There is a need for a co-ordinated and strategic approach to addressing the impact of development on the sensitive

areas within the New Forest National Park arising from growth in part of the PfSH area. A partnership⁴ has commissioned a new study of visitors to the New Forest's Natura 2000 sites. This research provides updated information⁵ on visitor activity and the evidence base for the preparation of a new co-ordinated approach to addressing recreational pressures on the New Forest through appropriate planning and mitigation measures.

- 3.16. South Hampshire continues to face pressing new challenges over the potential impact of development on the environment. Climate change is a significant global issue affecting new development and impacting on existing settlements and a number of local authorities have declared climate emergencies. There is a need to ensure that development is planned in a way that minimises carbon emissions that cause climate change and that new development, so far as is possible, is not vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. This overarching theme will be of great significance when considering the options for further development in the Joint Strategy and is of particular relevance to the UK's commitment to net zero carbon emissions by 2050. PfSH will ensure through the approach in the Joint Strategy that the policy framework enables the creation of strong and resilient communities able to withstand the effects of climate change.
- 3.17. In addition to the existing prioritisation given to policies and proposals to address climate change, the Coronavirus pandemic has caused many to consider how the economic recovery should be focused on a 'green' recovery. This should ensure that planning for economic growth does not simply assume that it will carry on as before without considering the implications of the pandemic. There is an opportunity to tackle deeply ingrained economic, environmental and social challenges, from climate change and inequality, to the sub-region's physical and mental health. PfSH is supporting the development of a 'Greenprint for South Hampshire' that will provide a shared framework to enable authorities to work together to deliver programmes that achieve economic, environmental and social improvements. The framework for the 'Greenprint for South Hampshire' is based on five priorities which reflect shared commitments of local authorities and other partners across South Hampshire. The priorities – including net zero with nature to address climate change; world class blue/green environments; and creating great places through quality in design and build – are relevant to policy making in the sub-region. As work on the Greenprint develops, additional detail can be included in future iterations of the SoCG.
- 3.18. Emissions from transport (and particularly the private car) are a significant causal factor of climate change and poor air quality locally and are influenced through the location of new development. PfSH has commissioned an [Air Quality Impact Assessment](#) and acknowledges that air quality is a strategic issue that needs continued collaborative working amongst PfSH authorities⁶. The Air Quality Impact Assessment provides a strategic baseline for the purpose of informing planning policies but will need updating in due course as it currently

⁴ Test Valley Borough Council, New Forest District Council, New Forest National Park Authority, Southampton City Council, Eastleigh Borough Council, Wiltshire Council, Natural England

⁵ Reports published to date can be accessed [here](#).

⁶ N.b. There is a separate [Air Quality Study](#) for the New Forest to 2036 that also flags up issues including potential impacts on New Forest habitats.

only deals with development planned to 2034 in the Spatial Position Statement (2016).

3.19. One of the most significant current risks facing new development continues to relate to the impact of nutrient deposition (total nitrogen and phosphates) on protected habitats, albeit agricultural sources are the most significant cause. New dwellings add to this issue through an increase in foul wastewater, and in surface water run-off, that drain to the Solent. Whilst this is a serious short-term issue that has resulted in a reduction in housing supply in the impacted area, immediate measures to deal with the current backlog of planning applications and short term development are now being brought forward and implemented. Work on longer term arrangements for mitigation measures continues as these will need to be put in place to ensure that the risk is mitigated, and development can continue on an ongoing sustainable basis. Mitigation solutions are likely to continue to require significant investment to meet the needs of future development, for example in removing sources of nitrogen deposition unrelated to wastewater treatment (e.g. taking land out of intensive agricultural production) or by providing enhanced treatment at sewage works. PfSH remains committed to working with central government agencies to find efficient solutions and work continues on a number of workstreams in this regard.

3.20. PfSH has formed a Water Quality Working Group (WQWG) to coordinate a PfSH-wide response to addressing the medium to long-term strategy (including consideration of an initial pilot scheme as a potential starting point). Individual Local Planning Authorities are also progressing their own interim solutions. The Group also includes local authorities from beyond the PfSH boundary that need to address this issue. At its meeting in July 2020 the PfSH Joint Committee endorsed:

- The establishment of a dedicated officer resource as a temporary planning officer post to work on the nutrient neutrality issue, and take forward a pilot sub-regional mitigation scheme;
- Continued investigation into determining a sub-regional mitigation scheme, including working towards a Solent Nutrient Fund; and
- PfSH's continued work with wider local authority partners beyond PfSH members in addressing the nutrient neutrality issue, including on potential funding.

A temporary Strategic Environmental Planning Officer (SEPO) was appointed for 12 months commencing in December 2020. Updates on progress in addressing the issue undertaken by the SEPO and more generally by the WQWG, have regularly been reported to the PfSH Joint Committee. The main work undertaken by the SEPO to date is reflected in a [report](#) to the Joint Committee on 27th July 2021.

3.21. Whilst ensuring that we plan for the new development we need, it is important for the successful delivery of that development that we do this whilst protecting a coherent pattern of town and countryside. This will ensure important countryside is protected by ensuring that the setting of towns and villages with distinct identities are protected by appropriate countryside gaps; and that the areas with most productive agricultural land, highest landscape value and greatest

recreational or ecological benefit are protected and enhanced. Careful choices will need to be made to ensure that we do plan for and deliver the homes, jobs and infrastructure that we all need whilst protecting and enhancing a coherent pattern of town and countryside which maintains and enhances our quality of life. The workstream on '*Green Infrastructure Needs and Consideration of Mechanisms on how to achieve Green Belt Designation*' will relate to these broader objectives.

c. the plan-making authorities responsible for joint working detailed in the statement, and list of any additional signatories (including cross-referencing the matters to which each is a signatory)

3.22. The authorities responsible for the joint working detailed in this SoCG are:

- East Hampshire District Council
- Eastleigh Borough Council
- Fareham Borough Council
- Gosport Borough Council
- Hampshire County Council
- Havant Borough Council
- New Forest District Council
- New Forest National Park Authority
- Portsmouth City Council
- Southampton City Council
- Test Valley Borough Council
- Winchester City Council

3.23. In addition, the joint working will be undertaken in conjunction with:

- Enterprise M3 LEP
- Environment Agency
- Hampshire and Isle of Wight Local Nature Partnership
- Highways England
- Homes England
- Natural England
- Solent LEP
- Solent Transport

At this stage it is not anticipated that these organisations would be formal signatories to the SoCG. Other key infrastructure providers will also be involved, for example public transport providers and water companies.

d. governance arrangements for the cooperation process, including how the statement will be maintained and kept up to date

- 3.24. PfSH has long established governance arrangements, the full details of which are on the [website](#). The PfSH Joint Committee members are the leaders or cabinet members of the constituent local authorities, supported by chief executives. The Solent LEP, Environment Agency and Homes England are represented on the Committee as observers and Natural England regularly attends the meetings.
- 3.25. Alongside the Joint Committee, an Overview and Scrutiny Committee has been established to complement and, where necessary, make recommendations to the Joint Committee with regards to PfSH business. The Committee comprises a nominated councillor and chief executive from each of the PfSH authorities.
- 3.26. The technical work that will be undertaken to lead to the new Joint Strategy will be overseen by the PfSH Planning Officers Group, a working group of planning officers from each of the partner authorities, including the county council, together with Solent Transport, Natural England and the Environment Agency. PfSH has appointed a consultant Project Manager to coordinate the work on behalf of the Planning Officers Group.
- 3.27. The PfSH Joint Committee will make decisions on strategic planning matters referenced in this SoCG, based on officer recommendations. Each Council will decide how to use its own decision-making mechanisms to consider its own approach to the decisions being made at the PfSH Joint Committee.
- 3.28. This SoCG sets out the process and workstreams that will lead to the review of the Spatial Position Statement and the production of a new Joint Strategy. As the evidence base progresses, it will be appropriate to produce further iterations of the SoCG to reflect the progress made and consider the next steps. A timetable for the anticipated progress of the evidence workstreams and the production of the Joint Strategy is included in Table 1 below. PfSH will remain adaptable to changes in the work programme depending on the results of the studies. Particular regard will be had to the need to support Local Planning Authorities through the need to demonstrate compliance with the Duty to Cooperate and national planning policy at their local plan examinations when considering the timing of future iterations of the SoCG.

Table 1 SoCG timetable

| | Q4 2021 | Q1 2022 | Q2 2022 | Q3 2022 |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| SDOA assessments⁷ | | | | |
| Identify SDOAs and scope assessments/transport commission⁸ | | | | |
| Procure consultants for SDOA assessments | | | | |
| Undertake assessments | X | X | X | |
| Procure transport consultants | | | | |
| Undertake modelling & TIAs ⁹ | X | X | X | |
| Finalise report | | | X | |
| Final report presented to Joint Committee | | | | X |
| Green Infrastructure Needs and Consideration of Mechanisms on how to achieve Green Belt Designation | | | | |
| Establish green infrastructure needs through SDOA assessments (SA/HRA) | X | | | |
| Consider options for policy approach scope and procure landscape assessment | X | | | |
| Undertake assessments and further consider options | | X | X | |
| Review evidence and determine approach to green belt designation | | | | X |

⁷ This workstream incorporates Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment of the potential Strategic Development Opportunity Areas.

⁸ Struck through text indicates that the stage is complete.

⁹ Transport Impact Assessments

e. if applicable, the housing requirements in any adopted and (if known) emerging strategic policies relevant to housing within the area covered by the statement

3.29. The assessed housing need using the standard method (as required by government policy) for the local authority areas within the PfSH area is set out in the table below¹⁰:

Table 2 Housing need 2021 – 36

| Local Authority | Standard Method 2021 – 2036 (dpa) ¹¹ | Total requirement 2021 – 2036 ¹² |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| East Hants (part) | 107 | 1,605 |
| Eastleigh | 675 | 10,125 |
| Fareham | 541 | 8,115 |
| Gosport | 328 | 4,920 |
| Havant | 507 | 7,605 |
| New Forest ¹³ | 993 | 14,895 |
| Portsmouth | 872 | 13,080 |
| Southampton | 1,389 | 20,835 |
| Test Valley (part) ¹⁴ | 180 | 2,700 |
| Winchester (part) | 226 | 3,390 |
| Total | 5,818 | 87,270 |

3.30. There is no centrally produced figure using the government’s standard method, and the above table has been compiled using the best figures available. Figures for districts which only partly fall within PfSH have been apportioned on the basis of the population of those wards which fall within PfSH, other than Test Valley as referenced in the table. All figures have been provided by the local planning authorities and represent their most up to date understanding of the application of the standard method on a consistent basis. It should also be noted that the figures are updated periodically as new sub-national population projections and affordability ratios are published¹⁵. The figure for Southampton

¹⁰ N.b. this relates to the current standard method and not the proposals that were published for consultation in August 2020.

¹¹ Dwellings per annum.

¹² It should be noted that housing requirement figures in local plans may differ, even for the same time period, due to the need to include a delivery buffer.

¹³ This figure covers the whole of New Forest District, including the part of the New Forest National Park within the district, and is covered by separate local plans prepared by NFDC & NFNPA.

¹⁴ This figure is derived from the TVBC Local Plan. Previous estimates have used population splits based on ward boundaries, although the ward boundaries are not contiguous with the PfSH boundary. The Local Plan splits the housing market in the borough between north and south and assumes a 33% population split in the southern housing market area.

¹⁵ Government policy requires the use of the 2014-based household projections. Revised affordability ratios are published every year.

includes the 35% uplift in need that the Government has applied to the 20 largest cities in England¹⁶.

3.31. The annual housing need figures in Table 2 can be multiplied by the number of years being planned for to give the total housing requirement. This means that the total housing requirement for the PfSH area between 2021 and 2036 is for some 87,000 homes¹⁷.

3.32. For the period to 2036, there is a significant amount of supply already identified through planning permissions, other urban¹⁸ sites (either windfall or sites identified in strategic housing land availability assessments (SHLAAs¹⁹)) and allocations in adopted local plans and made neighbourhood plans. Further allocations are proposed in the Havant Local Plan Review which is currently at examination. Fareham Borough Council has undertaken its Regulation 19²⁰ pre-submission Local Plan consultation.

3.33. The New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016 – 2036 was formally adopted on 29 August 2019 and makes provision for an additional 800 dwellings in the National Park over the Plan-period. The New Forest District Local Plan was formally adopted on the 6th July 2020 and makes provision for an additional 10,420 dwellings in the part of the District outside of the National Park over the plan period.

3.34. Fareham, Havant and Eastleigh Councils have made significant allocations for development in their emerging local plans and whilst still subject to the outcome of their examinations, these have reached a sufficiently advanced stage in the plan-making process to be considered as commitments from the Council concerned for the purpose of calculating the remaining housing needs to be planned for. In the case of the Eastleigh Local Plan, the Inspector's post hearing advice letter already provides a clear indication of the outcome in terms of housing supply, and Eastleigh's assumed commitments have been adjusted to fully reflect this. This SoCG will continue to be updated to reflect progress in local plans from Regulation 19 consultation through to adoption, with consequential adjustments to the housing supply figures.

3.35. The housing supply position has been calculated by adding commitments in the form of planning permissions²¹, SHLAA sites²² and local plan allocations

¹⁶ The 35% uplift for Southampton results in an increase in housing need of 360dpa, which equates to 5,400 dwellings from 2021 to 2036.

¹⁷ Local plans within the sub-region can be prepared at different times and may not use a 2016 base, particularly as housing need information is updated.

¹⁸ With the exception of the New Forest – see footnote 19 below.

¹⁹ SHLAAs may also be referred to as SLAAs (Strategic Land Availability Assessments), HELAAs (housing and economic land availability assessments) or SHELAAAs (strategic housing and economic land availability assessments)

²⁰ Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (2012)

²¹ These may include C2 units with the ratio in the Housing Delivery Test Measurement Rule Book applied to give the C3 equivalent. C2 bedspace units as C3 equivalents are not currently included for Test Valley Borough Council, but their supply figures do include C2 single dwellings.

²² SHLAA sites and other urban sites are included when they form part of the LPA housing land supply and are within existing settlement boundaries. SHLAA sites for New Forest District outside of settlement boundaries are also included as this source of supply has been tested through the

(adopted plans and the emerging Eastleigh, Havant and Fareham plans) and a windfall estimate (predominantly or wholly urban sites). It is recognised that other local planning authorities are currently identifying additional sites for their areas as part of their emerging local plans and consequently the housing supply figures will increase.

3.36. The identified potential housing provision for the local planning authority areas within the PfSH area is set out in Table 3 Housing Supply 2021 – 2036 below:

Table 3 Housing Supply 2021 – 36

| Local Planning Authority | Total provision 2021 ²³ – 36 |
|---|--|
| East Hants (part) | 1,177 |
| Eastleigh (including proposed allocations) | 7,469 |
| Fareham ²⁴ (including proposed allocations) | 9,922 |
| Gosport | 2,481 |
| Havant (including proposed allocations) | 8,529 |
| New Forest (outside national park) | 8,927 |
| New Forest National Park | 654 |
| Portsmouth ²⁵ | 12,618 |
| Southampton | 13,490 |
| Test Valley (part) | 3,211 |
| Winchester (part) | 5,810 |
| Total | 74,374 |

3.37. As can be seen by comparing the assessed housing need to 2036 with the currently identified supply there is a shortfall of some 13,000 homes that needs to be addressed through the work identified in this SoCG. It is important to stress that this gap is split across the Portsmouth and Southampton housing market areas, the housing gap in the two individual housing market areas will be considerably smaller, although it still needs to be addressed. As work progresses through the evidence base leading to the Joint Strategy, and further progress is made with local plans, it is intended that this table is updated to reflect any changes in provision. To further aid the understanding of the geographical distribution of housing need and current supply, the tables are combined below:

Table 4 Comparison of housing need and supply 2021 – 2036

examination of the Part 1 Local Plan and was found sound. Allocations will subsequently be made in their Part 2 Local Plan.

²³ Base date is 1st April 2021.

²⁴ Includes sites with a resolution to grant planning permission.

| Local Authority | Annual Housing Need using Standard Method (dpa) | Total housing need 2021 – 2036 | Supply = Commitments, local plan allocations + windfall estimate | Shortfall/surplus |
|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| East Hants (part) | 107 | 1,605 | 1,177 | -428 |
| Eastleigh | 675 | 10,125 | 7,469 | -2,656 |
| Fareham | 541 | 8,115 | 9,922 ²⁶ | +1,807 |
| Gosport | 328 | 4,920 | 2,481 | -2,439 |
| Havant | 507 | 7,605 | 8,615 | +1,010 |
| New Forest | 993 | 14,895 | 9,581 | -5,314 |
| Portsmouth | 872 | 13,080 | 12,618 | -462 |
| Southampton | 1,389 | 20,835 | 13,490 | -7,345 |
| Test Valley (part) | 180 | 2,700 | 3,211 | +511 |
| Winchester (part) ²⁷ | 226 | 3,390 | 5,810 | +2,420 |
| Total | 5,818 | 87,270 | 74,374 | -12,896 |

²⁵ It should be noted that the housing supply figures for Portsmouth do not include proposed development at Tipner West, or the full amount of development proposed for the city centre in the emerging local plan.

²⁶ Includes sites with a resolution to grant planning permission.

²⁷ The method for calculating the Winchester (part) housing need does not reflect Winchester's development strategy for housing provision, which could affect the availability of the apparent 'surplus' to meet wider PfSH needs.

f. distribution of needs in the area as agreed through the plan-making process, or the process for agreeing the distribution of need (including unmet need) across the area;

3.38. The majority of needs for housing and employment development up to 2036 are already planned to be met through existing planning permissions, allocations in local plans and neighbourhood plans and small-scale windfall development. However, there remain unmet housing and potentially employment needs which are not currently planned for across local authority areas and a strategic approach is needed to determine the most sustainable locations to accommodate this development within the sub-region.

3.39. PfSH has agreed a programme of work to review the Spatial Position Statement, leading to a new Joint Strategy. The three remaining workstreams are set out below:

- Strategic Development Opportunity Area (SDOA) assessments (including traffic modelling and transport impact assessments for the SDOAs)
- Joint Strategy Strategic Environmental Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, Habitats Regulations Assessment and Appropriate Assessment
- Green Infrastructure Needs and Consideration of Mechanisms on how to achieve Green Belt Designation.

3.40. The Spatial Position Statement (2016) includes Strategic Development Locations. The review of this document and the need to plan where further strategic growth will take place means the identification of further Strategic Development Opportunity Areas (SDOAs) is required. Some of these areas are already being identified through adopted or emerging local plans, e.g. Mayflower Quarter (Southampton) and Southleigh (Havant). These sites are already included in the housing supply figures in Table 3. Whilst these major proposed allocations make significant contributions to accommodating housing needs, further SDOAs will inevitably be needed alongside smaller brownfield and greenfield developments.

3.41. The PfSH Planning Officers Group has agreed a process to identify potential SDOAs for further assessment. This involved the identification of all sites above a threshold²⁸ that have been previously promoted or considered as reasonable alternatives as part of local and strategic planning processes. Consultants have been appointed to identify any further options and potential choices for land to accommodate strategic development and then these potential SDOAs will be subject to analysis and appraisal to establish the most sustainable options and the infrastructure investment needed to deliver them.

3.42. The assessment of the SDOAs is following the process below:

- Identification of potential SDOAs

²⁸ 20 hectares or 500 dwellings. A number of smaller sites in the same general location could potentially be combined to form a larger strategic site above the threshold.

- Detailed assessments of potential SDOAs including:
 - constraint mapping and sustainability appraisal
 - habitat regulations assessment (including appropriate assessment)
 - transport modelling and transport impact assessments (commissioned as a separate study)
 - landscape impact / green infrastructure
 - strategic infrastructure requirements or opportunities.

3.43. PfSH has commissioned consultants to prepare the assessments and undertake the sustainability appraisal and habitat regulations assessment/appropriate assessment and this work is well underway. The transport modelling and transport impact assessments are the subject of a separate commission and are being undertaken in conjunction with Solent Transport and its member organisations. The PfSH Planning Officers Group will then consider the results of the assessments before making recommendations to the Joint Committee as to the SDOAs to include in the Joint Strategy. The sustainability appraisal will be key to making these recommendations.

3.44. The Joint Strategy will aim to address South Hampshire’s housing needs up to 2036. However, given the lead in times for larger sites, it is likely that the SDOAs will continue to deliver new development well beyond 2036. The Joint Strategy will therefore provide an overall vision and strategic direction for new development up to 2050.

3.45. PfSH has commissioned and published the [Economic, Employment and Commercial Needs \(including logistics\) Study](#) which establishes the need for employment development in South Hampshire. It should be noted that the figures for office need are ‘aspirational’ in recognition of the time it may take before the market starts to deliver new development. The results of the Study are set out in Tables 5 and 6 below, alongside the estimated current supply of office floorspace and industrial land. This demonstrates that there is currently sufficient land allocated within South Hampshire to meet the need for employment development and there is no need to address this issue at the sub-regional level as is the case for housing development.

| Local Authority | Office need (sqm) (2019 – 40) | Office supply(sqm) (2021 – 40) | Balance (sqm) |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| East Hants (part) | 1,919 | 274 | -1,645 |
| Eastleigh | 95,805 | 99,280 | 1,917 |
| Fareham | 38,595 | 38,680 | 85 |
| Gosport | 14,616 | 9,063 | -5,553 |
| Havant | 38,477 | 355 | -38,122 ²⁹ |
| New Forest | 11,236 | 767 | -10,469 |
| Portsmouth | 74,217 | 84,589 | 10,372 |
| Southampton | 60,959 | 228,910 | 169,868 |
| Test Valley (part) | 20,176 | 28,357 | 8,181 |
| Winchester (part) | 36,468 | 49,800 | 13,332 |
| Total | 392,468 | 540,075 | 147,607 |

Table 6 Comparison of industrial land need and supply

| Local Authority | Industrial need (ha) (2019 – 40) | Industrial supply (ha) (2021 – 40) | Balance (ha) |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| East Hants (part) | 1.4 | 1.7 | 0.3 |
| Eastleigh | 9.9 | 44.5 | 34.6 |
| Fareham | 25.5 | 51.2 | 25.7 |
| Gosport | 15.5 | 20.7 | 5.2 |
| Havant | 9.1 | 19.9 | 10.8 |
| New Forest | -10.3 | 8.9 | 19.2 |
| Portsmouth | 52.6 | 37.8 | -14.8 |
| Southampton | -7.8 | 21.8 | 29.6 |
| Test Valley (part) | 52.6 | 23.9 | -28.7 |
| Winchester (part) | 19.2 | 26.3 | 7.1 |
| Total | 167.7 | 256.7 | 89.0 |

3.46. It should be noted that in Tables 5 and 6 present a general picture and probably slightly underestimate the need/supply balance given that the need calculation is from 2019 – 2040 and the supply figure is from 2021. Adding in completions from 2019 to the supply figure would likely increase it. Also, the need figures are for a net increase in space, whereas the supply figures do not take account of any losses of office or industrial sites. Individual Local Planning Authorities will need to consider this further, although it can be noted that the surplus of office and industrial sites would enable further losses without the need to allocate new sites. Some of the industrial need figures for individual Councils indicate a negative need. This should not be taken in itself as a policy requirement to reduce the stock of industrial sites in these areas, as industrial vacancy rates are low and sites are meeting the needs of local businesses. Again, individual Local Planning Authorities can consider this issue further.

²⁹ The submitted Havant Borough Local Plan includes flexible allocations (which do not specify the use class of employment that should be provided) in order to respond rapidly in a very uncertain market.

- 3.47. The Study also makes recommendations with regard to the need to find up to five sites to meet the need for strategic warehousing. The PfSH Planning Officers Group is currently considering how this need could be met, although initial work indicates a lack of suitable sites.
- 3.48. There are clear benefits in planning for a mix of uses when planning for new communities. There are also opportunities within the existing urban areas for significant redevelopment. The identification of Strategic Development Opportunity Areas will potentially include urban and greenfield sites, expanding upon those identified as Strategic Development Locations in the Spatial Position Statement.
- 3.49. The need to mitigate potential adverse impacts of new development on the environment is apparent through the evidence base from previous local plans and current issues relating to water and air quality and recreational pressure and potential harm to protected habitats. It is a major priority for the PfSH authorities to ensure that the natural environment is not diminished through new development and where possible, is enhanced. Furthermore, government policy now requires development to provide a net gain for biodiversity. Given the sub-region's location between two National Parks (the South Downs and the New Forest), the 'duty of regard' set out in Section 62(2) of the Environment Act 1995 is also relevant. This duty ensures that any decisions that could affect National Parks must have regard to the two statutory Park purposes. The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in July 2021 (paragraph 176) to recognise the importance of ensuring development within the setting of National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty is sensitively located and designed to avoid and minimise adverse impacts development may have on those designated areas.
- 3.50. There are legal requirements for carrying out strategic environmental assessment (incorporated within sustainability appraisal) and habitat regulations assessments (including appropriate assessments) when considering the location of new development. Given issues around recreational disturbance and the potential need to mitigate the impact of nutrient deposition from wastewater outputs and traffic emissions as a result of additional dwellings, there will be a requirement to allocate land to provide sustainable alternative natural greenspace and to reduce nitrate levels in the water environment. Consideration will need to be given to incorporating accessible natural green spaces within SDOAs to ensure that they are accessible to residents and assist with the delivery of appropriate environmental mitigation.
- 3.51. Climate change is an overarching theme that will be at the forefront of the strategy for new development. Matters such as flood risk and policy approaches to resilience can be explored through the sustainability appraisal and SDOA assessments. Any opportunities to reduce potential environmental impact through the location of development will be considered alongside mitigation measures that need to be addressed through planning policy.

- 3.52. The current Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the PfSH area was completed in 2007, with subsequent interim updates and reviews in 2012 and 2016. PfSH has commissioned a new level one SFRA for the majority of the PfSH region (except East Hampshire, which completed an SFRA for its planning area in 2018 and is currently updating it), along with the whole local planning authority areas of Test Valley, Winchester and the New Forest National Park. This is to take account of changes in legislation and policy, as well as emerging updates to evidence, modelling and mapping of flood risk. The new SFRA is expected to be completed in 2022.
- 3.53. Dealing with climate change issues can have a long-term beneficial impact on the health and wellbeing of the new communities now being planned. Other issues, such as access to green spaces and opportunities for active travel can also be addressed through the strategy for new development.
- 3.54. Impacts on health caused by poor air quality will be considered through the sustainability appraisal. Impacts on the natural environment (European and Ramsar sites) will be considered through the Habitat Regulations Assessment. Development should be located so as to minimise adding to air quality problems and regard should be had to designated Air Quality Management Areas when determining strategic approaches to development.
- 3.55. The strategy will meet development needs, informed by the sustainability appraisal of SDOAs, which will take account of all relevant factors as set out above, of which green infrastructure is one. The *'Green Infrastructure Needs and Consideration of Mechanisms on how to achieve Green Belt Designation'* workstream will commence as the draft results of the SDOA assessments become available. This will enable consideration of potential Green Belt designation to take place, as appropriate, in the light of evidence as to development requirements and the most sustainable options for development in South Hampshire based on all relevant factors, including the green infrastructure needs of potential SDOAs. The policy approach to Green Belt designation, if appropriate, can then be included in the Joint Strategy where, along with other policies, it will be subject to sustainability appraisal. Any proposals for formal Green Belt designation would then need to be pursued through individual local plans.
- 3.56. PfSH intends that the review of the Spatial Position Statement will lead to a new Joint Strategy. Whilst the initial workstreams have been agreed and this work has commenced, further work remains to be undertaken to establish the full scope for the Joint Strategy. A timetable for the evidence workstreams is included in Table 1 at para 3.27 above. A detailed project plan has been prepared for the workstreams set out in this SoCG. Substantial progress has been made on the preparation of the evidence base and as this nears completion the PfSH Planning Officers Group can commence drafting the Joint Strategy. It is anticipated that this will be presented to Joint Committee in Autumn 2022.
- 3.57. The technical work outlined above will enable the preparation of a PfSH Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will be both evidence based and aligned to an agreed distribution of development to meet the need for homes and jobs. This

will provide a strong statement to Government of our strategic infrastructure 'asks', in order to deliver development. This will include for example transport, flood risk management, water and environmental infrastructure.

g. a record of where agreements have (or have not) been reached on key strategic matters, including the process for reaching agreements on these

- 3.58. PfSH published a Spatial Position Statement in 2016. This SoCG sets out the process to update and replace that document and is agreed by the PfSH authorities. It is anticipated that the new Joint Strategy will set out the distribution of housing and employment provision between the respective Local Planning Authorities, particularly with respect to providing for unmet needs, amongst other strategic spatial policies (including the sub-regional approach to potential Green Belt designation).
- 3.59. PfSH Joint Committee agreed a SoCG with Eastleigh in July 2019, Havant in January 2021 and Fareham in October 2021.

h. any additional strategic matters to be addressed by the statement which have not already been addressed, including a brief description how the statement relates to any other statement of common ground covering all or part of the same area

3.60. The SoCG sets out a process by which the PfSH authorities will review and update the Spatial Position Statement (2016). It is not intended to replace or supersede any existing SoCG that exists between PfSH and individual local planning authorities or bilateral agreements between local planning authorities.

3.61. There are no other strategic matters to be addressed by the SoCG that have not been referenced earlier in the SoCG.

Signatories

Ken Moon
Economic Development and Rural Affairs Portfolio Holder
East Hampshire District Council

Keith House
Leader
Eastleigh Borough Council

Seán Woodward
Leader
Fareham Borough Council

Graham Burgess
Leader
Gosport Borough Council

Rob Humby
Executive Lead Member for Economy, Transport and Environment
Hampshire County Council

Alex Rennie
Leader
Havant Borough Council

Diane Andrews
Portfolio Holder for Planning, Regeneration and Infrastructure
New Forest District Council

Gavin Parker
Chairman
New Forest National Park Authority

Hugh Mason
Cabinet Member for Planning Policy & City Development
Portsmouth City Council

Dan Fitzhenry
Leader
Southampton City Council

Nick Adams-King
Deputy Leader
Test Valley Borough Council

Neil Cutler
Deputy Leader
Winchester City Council

