

Policy H4: Development Within Settlements

Overview of Comments:

Support - 19

Neither support or object - 8

Object - 15

The changes to the supporting text and the Local Plan policies have not only been informed by the responses to the Regulation 18 consultation but they have also taken on board any additional feedback that has come out of discussions/meetings with statutory consultees and members in order to improve the clarity and understanding of the contents of the Local Plan.

Comments in support of H4 - development within settlements		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
BHLF-KSAR-N87J-R Micheldever Parish Council ANON-KSAR-NK36-K (2 comments)	Support this policy but it should mention Village Design Statements.	Support welcomed and comments noted. Policy H4 defines the broad type of development to be permitted in various settlements, but Village Design Statements are mentioned in the design policies (D3 and D4). It is important to read the LP as a whole. Recommended response: No change
ANON-KSAR-NK4P-E	Hope that WCC will take into consideration representations from Parish Councils who will have considered small village housing needs and the best mix of dwellings.	Comments noted. Policy H4 specifically provides for development to meet local needs, including housing needs, where it has clear community support. Recommended response: No change
ANON-KSAR-NK5V-N	Support the Otterbourne proposal (OT1) but local school and GP services need resources and flooding in the area is a priority.	Support welcomed and comments noted. Recommended response: No change

BHLF-KSAR-N8ZJ-U	Supports Policy H4 in that it permits development within the defined boundaries of Kings Worthy.	Support welcomed and comments noted. Recommended response: No change
------------------	--	--

Comments which neither support nor object to H4 - development within settlements		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
ANON-KSAR-NK1Z-N Shedfield Parish Council	Tighter restrictions are needed for new homes outside of the settlement boundaries.	Comments noted. Settlement boundaries are a long-standing and effective means of containing development within established settlements. Policy SP3 limits residential development in the countryside to exceptional circumstances where there is a need for development to be located outside settlement boundaries. Recommended response: No change
ANON-KSAR-NKYQ-M	Development must take more account of traffic implications and the effect on areas with no pavements but where safe rural walking is a major need.	Comments noted. Other policies in the Local Plan deal with walking, cycling and the traffic implications of development, particularly policies T1 and T4. It is important to read the LP as a whole. Recommended response: No change
BHLF-KSAR-N86X-5	Concerned with the proposed boundaries and inconsistencies with the approach to 'carried forward sites'. For example, in Otterbourne the settlement boundary excludes proposed site allocation Policy OT01, but the 'carried forward sites' are included within the settlement boundaries even when not all of the land has been developed or subject to planning permission. All proposed site allocations should be included within the settlement boundaries.	Comments noted and agreed that the policies map needs to be updated for the Regulation 19 Plan and that there needs to be consistency. In general, new allocations are included within the settlement boundaries but this has not always been done if it could enclose areas that are to be retained for open space, etc.

	The interactive policy map does not depict the emerging planning policies so it is not possible to determine whether policies are consistent across the emerging Local Plan.	Recommended response: Update the Policies Map for the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan and check site allocations to ensure a consistent approach to the definition of settlement boundaries.
ANON-KSAR-NKFD-M	There are 37 references in the draft Plan to the "Policies Map" but the map itself does not appear in the document.	Comments noted and agreed that the policies map needs to be updated for the Regulation 19 Plan. Recommended response: Update the Policies Map for the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.
Comments which object to H4 - development within settlements		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
ANON-KSAR-N8YM-W ANON-KSAR-NKAB-D ANON-KSAR-N81F-E (3 comments)	Object to Policy H4 which is overly restrictive and contrary to the NPPG and NPPF. There is precedent across the PfSH authorities for policies to respond to housing land supply shortfalls, which should be included and extended to help address unmet need. Some respondents promote sites in the following locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land at Fairthorne Grange which is well situated to complement and align with the growth of North Whiteley and retain a gap between Whiteley and Curdridge. - Land on the north-eastern edge of Bishop's Waltham which is a sustainable settlement and represents a logical urban extension. 	This policy carries forward the approach of the existing Local Plan which has been successful in defining the type and location of development in various settlements. This approach was found to be consistent with the NPPF and remains so. Specific 'omission' sites are dealt with elsewhere, as is the issue of the development strategy. It is not accepted that a more flexible approach is needed, as the Local Plan identifies and addresses housing and other development needs. If additional sites are needed these will be allocated by the Plan and if circumstances change significantly it may be necessary to review the Plan. Additional flexibility would not provide the

	Policy H4 should be amended to allow greater flexibility for sustainable development opportunities well situated to urban centres and locations for strategic growth, such as Winchester Town.	clarity expected of a Local Plan in terms of the type and location of development in various settlements. Recommended response: No change
BHLF-KSAR-N8BZ-K BHLF-KSAR-N8BT-D (2 comments)	Object to the policy only supporting development within the defined boundaries of the settlements as some suitable and accessible sites are outside, but well related to, boundaries. Settlement boundaries and/or draft allocations should be reviewed to include suitable and accessible sites, or the policy should allow for sites adjoining settlement boundaries.	Comments noted. See above. Settlement boundaries identify the extent of the existing or proposed main built-up areas, so include 'suitable' land. Where housing targets are set the relevant settlement boundaries and potential development sites have been reviewed and adjusted as necessary. For sites falling outside these boundaries countryside policies apply, which may allow for certain forms of redevelopment or expansion. Recommended response: No change
ANON-KSAR-NKBJ-P Soberton Parish Council	The reference in H4 to 'continuously developed road frontage' needs to be defined better. There are locations where spacing between development becomes longer and merges into the next settlement, so potential for smaller settlements join.	Comments noted. It is accepted that the term 'continuously developed road frontages' has sometimes been difficult to interpret or apply in practice. Changes are therefore proposed, mainly to the explanatory text accompanying policy H4, which emphasise the importance of containing development within the recognised built limits of the relevant settlement. This aims to avoid ribbon development extending into the countryside or schemes which do not reflect the development form and character of the settlement concerned. Changes to Policy H4 are also proposed to set its requirements out more clearly.

		<p>Recommended response: Amend Policy H4 as follows: Development that accords with the Development Plan will be permitted <u>in the following groups of settlements</u>:</p> <p><u>A.</u> Within within the defined boundaries of the following settlements, as shown on the Policies Map: Bishop’s Waltham, Colden Common, Compton Down, Denmead, Hursley, Kings Worthy, Knowle, Littleton, Micheldever, Micheldever Station, New Alresford, Old Alresford, Otterbourne, South Wonston, Southdown, Southwick, Sparsholt, Sutton Scotney, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, Whiteley, Wickham, Winchester Town.</p> <p><u>B.</u> Within the following settlements, which have no defined settlement boundary, <u>where</u> development and redevelopment: <u>i.</u> that consists of infilling of a small site <u>and</u>; <u>ii.</u> <u>is</u> within a continuously developed road frontage may be supported <u>and</u>; <u>iii.</u> where this would be of a form compatible with the <u>built form and</u> character of the village <u>and</u>; <u>iv.</u> <u>would</u> not involve the loss of important gaps between developed areas.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Bighton, Bishops Sutton, Compton Street, Crawley, Curbridge, Curdridge, Durley, Durley Street, East Stratton, Gundleton, Headbourne Worthy, Hundred Acres, Newtown, North Boarhunt, Northbrook, Northington and Swarraton, Otterbourne Hill, Shawford, Shedfield, Shirrell Heath, Soberton Heath, Stoke Charity, Wonston, Woodmancott</p> <p><u>C.</u> Other development proposals may be supported to reinforce a settlement's role and function <i>where they:</i></p> <p><i>i.</i> to meet a community need or to realise local community aspirations;</p> <p><i>ii.</i> These should be <u>are</u> community-led and identified through a Neighbourhood Plan or other process which demonstrates clear community support.</p> <p>Elsewhere, countryside policies will apply and only development appropriate to a countryside location will be permitted, as specified in Policy SP3</p> <p>Amend paragraph 9.27 as follows: ...Settlement boundaries are not appropriate for some smaller or more dispersed villages and limited infilling development may be allowed in these settlements. <u><i>The character of these settlements is frequently of</i></u></p>
--	--	---

		<u>development along road frontages and infilling will be permitted on sites forming gaps within the recognisable built limits of the settlement, where there are residential buildings either side. The character of these settlements can vary substantially, but the key requirement is that development is contained within the main developed part of the settlement, rather than creating or extending development which would appear to be scattered or poorly related to the built form of the village....</u>
ANON-KSAR-NKC2-Y	<p>Object to the prescriptive nature of the settlement boundaries. Parts of the current Littleton settlement boundary comprise a series of "in and outs" for no apparent reason whereas other parts are more regular. This can lead to situations where a development is possible in a plot just within DM1 but not an adjacent plot a few metres away. It should be permissible to request an adjustment to the settlement boundary to include very small areas just outside the boundary.</p> <p>A blanket approach is adopted of a site being either "in or out" of the settlement boundary regardless of the degree of flexibility promised in the 2014 settlement boundary review or a ready means to request small adjustments. A more flexible approach should be adopted.</p>	<p>Comments noted, these raise similar points to those above. Settlement boundaries provide a very clear and well-established means of identifying where development is, in principle, acceptable. Inevitably this means that development may be permitted on one side of the 'line' but not the other, but this is the consequence of a clear policy. More 'flexibility' would simply result in a lack of clarity.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N863-Z	Curdridge should have a higher sustainability score, have a settlement boundary and be looked at as an option for accommodating growth.	Comments noted. Policies SP2 and H3 of the draft Local Plan set out the spatial development strategy and settlement hierarchy respectively. Whether Curdridge

		<p>has an appropriate place within the settlement hierarchy is considered in relation to policy H3 (on which this respondent has also commented).</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N8RD-D	<p>The Plan identifies Swanmore as having a windfall allowance of 20 dwellings to be met through development within the settlement boundary. The SHLAA indicates there are no sites within the settlement boundary to deliver the windfall development envisaged.</p> <p>Swanmore should be classified as a 'Larger Rural Settlement' with a requirement for 85-200 dwellings over the Local Plan period. Land north of Lower Chase Road should be incorporated into the settlement boundary as it is largely developed, broadly similar to the area to the south, and in part of the built-up area of the village.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Windfall sites are by definition unidentified and are different from SHELAA sites which are specifically promoted and mapped.</p> <p>Policies SP2 and H3 of the draft Local Plan set out the spatial development strategy and settlement hierarchy respectively. Whether Swanmore has an appropriate place within the settlement hierarchy is considered in relation to policy H3 (on which this respondent has also commented).</p> <p>Comments on specific sites are considered in the individual settlement sections of the Development Allocations: The Market Towns and Rural Area Chapter.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-N8GW-N	<p>Durley is identified as a village with no defined settlement boundary in Policy H4 with development limited to infilling. The NPPF promotes sustainable development in rural areas, where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Durley scores well with regard to access to facilities and services and is well connected with the M27 and Hedge End Station within a 5 minute drive. The Council should undertake a 'health-check' on all villages to ensure that there is</p>	<p>Comments noted. Durley's position in the settlement hierarchy does not justify a specific housing target or allocations and its predominant character of development fronting rural roads is not conducive to defining a settlement boundary. Comments on the settlement hierarchy are considered in relation to policy H3.</p>

	<p>sufficient housing growth to support services and facilities and bring forward opportunities for transformational growth to enhance vitality and viability and help deliver for new infrastructure.</p> <p>The wording of H4 does not incentivise local communities to prepare Neighbourhood Plans to boost the supply of housing. Additional allocations of a reasonable scale should be made or the Local Plan should require villages to prepare Neighbourhood Plans to allocate sites (site promoted at Durley for approximately 12 dwellings).</p>	<p>The Settlement Hierarchy Review 2022 assesses the level of services and facilities available and allocates development to those locations which are best served. Given the modest level of services available there is no justification to allocate additional development, nor any evidence that this would enhance their vitality or viability.</p> <p>Comments on specific sites are considered in the sections on 'omission' sites. Recommended response: No change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKQB-W	<p>This wording is very restrictive "development and redevelopment that consists of infilling of a small site within a continuously developed road frontage may be supported, where this would be of a form compatible with the character of the village, etc." It would be more appropriate to read "development within the settlement may be supported."</p>	<p>Comments noted. The policy wording seeks to define what is meant by infilling, which the policy provides for in the settlements listed. Replacing this by 'development may be supported' would be vague and would not define the type or scale of development that may be permitted (other respondents have commented that the policy should be more specific, not less). However, it is accepted that the wording of the policy and its explanatory text could be improved and changes are proposed to achieve this. Recommended response: Amend Policy H4 as follows: Development that accords with the Development Plan will be permitted <i>in the following groups of settlements:</i> <u>A.</u> Wwithin the defined boundaries of the following settlements, as shown on the Policies Map:</p>

		<p>Bishop's Waltham, Colden Common, Compton Down, Denmead, Hursley, Kings Worthy, Knowle, Littleton, Micheldever, Micheldever Station, New Alresford, Old Alresford, Otterbourne, South Wonston, Southdown, Southwick, Sparsholt, Sutton Scotney, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, Whiteley, Wickham, Winchester Town.</p> <p><u>B.</u> Within the following settlements, which have no defined settlement boundary, <u>where</u> development and redevelopment:</p> <p><u>i.</u> that consists of infilling of a small site <u>and</u>;</p> <p><u>ii.</u> <u>is</u> within a continuously developed road frontage may be supported <u>and</u>;</p> <p><u>iii.</u> where this would be of a form compatible with the <u>built form and</u> character of the village and;</p> <p><u>iv.</u> <u>would</u> not involve the loss of important gaps between developed areas.</p> <p>Bighton, Bishops Sutton, Compton Street, Crawley, Curbridge, Curdridge, Durley, Durley Street, East Stratton, Gundleton, Headbourne Worthy, Hundred Acres, Newtown, North Boarhunt, Northbrook, Northington and Swarraton, Otterbourne Hill, Shawford, Shedfield, Shirrell Heath,</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Soberton Heath, Stoke Charity, Wonston, Woodmancott</p> <p><u>C.</u> Other development proposals may be supported to reinforce a settlement's role and function <i>where they:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i.</i> to meet a community need or to realise local community aspirations; <i>ii.</i> These should be <u>are</u> community-led and identified through a Neighbourhood Plan or other process which demonstrates clear community support. <p>Elsewhere, countryside policies will apply and only development appropriate to a countryside location will be permitted, as specified in Policy SP3</p> <p>Amend paragraph 9.27 as follows: ...Settlement boundaries are not appropriate for some smaller or more dispersed villages and limited infilling development may be allowed in these settlements. <u><i>The character of these settlements is frequently of development along road frontages and infilling will be permitted on sites forming gaps within the recognisable built limits of the settlement, where there are residential buildings either side. The character of these settlements can vary substantially, but the key requirement is that development is contained within the main developed part of</i></u></p>
--	--	---

		<u><i>the settlement, rather than creating or extending development which would appear to be scattered or poorly related to the built form of the village....</i></u>
ANON-KSAR-N8N9-X	<p>Areas outside these boundaries are rated as "in the countryside" but there are pockets / ribbons of dwellings adjacent to or within 400m of the boundary. These sites have the same characteristics as infill sites. This lack of infill in the countryside or outside a boundary means suitable sites cannot be brought forward.</p> <p>The policy needs to define "infill" in the countryside, not just assume it doesn't exist.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Policy H4 provides for infilling within the settlements listed in the policy. These are recognisable settlements in their own right and deemed suitable for limited development. Other pockets or ribbons of development are generally too small or loosely developed to be recognised as settlements by the Local Plan. It would not be appropriate to provide for development in these areas, which also typically do not contain local facilities or services.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N87T-2	<p>Policy H4: allows the possibility of infilling in settlements where there are no defined settlement boundaries but development is resisted where it would involve the loss of important gaps between developed areas. This seems to refer to settlement gaps, so the only areas where infilling is resisted is in settlement gaps. Development in these areas should also be assessed on other planning considerations such as character and landscape.</p> <p>The Policy provides for other development which is community-led and identified through a Neighbourhood Plan or other process which demonstrates clear community support. It is not clear what the statement "other process" means and the Plan has no guidance</p>	<p>Comments noted. The reference in policy H4 to gaps between developed areas is intended to refer to small gaps that may be between the parts of a settlement, not necessarily the settlement gaps defined by policy NE7. It is important to set the policy for infilling in policy H4, although it is accepted that matters such as character and landscape should additionally be taken into account.</p> <p>The reference to 'other process' is in the context of development proposals which fall outside the provisions of Policy H4. It is raised as an alternative to a formal</p>

	<p>on how such development can be progressed. A proposal for development of a site in Whiteley Lane had the support of the majority of residents. The Plan should clarify what community support means so that it can be addressed satisfactorily.</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Plan, but refers to ‘clear community support’ rather than simply the support (or objections) of nearby residents. However, it is accepted that it would be useful to add some clarification in the explanatory text.</p> <p>Recommended response: Create new Paragraph 9.28 to include the last 2 sentences of paragraph 9.27 and additional text as follows:</p> <p>9.28 Outside these provisions built development, especially for housing, is normally only permitted where there is a particular need for it which cannot be met within a built-up area. Policy H4 lists those settlements within the Plan area with settlement boundaries (as defined on the Policies Map) and those where infilling may be permitted. <u>The policy also provides for other development that is needed and supported by a local community, which could include community facilities, infrastructure, or particular types of housing. It provides a less formal process than a Neighbourhood Plan but it is critical that development is community-led, not simply the result of pressure from a landowner or developer. The local planning authority will expect to see evidence that any community needs and benefits that are claimed for a proposal have been instigated by the local community and are clearly identified through a</u></p>
--	--	---

		<u>Neighbourhood Plan, Parish Plan or similar process, normally involving extensive community consultation and Parish Council support.</u>
BHLF-KSAR-N8T1-V	<p>The retention of the existing spatial strategy, including the restrictions to limit to infilling in 24 settlements is unjustified. Since that policy was included in Local Plan Part 1 the NPPF and national policy have strengthened the role of new housing in maintaining and enhancing rural communities. The Local Plan must also be formed from an understanding of needs and opportunities, which in-turn inform the spatial strategy, including evidence of local housing need, the level of development required to support a thriving rural community, the availability of land, the dual role many settlements in delivering services, and accommodating a greater proportion of the PfSH unmet needs .</p> <p>There are 37 references in the draft Plan to the "Policies Map" but the map itself does not appear in the document.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The draft Local Plan broadens the number of settlements that have a specific target for development, basing this on the most sustainable locations. It does not, therefore, simply carry forward the existing Local Plan spatial strategy, although the emphasis of the NPPF remains on achieving sustainable development. This involves resisting development in locations or of a scale that would not be appropriate.</p> <p>The comment regarding the Policies Map is noted and it is agreed that the policies map needs to be updated for the Regulation 19 Plan.</p> <p>Recommended response: Update the Policies Map for the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N8Z4-5	<p>Policy H4 carries forward the approach of the adopted local plan whereas the NPPF seeks a significant boost to the supply of houses. Given the contribution of windfall sites to overall housing supply, the policies are not strong enough in supporting sites outside defined settlement boundaries. Providing support for windfall sites across the district could help to deliver additional homes, significantly boosting the supply of housing.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The emphasis of the NPPF remains on achieving sustainable development, including directing development to the most sustainable locations. The estimates of windfall capacity are based on existing planning policies and do not require these to be relaxed to achieve the levels of windfall expected.</p>

	<p>Policy H4 should be amended to delete the requirement that a site 'consists of infilling of a small site within a continuously developed road frontage'. Policy H4 should be more flexible to encourage windfall development on sites in settlements without defined settlement boundaries and the countryside.</p>	<p>The policy wording seeks to define what is meant by infilling, which the policy provides for in the settlements listed. Deleting this would not define the type or scale of development that may be permitted (other respondents have commented that the policy should be more specific, not less). As a result it would not provide clarity and would lead to unsustainable development. However, it is accepted that the wording of the policy and its explanatory text could be improved and changes are proposed above to achieve this.</p> <p>Recommended response: See proposed changes to Policy H4 and its explanatory text set out in response to comments above.</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKQN-9	<p>It needs to make clear that proposals should meet the requirements of the 15-minute neighbourhood principles in policy T1. Infill developments in smaller villages should be within 15 minutes by active travel or public transport of the village shop, village hall, primary school and pub, etc even if these are in another village.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The requirements of policy T1 apply to all development. While these seek to prioritise active travel, etc it is not a requirement for all development to be within 15 minutes of particular facilities by active travel. This will not always be possible as the range of facilities listed by the respondent may not all exist in parts of the rural area.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N8B2-B	<p>Policy H4 claims that the NPPF requirement for 10% of development on small sites is already satisfied by past completions. This is a false claim, and a missed opportunity improve the local economy.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Policy H4 does not refer specifically to small sites, which are considered at paragraph 9.23 and Table H3. These do not claim that the requirement for 10% of housing to be on small sites is met</p>

		just by completions, which constitute only a small part of the supply of small sites. Recommended response: No change
--	--	---

	Recommendations	Officer response
Comments from SA	<p>No recommendations are included in relation Policy H4. The level of housing provision for the District is set out to have regard for the Government's Standard Method calculation and it is therefore not considered appropriate to include recommendations in relation to this policy area.</p> <p>The spatial strategy for the District is implemented through the allocation of sites included in the plan. The appraisal of site options has informed the selection of sites for allocation. Furthermore, throughout the IIA, recommendations are included relating to the topic based policies against which proposals for the development of allocated sites will be decided upon.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Recommended response: No change</p>
Comments from HRA	None.	NA

Policy H4: Development Within Settlements

Amendments to policy

Development that accords with the Development Plan will be permitted **in the following groups of settlements:**

A. Wwithin the defined boundaries of the following settlements, as shown on the Policies Map:

Bishop's Waltham, Colden Common, Compton Down, Denmead, Hursley, Kings Worthy, Knowle, Littleton, Micheldever, Micheldever Station, New Alresford, Old Alresford, Otterbourne, South Wonston, Southdown, Southwick, Sparsholt, Sutton Scotney, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, Whiteley, Wickham, Winchester Town.

- B.** Within the following settlements, which have no defined settlement boundary, **where** development and redevelopment:
- ~~i. that~~ consists of infilling of a small site and;
 - ii. is** within a continuously developed road frontage ~~may be supported and~~;
 - iii. where** this would be of a form compatible with the **layout, built form and** character of the village and;
 - iv. would** not involve the loss of important gaps between developed areas.

Bighton, Bishops Sutton, Compton Street, Crawley, Curbridge, Curdridge, Durley, Durley Street, East Stratton, Gundleton, Headbourne Worthy, Hundred Acres, Newtown, North Boarhunt, Northbrook, Northington and Swarraton, Otterbourne Hill, Shawford, Shedfield, Shirrell Heath, Soberton Heath, Stoke Charity, Wonston, Woodmancott

- C.** Other development proposals may be supported to reinforce a settlement's role and function **where they:**
- ~~i. to~~ meet a community need or ~~to~~ realise local community aspirations:
 - ~~ii. These should be~~ **are** community-led and identified through a Neighbourhood Plan or other process which demonstrates clear community support.

Elsewhere, countryside policies will apply and only development appropriate to a countryside location will be permitted, as specified in Policy SP3

Amendments to supporting text

9.27 The area outside of defined settlement boundaries is defined as 'countryside' in policy terms and Policy SP3 applies to these areas. 'Settlement boundaries' are a key tool within the development plan and indicate where built development is, in principle, acceptable. Most settlement boundaries were reviewed in the current Local Plan and these have been further reviewed as necessary in considering site allocations. Settlement boundaries are not appropriate for some smaller or more dispersed villages and limited infilling development may be allowed in these settlements. **The character of these settlements is frequently of development along road frontages and infilling will be permitted on sites forming gaps within the recognisable built limits**

of the settlement, where there are residential buildings either side. The character of these settlements can vary substantially, but the key requirement is that development is contained within the main developed part of the settlement, rather than creating or extending development which would appear to be scattered or poorly related to the layout and built form of the village.

9.28 Outside these provisions built development, especially for housing, is normally only permitted where there is a particular need for it which cannot be met within a built-up area. Policy H4 lists those settlements within the Plan area with settlement boundaries (as defined on the Policies Map) and those where infilling may be permitted. **The policy also provides for other development that is needed and supported by a local community, which could include community facilities, infrastructure, or particular types of housing. It provides a less formal process than a Neighbourhood Plan but it is critical that development is community-led, not simply the result of pressure from a landowner or developer. The local planning authority will expect to see evidence that any community needs and benefits that are claimed for a proposal have been instigated by the local community and are clearly identified through a Neighbourhood Plan, Parish Plan or similar process, normally involving extensive community consultation and Parish Council support.**