

Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies Plan

Council's response to the representations received on the Main Modifications to the Development Sites and Policies Plan (DSD01)

April 2015

DCD-36

Introduction

Representations were invited on Main Modifications to the Welborne Plan between Monday 16 February 2015 and Monday 30 March 2015. A total of 53 representors submitted a response to the consultation. This document summarises the representations received and provides a brief response from the Council on them.

The Council's summaries provide an overview of the representations and reference should be made to the original representations for full details. All representations have been sent to the Inspector, in their original as received versions, for consideration by Mr Hogger in his Examination of Local Plan Part 2, whilst each representation received can be viewed on the Council's [DSP examination webpage](#).

A number of representations were received which did not relate to any of the Main Modifications but which related to the Minor Modifications, which were also published for consultation.

Main Modification	Plan Ref	Summary of Representations received	Fareham Borough Council Response
DMM1	Page 8: Paragraph 1.11	<p>Commitment to early review to take account of the PUSH Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 (SHMA) is welcome although some responses question the timetable requesting that it be brought forward. (Hallam Land Management-DREP519). One party suggests that the timetable is overly optimistic and is a ploy to persuade the LP2 Inspector to find the plan “sound”.</p> <p>Re-iteration that LP2 being found sound is not an endorsement of the CS housing target or uplift from South Hampshire Strategy as being representative of Objectively Assessed Need (OAN).</p> <p>Adoption of the plan will not address the immediate five year shortage of housing land as set out in PUSH SHMA 2014 (DPH06). It will also likely remove the incentive for the Council to conduct the Local Plan Review as soon as possible.</p> <p>One party states it is unlikely that Fareham Borough Council will readily accept that some of Gosport’s shortfall could/should be accommodated within Fareham Borough as this would require additional greenfield development.</p> <p>Text needs strengthening so as to provide clear details and a framework on how the forecast housing growth will be delivered and that the plan is subject to ongoing review and monitoring to ensure that the spatial location of new housing is planned for appropriately and at the correct time.</p>	<p>Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies Plan is a continuation of the process and policies which have been approved in the adopted Core Strategy and thus does not set out housing targets in its own right. One of its purposes is to identify the policies and sites that will deliver the quantum of housing as set out in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Ministerial letter from the Rt. Hon. Brandon Lewis to The Planning Inspectorate (DOE05) states that the publication of new evidence with particular reference to Strategic Housing Market Assessments does not in itself render Local Plans out of date. The timetable as set out by the Council meets the spirit of the letter as the early review will incorporate new evidence jointly commissioned with its PUSH partner authorities.</p> <p>The information and conclusions which will follow from the PUSH approach will enable the Council to assess an OAN for housing development in Fareham – the approach required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the stated timetable is feasible. Fareham Borough Council as part of PUSH will be party to the preparatory work underpinning the South Hampshire Strategy Review and will be in a position to conduct additional independent work to ensure that the Local Plan Review timetable is adhered to.</p> <p>Gosport Borough Council as a PUSH authority will have its unmet need met jointly by the PUSH authorities at a regional level. Once this unmet need is quantified it will be distributed through the South Hampshire Strategy Review.</p> <p>Monitoring of the Local Plan Documents will be conducted in line with national guidance and Regulation 34 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)</p>

Main Modification	Plan Ref	Summary of Representations received	Fareham Borough Council Response
			(England)Regulations 2012.
DMM2	Page 15: Paragraph 3.16 & Policy DSP2	Reference to new development adhering to principles of CS17 is not prescriptive enough. Suggested changing to wording to read: “all new development will adhere to principles of CS17”	The Council is of the view that the wording in its current form in conjunction with the forthcoming Design Guidance SPD is robust enough to deliver development that will adhere to the principles of CS17 in line with nationally prescribed standards as required by paras. 94 and 95 of the NPPF and accompanying national policy guidance.
DMM3	Page 17: Policy DSP3	Suggested changing to the wording to strengthen policy by replacing the word should with <u>must</u> .	The Council is of the view that the policy as worded is robust and clear.
DMM4	Pages 17-18: Paragraph 3.25 & Policy DSP5	One party suggested the proposed wording still seeks to require that a landowner surrenders its commercial position in regard to site assembly and comprehensive development. That is a proposed use of planning legislation to achieve other lawful entitlements. It is proposed that that wording be amended by: 1) Deletion of the word “required” between “...be” and “sought”. 2) Deletion of all words from and including “...prevent – provided”	The proposed Main modification addresses issues raised during the Examination Hearings and the revised wording does not require legal agreements but states that they will be “sought” as set out in Council document on Issue 2; the existing Settlements (DSP2-DSP6) – Actions arising from hearing session (DCD20).
DMM5	Page 23: Policy DSP6	English Heritage supported the change.	No Council response necessary.
DMM6 DMM7	Page 25: Paragraph 4.6 & Policy DSP7	One party considered it unlikely FBC will be able to resist determined developers on a case by case basis. Others supported the policy.	The Council is of the view that the policy as worded is robust and clear.

Main Modification	Plan Ref	Summary of Representations received	Fareham Borough Council Response
DMM8	Page 26: New paragraph and new policy	<p>There have been many instances of developers using the viability weapon to ensure that they do not have to build affordable homes. Also unconvinced that any legal agreement to ensure that units will be retained as affordable housing in perpetuity, will in fact achieve that aim.</p> <p>Additional reference to consideration of the “historical environment” would be welcome.</p> <p>Hampshire County Council (HCC) requests that the policy and supporting text is amended further to be more flexible in approach and should state clearly that 100% of affordable housing on suitable exception sites be permitted irrespective of whether the target levels set out in Policy CS18 have been met.</p> <p>HCC suggests this could be achieved by the deletion of the bulk of the first sentence of the policy to the comma (so that that policy starts “Planning permission may be granted.....”) with a corresponding deletion to the first paragraph of supporting text (i.e. deletion of the words “However, where, through the Council’s monitoring or other evidence, it can be demonstrated that the levels of affordable dwellings (as defined by the NPPF) being delivered through the above methods are not meeting the target levels set out in Policy CS18 of the Core Strategy,....”</p>	<p>The policy wording explicitly states that proposals should be brought forward and managed by not for profit social housing providers who are regulated by the Homes and Communities Agency this will ensure that all proposals will deliver and retain the affordable housing in perpetuity where this is controlled and required by an appropriate legal agreement as provided for by the Planning Acts.</p> <p>The Historical Environment is a material consideration of any planning application as set out in the NPPF and accompanying national policy guidance. It is the Council’s view that the inclusion of the proposed text would not have any effect on the weighting of the historical environment in the determination of a planning application.</p> <p>Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies Plan is a continuation of the process and policies which have been established in the approved Core Strategy and thus does not set out housing targets in its own right. One of its purposes is to identify the policies and sites that will deliver the quantum of housing as set out in the Core Strategy. As such the proposed modification deals solely with securing the target levels of affordable housing as set out in Core Strategy Policy CS18.</p> <p>The identified Local Plan Review will provide the opportunity to identify suitable sites to meet identified housing need. Overall, no additional modification to the Plan is considered necessary.</p>
DMM9	Page 26: Policy DSP8	No response received	No Council response required.
DMM10	Pages 30-31: Paragraphs 4.19 - 4.20 &	If the seasonal occupancy restriction is to be removed it should be replaced by a robust holiday occupancy condition with the definition of holiday use made clear.	The Council is of the view that the revised wording of the policy is robust and clear and addresses issues raised during the Examination as set out in the Council’s

Main Modification	Plan Ref	Summary of Representations received	Fareham Borough Council Response
	Policy DSP11	There should be more robust wording limiting continuous occupation to 30 days or less and for not more than 60 days per calendar year. Not convinced that monitoring of the proposed policy changes will be possible.	document on Issue 3: The Natural Environment (DSP7-DSP16) – Actions arising from hearing session (DCD-21). With regard to the monitoring of occupancy a monitoring framework will be required as set out in criterion ii of policy DSP11 and facilitate any enforcement action should the need arise.
DMM11	Pages 31-32: Paragraphs 4.22 – 4.36	No response received.	No Council response required.
DMM12	Page 44: Table 3 & Paragraph 5.9	<p>Concerns are raised over the provision of employment floorspace being delivered at Welborne and Little Park Farm with particular reference to deliverability of the sites.</p> <p>The argument raised by one site promoter is that if the Welborne and Little Park Farm sites were to be removed from the Plan due to their deliverability issues; there would be an insufficient supply to meet the resultant shortfall of warehouse and distribution space within South Hampshire as identified by the Solent Strategic Economic Plan. The Council is therefore advised to alter the Plan to include the additional site being promoted.</p> <p>Objections to the amendments in Table 3 and paragraph 5.9 are raised by the site promoter for Little Park Farm. It has been argued that the table and paragraph 5.9 should have remained unaltered. The proposed changes are not consistent with other modifications that relate to Little Park Farm employment site. B1 uses are recommended to be re-included for Little Park Farm, rather than limiting the site to just B2 and B8 uses.</p>	<p>The Council is satisfied that the employment site at Little Park Farm is deliverable and employment provision at Welborne will be delivered in line with the phasing in the Welborne Plan. There is therefore no need to allocate the site promoted by White Young Green.</p> <p>Table 3 of the DSP Plan (as amended by Proposed Modification DMM12) sets out the most likely use which is anticipated to come forward on the site for the purposes of considering the supply of employment land in the Borough.</p> <p>The text which forms the last paragraph of the Proposed Modification makes it clear that office development could come forward on all or part of the site and the flexible policies in the Plan would allow that to happen.</p>
DMM13	Page 46: Paragraph 5.17 &	One respondent sought to clarify what is meant by the phrase “financially unviable” and who decides whether or	In the context of this modification, “ <i>financially unviable</i> ” means that it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of

Main Modification	Plan Ref	Summary of Representations received	Fareham Borough Council Response
	Policy DSP17	not economic development is appropriate.	<p>the Council that the costs of modernising or redevelopment of the land or building for employment uses does not provide sufficient value for the land to come forward and the development to be undertaken.</p> <p>Whether or not development is appropriate is decided by the Council when determining a planning application.</p>
DMM14	Page 50: Policy DSP19 – first bullet	<p>The proposed modification is welcomed and supported.</p> <p>A question is asked relating to how the Council will decide if the built character and historic significance of an area will be affected.</p>	<p>The Council will take into consideration relevant legislation, the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Guidance , any comments made from the Council’s Design and Conservation Officers, subsequent evidence documents relating to the site in question and other consulting organisations when considering any planning application for increases and modifications to Boatyards.</p>
DMM15	Page 126: Development Brief for site E2	<p>One respondent argued that deliverability of the site is strongly questioned and it is suggested that as a result, the Plan requires additional sites to be allocated (such as the alternative site being promoted) to account for Little Park Farm not being delivered and to enable Fareham to help meet the shortfall identified in the Solent Strategic Economic Plan.</p> <p>The site promoter of site E2 supported the proposed modification.</p>	<p>This is a reiteration of issues raised earlier. No further Council response required.</p>
DMM16	Page 59: Policy DSP25 (second paragraph)	<p>English Heritage supported the proposed modification.</p>	<p>No Council response required.</p>
DMM17	Page 72: Policy DSP32 (second paragraph)	<p>English Heritage supported the proposed modification.</p>	<p>No Council response required.</p>

Main Modification	Plan Ref	Summary of Representations received	Fareham Borough Council Response
DMM18	Page 80: Paragraph 5.163	<p>Suggestions made that the GVA Report and its evidence used by the Council is out of date and is not contemporary with the adapting and changing nature of retail shops and shopping habits.</p> <p>A new local food store on the Portchester precinct car park (south) is not going to create the retail food competitiveness needed within the district centre and could take custom away from other retailers located there. In addition, the subsequent loss of parking due to current proposals, will damage the vitality and attractiveness of the centre.</p> <p>Many respondents are in favour of a recent application to construct a food store outside of the current district centre.</p> <p>It has been noted that there was a long term vacant unit within the precinct that has now been filled for a community use which, it is argued could prove highly successful in future years thus increasing the demand for ample parking provision at Portchester Centre.</p> <p>There are also other various vacant units (current and forthcoming) at the centre which demonstrates that additional retail units here are not required, and that some retail sites are at present, being underused.</p> <p>It is also difficult to imagine that any new food store located at Portchester District Centre could integrate itself with the centre correctly and appropriately.</p>	<p>The Council maintains that its evidence is robust and up to date and reflects the situation at Portchester.</p> <p>The modification states that any proposals for additional retail floorspace will need to have regard to parking levels and integrate itself with the Centre in order for them to be considered viable. These issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The vacant units do not meet the size which would be necessary to meet the needs of a new retail food outlet in the Portchester District Centre and as currently demonstrated there is no demand for them in their current state.</p> <p>Whilst the application for a food store is yet to be determined a retail food store at the centre is preferred to maintain the vitality and attractiveness of the centre, as noted in the Fareham Retail Study 2012 (DED04).</p>
DMM19	Page 80: Paragraph 5.164 & Policy Map (Portchester District Centre)	<p>Questions are asked as to the viability of expanding Portchester District Centre, particularly when considering current consumer and shopper habits.</p>	<p>The Council's current evidence supports the expansion. This will increase the attractiveness of the centre and encourage and maintain and improve its vitality.</p>

Main Modification	Plan Ref	Summary of Representations received	Fareham Borough Council Response
DMM20	Page 80: Policy DSP36 (first bullet point)	<p>Car parking spaces in Portchester District Centre should be for shoppers only. There exist a number of day commuters that utilise the free parking provided at this centre and as a result spaces are limited for shoppers. Restrictions on all day parking and utilisation of the lorry park could result in adequate space for a supermarket at the centre whilst still maintaining parking spaces for shoppers. Changes to the Plan should reflect this and will help differentiate between shoppers and all day commuter parking.</p> <p>There is scepticism that a sizeable retail store proposed could be provided without any reduction in car parking levels. For credibility, it is asked how the Council expects to achieve this.</p>	<p>Changes to charges for parking provision fall outside the scope of the plan. The Council is of the view that free parking adds to the vitality of the Centre and would seek to retain it.</p> <p>The Council will carefully consider each planning application and its accordance with Policy DSP36.</p> <p>When making its decision, the Council will give particular scrutiny to the provision of parking. This could be provided through a variety of means, including the rationalisation of existing uses and the intensification of the current car parking area. Planning applications that demonstrate they are able to provide a retail food store with sufficient parking will be supported.</p>
DMM21	Page 85: New paragraphs after 5.180 & New text at end of Policy DSP40	<p>Addition of further text to Policy DSP40 is welcome as it provides greater flexibility when considering housing applications outside of the existing urban settlement boundaries.</p> <p>Gladman would be opposed to the use of restrictive policies such as urban settlement boundaries and strategic gaps if these would only act to prevent otherwise sustainable development from going ahead.</p> <p>Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply and policy DSP40 should be engaged immediately. First criterion of policy DSP40 should be replaced by the following text:</p> <p><i>‘they can make a significant contribution to serving the identified housing requirements of Fareham or the adjoining urban areas of neighbouring Boroughs.’</i></p> <p>Comment regarding loss of countryside arising from Welborne development.</p> <p>The reference to the ‘Core Strategy housing targets’ in</p>	<p>Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies Plan is a continuation of the process and policies which have been approved in the adopted Core Strategy and thus does not set out housing targets in its own right. Its purpose is to identify the policies and sites that will deliver the quantum of housing as set out in the Core Strategy. As such it is the Council’s view that the proposed modification provides sufficient flexibility.</p> <p>It for the Local Plan review to stipulate housing targets in light of emerging evidence and the review of the PUSH Spatial Strategy. The information and conclusions which will follow from the PUSH approach will enable the Council to consider the Objectively Assessed Need for Housing development in Fareham – the approach required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p>

Main Modification	Plan Ref	Summary of Representations received	Fareham Borough Council Response
		<p>the final line of the first new paragraph for page 85 should be deleted and replaced by 'objectively assessed housing need'.</p> <p>Housing delivery at Welborne is being referred to in appeal situations so it should be referred to in the revised wording of Policy DSP40.</p> <p>The modification fails to deal with the identified shortcomings identified in MM21 by the Inspector in his Preliminary Findings letter and the Plan must still be considered unsound in regards of flexibility in housing supply.</p>	
DMM22	Page 153: Development Brief for site H7	<p>Recent planning refusal shows that access from or through Green Lane should be removed.</p> <p>Retention of the boundary as shown on the site map would be undemocratic, unnecessary, unworkable and prevent restoration of the hedge and verge so preventing restoration of amenity as replacements would be expected to continue to be removed as they have been for the last 30+ years.</p>	These responses are a reiteration of issues raised earlier. With regard to access to the site from Green Lane the modification is to remove any reference to access from Green Lane.
DMM23	Page 166: Development Brief for site H11	No response received.	No Council response required.
DMM24	Page 85: New paragraph after 5.181 and amendments to Development Briefs for housing sites H12 and H13	No response received.	No Council response required.

Main Modification	Plan Ref	Summary of Representations received	Fareham Borough Council Response
DMM25	<p>Page 90: New paragraph after 5.193; and Page 92: Addition to start of Policy DSP42</p>	<p><u>Housing Site H20</u></p> <p>Inclusion of site H20 at this stage means that there has been insufficient public consultation.</p> <p>Site is unsuitable due to noise, inadequate parking, highway safety concerns and would not be in keeping with existing neighbouring development.</p> <p>Site should not be considered brownfield as categorised in December 2014 Viability Report by Jenkins Duval. Site viability is uncertain.</p> <p>Alternative site proposed at Red Barn Avenue</p> <p>Inappropriate development that would lead to the loss of trees and open space that is well used by older persons.</p> <p>Site brief should take account of water main running parallel to the site and the easement required for it.</p> <p>Under 'information required', Natural England advise that contributions towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership should be listed in order to avoid a likely significant effect on the Solent SPAs.</p> <p>Suggestions for the addition of a turning lane to address highway safety concerns.</p> <p><u>Housing Site H16</u></p> <p>Hampshire County Council considers that the removal of reference to Extra Care for site H16 would mean that no identified sites for extra care facilities has been identified for Fareham depriving residents of the choice of such accommodation. No such change is proposed with regard to either of the other two sites designated for Older person's accommodation, and so in the absence of any argument or evidence for such a change HCC find the proposed modifications result in the allocation of Site</p>	<p><u>Housing Site H20</u></p> <p>Housing site H20 was removed following a viability assessment that concluded that the site was unviable. Subsequent submissions by the site promoters showed that the site was viable and had a realistic prospect of being delivered within the plan period. This led to its re-inclusion to the DSP Plan allocations.</p> <p>The majority of the concerns with regard to highway safety, parking and the amenity of neighbouring development are material considerations which will be dealt with through the planning application process.</p> <p>Furthermore due regard has been paid to these concerns as part of the plan making process with relevant professionals (including tree and highway officers) consulted to ascertain the suitability of the proposed allocation.</p> <p>The Jenkins Duval Viability Report (DHO16) describes the site as comprising, '...a grass verge and open grassed space owned by Fareham Borough Council and an industrial unit occupied by Merjen Engineering at the corner of the A27 and Station Road...'.The report does categorise the site as brownfield for the purpose of the existing use value calculation. This provides a robust basis for the viability assessment.</p> <p>The comment regarding the need to address any likely impacts upon the SPAs is understood and accepted. Policy DSP15 applies to this and all other sites allocated for residential development in the Plan. All site briefs require ecological surveys to be undertaken and any impacts identified to be mitigated SRMP will be addressed as part of this. Therefore a further amendment to the site brief is not considered necessary.</p>

Main Modification	Plan Ref	Summary of Representations received	Fareham Borough Council Response
		H16 to be unsound. Proposal for the wording to be changed back to include reference to Extra Care.	<p><u>Housing site H16</u></p> <p>Chapter 5 of the Plan outlines how the diverse housing needs of older people can be met through a variety of products, including sheltered accommodation, retirement communities and extra care accommodation. The Council considers that a degree of flexibility to the site briefs to reflect this is warranted. The Council considers that the Proposed Modification does not preclude any of the sites identified in policy DSP42 from coming forward for extra care schemes. All of the sites identified as being suitable for older persons' accommodation are described in similar terms in the individual site briefs.</p>
DMM26	Page 97: Policy DSP47 (bullet point (vi))	No response received.	No Council response required.
DMM27	Pages 101-105: Paragraphs 6.11, 6.12, 6.19, new paragraph after 6.19, paragraph 6.20, new paragraph after 6.20 and Policy DSP49	<p>Concerns are raised as to the level of traffic that the proposed Stubbington Bypass will generate and its ability to solve current traffic issues. Arguments are presented that the proposed bypass will increase traffic at the Titchfield Gyratory and the scheme will encourage further development within the area. Doubts have been expressed that the scheme will actually come into fruition.</p> <p>Others have provided support for the inclusion of the Bypass within the Plan and for the explanation of the implications the road will have on the strategic gap and the mitigation proposals stated to offset the impact of this road. Particular regard needs to be given on the potential impact on the Solent SPAs and of supporting habitats. It is suggested that appropriate winter surveys will be required and carried out to establish the importance of those sites and it will be necessary to inform interested</p>	<p>Concerns over traffic impacts are understood and will be taken into consideration by the Highway Authority and will be mitigated as appropriate and where necessary.</p> <p>A review of the strategic gap in this area will not be required. The scheme will be appropriately designed with careful consideration, as stated in the modification, to the fundamental purpose of the strategic gap and the principles and criteria set out in Policy CS22 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed route has been designed by the Highway Authority with engagement of the Council to ensure that there will be no significant or material detrimental effect to the purposes of the strategic gap.</p> <p>Any proposals will be accompanied by the relevant environmental assessments.</p> <p>The Council, in consultation with the Highway Authority, is</p>

Main Modification	Plan Ref	Summary of Representations received	Fareham Borough Council Response
		<p>parties.</p> <p>As no overall review of the strategic gap is proposed, it is suggested that a localised revision of the strategic gap within the location of the new road is proposed in conjunction with the local adjustment of the strategic gap boundaries around the new Bypass.</p> <p>The preferred route of the Stubbington Bypass differs from that of a current planning application for up to 1,550 dwellings. The promoter of the Newlands site proposes the route be realigned to reflect what is shown in the planning application ensuring that the route does not affect or undermine the purpose of the strategic gap in this area.</p>	<p>content that the correct alignment of the proposed bypass is shown in the Proposed Modification.</p>
DMM28	Page 105: Paragraphs 6.21- 6.22 & Policy DSP50	<p>Comments are made as to the access to Whiteley, currently only being possible from 2 locations; one of which has only been recently opened. An issue is raised about the likelihood of Whiteley Way being completed set against Winchester City Council aspirations to extend/expand north of Whiteley.</p> <p>A point is made that the newly opened Whiteley Shopping Centre is only directly accessible by means of a car, as there is no regular bus service operating within the vicinity of the shopping centre.</p>	<p>The completion of Whiteley Way will be considered alongside any expansion of North Whiteley by the Highways Authority. The time scale for implementation and the policy position is subject to review as stated within the plan.</p> <p>Bus services can be provided if a requirement is identified and/or the issue is raised with the bus service provider or made directly to the Transport Authority.</p>
DMM29	Page 114: Policy DSP54	<p>One party considered there are high levels of maritime usage and infrastructure already on the River Hamble. Any increases in mooring provision as a result of this policy will further contribute to the negative impact on the River and its natural environment. It is argued that increased permission for new mooring sites will further deteriorate the visual amenity of the river and encourage further development within the natural bounds of the</p>	<p>The Council will consider any applications for increased moorings on the River Hamble against Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy, particularly the visual and physical impact of the development on the river and the surrounding area including the Solent Special Protection Areas (SPA).</p>

Main Modification	Plan Ref	Summary of Representations received	Fareham Borough Council Response
		river.	
DMM30	Page 33: New paragraphs after paragraph 4.29	One party considers that the provision of cycle and walkways throughout the Borough is be unsatisfactory. Assurances are sought on how any future provision in cycle and walkways will be maintained and will they be provided at a higher standard than current routes.	The Council is working with other interested parties, including the Highway Authority and landowners, to deliver, maintain and improve pedestrian and cycle routes to an appropriate standard.
DMM31	Page 83-87: Paragraphs 5.173, 5.174, 5.180 and 5.184 and Table 4 and Appendices C, D, E and G	One party considers that the PUSH estimates of housing need to be based on an expected influx of residents from other parts of the country, not just to service the needs of Fareham. They consider that taken together with Welborne, and the many other local plans there are far too many dwellings proposed for this already overcrowded region.	Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies Plan is the completion of the Core Strategy and thus does not set out a housing target. Its purpose is to identify the policies and sites that will deliver the quantum of housing as set out in the Core Strategy. The Proposed Modification updates the housing figures to reflect the latest position.
DMM32	Pages 123-132: Development Briefs for sites E1-E5	The site promoters supported the proposed changes of wording with regards to site E2 – Little Park Farm.	No Council response required.
DMM33	Page 199: Table 5	<p>One party considered the proposed modification does not respond to the discussion on Issue 10 during the Examination Hearings. The Council's monitoring framework is still focused entirely on performance and output indicators that are related to development plan policies. Monitoring of context and outcomes is required as well as monitoring of policy-based performance indicators.</p> <p>This concern is exemplified in relation to housing where it is particularly important to monitor demand and requirements as well as supply. National Planning Practice Guidance provides relevant guidance in sections on the assessment of housing and economic development needs. These assessments need to be</p>	<p>The proposed modifications provide clarity on how the Council will monitor policies in LP2 and how it's monitoring will inform the formulation of policies for the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Monitoring of the Local Plan Documents will be conducted in line with national guidance and Regulation 34 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The requested additional market signals indicators regarding housing are covered by national planning practice guidance (Paragraph: 037 Reference ID: 2a-037-20140306) and will thus be included in any monitoring reports.</p>

Main Modification	Plan Ref	Summary of Representations received	Fareham Borough Council Response
		<p>kept up to date by regular monitoring of market signals as well as periodic reviews of forecasts.</p> <p>In particular, the following market signals should be monitored to assess the impacts of planning policies on the housing market, access to housing and the affordability of housing: land prices, house prices, rents, affordability ratios, rates of development, overcrowding, homelessness, households sharing or in temporary accommodation and concealed households.</p>	
DMM34	Policies Map (Brent Geese and Waders)	The proposed correction to the Policy Map in relation to advice received from Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre was welcomed by two parties.	No Council response necessary.