

## Q1 Your details

Please provide your personal details in full in order for your representation to be taken into account at the examination:

First Name [REDACTED]  
Last Name [REDACTED]  
Address [REDACTED]  
Post Code [REDACTED]  
Telephone [REDACTED]  
Email Address [REDACTED]  
Organisation (if applicable)

## Q2 Make a representation

Please try to make sure your comment relates to whether the draft plan meets the basic conditions.

What are you commenting on?

Paragraph Number 4.1  
Policy Reference  
Other (Please provide details) Info gathered from Questionnaire

## Q3 Do you support, oppose or wish to comment on this paragraph?

- Support
- Support with modifications
- Comment
- Oppose

## Q4 Comments

152 respondents from a distribution of 500 clearly is not enough to gain a full view of the requirements from residents and businesses. A quick straw poll of friends and neighbours in many areas of village were not aware of the questionnaire and are not aligned with the results. The next issue is that 23% (35 people) of respondents were aged under 16 vs 15% of working age adults. I'm not sure of the value and quality of this data. My understanding is public meetings have been poorly attended and the sessions held during the summer of 2018 were during work hours for most people so again were poorly attended. In short, the basis for this plan is fundamentally flawed and has not captured the true requirements for residents and businesses, purely due to the fact the Forum would not engage with village in an appropriate and accessible way. As another example of poor engagement, in paragraph 4.4 it also states there is an audit trail of key meetings yet, no minutes of these meetings has been published (last minutes posted on the titchfieldmatters.org.uk site is from Oct '16). How are we as residents supposed to understand what has happened?

Q5 What improvements or modifications should be made to the neighbourhood plan?

(You will need to say why this change will enable the Plan to proceed. It would be helpful if you could provide revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.)

As stated above, the empirical data used as a basis for this plan is flawed and must be revisited and the plan amended accordingly. Data from 153 respondents in a area populated by over 3000 is not acceptable and cannot be used. The planning process has been running for 2 years yet for many in the village, this consultation is the first they have heard of it.

Q6 Would you like to comment on another part of the Titchfield Neighbourhood plan?

Yes

No

Q7 The part of the plan to which your representation relates

Paragraph Number 9.2

Policy Reference

Other (Please provide details) Housing Needs questionnaire

Q8 Do you support, oppose or wish to comment on this paragraph?

Support

Support with modifications

Comment

Oppose

Q9 Comments

I oppose the questionnaire itself but again its the decisions made from the returned data i have issue with. 250 questionnaires were given out and 32 were returned. 32 respondents from an area that supports +3000 people is not sufficient to derive data from accurately. When challenged, the Forum disagreed

Q10 What improvements or modifications should be made to the neighbourhood plan?

(You will need to say why this change will enable the Plan to proceed. It would be helpful if you could provide revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.)

This survey cannot be used as part of the decisions making. Either it needs to be removed or re-run.

Q11 Would you like to comment on another part of the Titchfield Neighbourhood plan?

Yes

No

Q12 The part of the plan to which your representation relates

Paragraph Number 9.3

Policy Reference

Other (Please provide details) 153 dwellings in windfall sites

Q13 Do you support, oppose or wish to comment on this paragraph?

- Support
- Support with modifications
- Comment
- Oppose

Q14 Comments

The NP should be aligned with the Fareham Local Plan and not contradict it. My understanding is that the Fareham plan has NO allocations for houses needed in the area defined in the NP. Therefore I see this as a contradiction. If the 153 are required, I cannot see how this could be provided by windfall sites as there are not any and unlikely to be in the term of the plan's life cycle. Therefore I see this statement as a risk, allowing developers to find a loophole to build 153 properties on a greenfield site.

Q15 What improvements or modifications should be made to the neighbourhood plan?

(You will need to say why this change will enable the Plan to proceed. It would be helpful if you could provide revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.)

The NP must either be aligned with the Fareham plan valid before changes were made in 2018 or be rewritten to be aligned with changes made to the NPPF and the revised Fareham plan. Fundamentally, defining a number to be built but not defining where (as confirmed in paragraph 9.6) seems to go completely against the core purpose of the plan. Either state 0 properties or find a site before a site is forced upon us.

Q16 Would you like to comment on another part of the Titchfield Neighbourhood plan?

Yes

No

Q17 The part of the plan to which your representation relates

Paragraph Number 10.12

Policy Reference

Other (Please provide details)

Q18 Do you support, oppose or wish to comment on this paragraph?

- Support
- Support with modifications
- Comment
- Oppose

Q19 Comments

There is no evidence of any consultation that has taken place regarding the use of the canal path as a cycle route. In fact, there has been calls to widen the path to allow dual use, plus to allow use by disabled users and so that parents with pushchairs can use the path. At the moment, neither group can dual to the installation of a swinging gate. It is also the case that a cycle route via Posbrook Lane is not within the remit of the Forum, nor could they deliver this.

Q20 What improvements or modifications should be made to the neighbourhood plan?

(You will need to say why this change will enable the Plan to proceed. It would be helpful if you could provide revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.)

Any references to cycling and footpaths must be 1) publicly consulted on with evidence provided and 2) rewritten to include what can be achieved as apposed to what the aspiration is.

Q21 Would you like to comment on another part of the Titchfield Neighbourhood plan?

Yes

No



Q22 The part of the plan to which your representation relates

Paragraph Number

Policy Reference

Other (Please provide details) Communication with the Forum

Q23 Do you support, oppose or wish to comment on this paragraph?

- Support
- Support with modifications
- Comment
- Oppose

Q24 Comments

Starting as a keen supporter of this plan, I became very concerned at the level of engagement the group had with the village. The site they used was very niche and was not advertised apart from one leaflet delivered before the summer.

As to why, no explanation was given. Since then, my interactions via e-mail have not been very helpful in answering my questions to the point where I had to contact Locality directly for advice as the Forum refused to comment. These occurred up to the 21st December 2018 where I advised I no longer wish to communicate with them. I can provide these e-mail interactions if required however I must point out, I was asked by the Forum to keep these confidential which I feel I'm under no obligation to do as this was part of a "public" consultation. In short, for me this plan is a great missed opportunity and in its current state represents a risk to the area.

Q25 What improvements or modifications should be made to the neighbourhood plan?

(You will need to say why this change will enable the Plan to proceed. It would be helpful if you could provide revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.)

I believe this plan should be rewritten from the ground up including changes made to the NPPF last year and also to be in line with FBC's revised plan. Without this, I can see this plan will have no relevance within 12-18 months.

Q26 If a hearing is held by the independent examiner would you like to participate?

- Yes
- No

Q27 Please outline why you consider your participation is necessary:

Q28 Would you like to be kept informed of the progress of the neighbourhood plan?

Yes

No