



Incorporated 1969 Charity No: 257609

To promote high standards of planning and architecture.

To educate the public in the geography, history, natural history and architecture of the village.

To assist towards the preservation, protection, development and improvement of features of historic or public interest.

To act as a **co-ordinating body and** facilitator with local authorities, and all other statutory groups, voluntary organisations, charities and persons having aims that are similar to those of the Trust.

www.titchfieldvillagetrust.com

E Mail: TitchfieldVillageTrust@outlook.com

Dear Inspector

The attached is the submission from the Titchfield Village Trust in response to the public consultation into the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan.

[REDACTED]

Chairman Titchfield Village Trust

[REDACTED]

TitchfieldVillageTrust@outlook.com



Incorporated 1969 Charity No: 257609

To promote high standards of planning and architecture.

To educate the public in the geography, history, natural history and architecture of the village.
To assist towards the preservation, protection, development and improvement of features of historic or public interest.

To act as a co-ordinating body and facilitator with local authorities, and all other statutory groups, voluntary organisations, charities and persons having aims that are similar to those of the Trust

We would like to open by quoting from the Department for Communities & Local Government in their guide to Neighbourhood Plans.

1. *A Neighbourhood Plan is about the uses and development of land.*
2. *Often the process of preparing a plan will highlight non- planning issues. These would **not** form part of the statutory neighbourhood plan so should not be subject to the independent examination and referendum.*
3. *A neighbourhood plan may deal with transport insofar as it relates to new development. It may **not** deal with things like traffic management of existing networks, unless such management would be necessary to allow development to be approved.*

Taking these guidelines into consideration it would appear that Chapters 10 (Getting Around), 11 (Commercial and Economic Objectives) 12 (The Built and Natural Environment), and 13 (Historic Titchfield) fall outside the plans remit, and certainly outside the referendums terms of reference.

To be frank these chapters are a case of The Neighbourhood Forum stealing the clothes that the Titchfield Village Trust have been wearing over the last 50 years!

The risk is that the inclusion of all 'nice to have', i.e. aspirational community things contained in these chapters, whilst being topics that everyone may agree are good aims; in fact many are already being worked on and have been undertaken by the Titchfield Village Trust over the last 50 years, really do obfuscate what is to be voted on. If a referendum comes about clarity is required to emphasise that any vote is focussed on and about housing development (i.e. number of houses, where they are to be built, type etc) and that matters such as traffic, parking, history, buses etc will not be influenced by a yes vote.

Concentrating then on the planning and development.

Our major concern is over paragraph 9.3.

153 dwellings to be built in the plan period of 16 years within the plan boundary.

This would be the equivalent of 10 houses per year as stated in the original Draft Neighbourhood Plan.

Will that result in 20 in year 2 etc.etc. until it reaches 153 ?

We do note that the plan states in para 9.6 it is not specifying any sites.

This will mean that if a referendum is held and votes yes, it will form a part of the local plan that affects Titchfield and we are certain that developers will notice this and they, as they are already doing, will inevitably identify sites even if the plan doesn't.

We do not have room for 153 dwellings within the village without destroying green field sites.

As things stand within the current draft local plan Fareham Borough Council has "NO development" planned for Titchfield. It states: *"Titchfield is a small settlement, with a rich historic character and a thriving local centre. Few development opportunities have been identified, apart from small infilling proposals"*

FBC's own Core Strategy and Policy CS22 creates the strategic Meon Gap, which means that proposals for development will not be permitted.

The Village falls right in the middle of this gap. This neighbourhood plan goes directly against that policy and indeed the Government National Planning Policy Framework which states:

Strategic policy-making authorities should establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area, which shows the extent to which their identified housing need (and any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas) can be met over the plan period. Within this overall requirement, strategic policies should also set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas which reflects the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development and any relevant allocations
Once the strategic policies have been adopted, these figures should not need retesting at the neighbourhood plan examination, unless there has been a significant change in circumstances that affects the requirement

Fareham Borough Council have already decided that there is to be **no development** within the Neighbourhood Plan area but have been told by the government that they will have to increase their current housing allocation within the entire borough. We have already backed the construction of 400 new dwellings on the edge of the village as part of that housing need.

The Titchfield Village Trust Committee do not believe that Fareham Borough Council should, or in fact will, go back on their commitment to no development within Titchfield.

This Neighbourhood Plan says there needs to be development.

The Titchfield Village Trust Committee fundamentally disagrees.

Other points outside the referendum agenda but included in the Plan:

Para 4.2 :

We need to clarify why the Forum left the Trust, as this paragraph is being somewhat economic with the truth.

It was the Village Trust that asked the Neighbourhood Forum to cease being a sub-committee. We were being told that in order to comply with government regulations **we** had to alter **our** constitution in order to fit the Neighbourhood Forum model.

We felt, more than anything that we had to remain independent from both local and national government and protect our charitable status so asked the Forum to leave, which they did.

Para 10.6

“The growth of car ownership has not been offset by any significant increase in parking facilities”

The Trust helped campaign for the new parking arrangements in the community centre after 2 traffic surveys carried out by FBC resulting in an extra 30 spaces, this would seem to us ‘significant’

We would like to emphasise that The Titchfield Village Trust has over the last 50 years been the voice of the village. We have campaigned, in many cases successfully, on most of the aims, objectives and aspirations contained in Chapters 10,11,12, and 13.

As things stand the Titchfield Village Trust Committee will be advising its members to vote NO if this plan gets to the referendum stage for the reasons stated above.

As an after thought it might be prudent to point out that a developer (Foreman Homes) recently appealed a Fareham Borough Council planning committee refusal for 150 dwellings within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

This was opposed by Titchfield Village Trust and the Neighbourhood Forum.

The result of the appeal is imminent but the Neighbourhood Forum in their opening submission pointed out that if the appeal was successful the 153 dwellings they are recommending would be *'fulfilled in one fell swoop'*

Perhaps it might be worth waiting until the planning appeal is decided because if the housing requirement is met in this way there would be no need for a referendum.

The Neighbourhood Forum have divided this once cohesive community as well as costing the public purse over £13,500.

We really should not be wasting more public money on a referendum.