

## **Appendix 3:**

### **Regulation 19 Summary of Responses**

## Contents

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Regulation 19 Publication Local Plan Consultation</b>	Page 8
	Introduction	Page 9
	Vision and Key Strategic Priorities	Page 14
	Development Strategy	Page 18
	Housing Need and Supply	Page 40
	• H1 – Housing Provision	Page 40
	• FTC1 – Palmerston Car Park	Page 59
	• FTC2 – Market Quay	Page 61
	• FTC3 – Fareham Station East	Page 64
	• FTC4 – Fareham Station West	Page 67
	• FTC5 – Crofton Conservatories	Page 69
	• FTC6 – Magistrates Court	Page 70
	• HA1 – North and south of Greenaway Lane	Page 71
	• HA3 - Southampton Road	Page 85
	• HA4 – Downend Road East	Page 86
	• HA7 – Warsash Maritime Academy	Page 91
	• HA9 – Heath Road	Page 93
	• HA10 – Funtley Road South	Page 95
	• HA12 – Moraunt Drive	Page 96
	• HA13 – Hunts Pond Road	Page 97
	• HA15 – Beacon Bottom West	Page 97
	• HA17 – 69 Botley Road	Page 98
	• HA19 – 399-403 Hunts Pond Road	Page 99
	• HA22 – Wynton Way	Page 100
	• HA23 – Stubbington Lane	Page 100
	• HA24 – 335-357 Gosport Road	Page 101
	• HA26 – Beacon Bottom East	Page 101
	• HA27 – Rookery Avenue	Page 102
	• HA28 – 3-33 West Street	Page 103
	• HA29 – Land East of Church Road	Page 104
	• HA30 – 33 Lodge Road	Page 104

• HA31 – Hammond Industrial Estate	Page 105
• HA32 – Egmont Nursery	Page 107
• HA33 – Land East of Bye Road	Page 119
• HA34 – Land South West of Sovereign Crescent	Page 119
• HA35 – Former Scout Hut, Coldeast Way	Page 120
• HA36 – Locks Heath District Centre	Page 121
• HA37 – Former Locks Heath Filing Station	Page 122
• HA38 – 68 Titchfield Park Road	Page 124
• HA39 – Land at 51 Greenaway Lane	Page 125
• HA40 – Land west of Northfield Park	Page 125
• HA41 – 22-27a Stubbington Green	Page 126
• HA42 – Land south of Cams Alders	Page 126
• HA43 – Corner of Station Rd, Portchester	Page 129
• HA44 – Assheton Court	Page 129
• HA45 – Rear of 77 Burr ridge Road	Page 131
Housing Policies	
• HP1 – New Residential Development	Page 133
• HP2 - New Small-scale Development Outside Defined Urban Areas	Page 135
• HP3 - Change of Use to Garden Land	Page 139
• HP4 - Five-year Housing Land Supply	Page 140
• HP5 - Provision of Affordable Housing	Page 143
• HP6 - Exception Sites	Page 145
• HP7 - Adaptable and Accessible Dwellings	Page 147
• HP8 - Older Persons' and Specialist Housing Provision	Page 150
• HP9 - Self and Custom Build Homes	Page 151
• HP10 - Ancillary Accommodation	Page 154
• HP11 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People	Page 155
• HA45 - Rear of 77 Burr ridge Road	Page 156
• HP12 - Development Proposals within Solent Breezes Holiday Park	Page 159
Employment	
• E1- Employment Land Provision	Page 159
• E2 - Faraday Business Park	Page 163
• E3 - Swordfish Business Park	Page 164

• E4 - Solent 2	Page 166
• E5 - Existing Employment Areas	Page 167
• E6 - Boatyards	Page 169
• E7 – Solent Airport	Page 169
Retail and Community Facilities	
• R1 - Retail Hierarchy and Protecting the Vitality and Viability of Centres	Page 171
• R2 - Out-of-Town proposals for Town Centre Uses	Page 173
• R3 - Local Shops	Page 174
• R4 - Community and Leisure Facilities	Page 175
Climate Change	
• CC1 - Climate Change	Page 176
• CC2 - Managing Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems	Page 180
• CC3 - Coastal Change Management Areas	Page 181
• CC4 - Renewable and Low Carbon Energy	Page 182
Natural Environment	
• NE1 - Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network	Page 183
• NE2 - Biodiversity Net Gain	Page 185
• NE3 - Recreational Disturbance on the Solent Special Protection Areas (SPAs)	Page 190
• NE4 - Water Quality Effects on the Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Ramsar Sites of the Solent.	Page 191
• NE5 - Solent Wader and Brent Goose Sites	Page 193
• NE6 - Trees Woodland and Hedgerows	Page 195
• NE7 - New Moorings	Page 197
• NE8 - Air Quality	Page 197
• NE9 - Green Infrastructure	Page 201
• NE10 - Provision and Protection of Open Space	Page 202
• NE11 – Local Green Space	Page 204
Transport and Other Infrastructure	
• TIN1 - Sustainable Transport	Page 204
• TIN2 - Highway Safety and Road Network	Page 208
• TIN3 - Safeguarded Routes	Page 211
• TIN4 - Infrastructure Delivery	Page 212
Design	

• D1 - High Quality Design and Placemaking	Page 215
• D2 - Ensuring Good Environmental Conditions	Page 218
• D3 - Coordination of Development and Piecemeal Proposals	Page 218
• D4 - Water Quality and Resources	Page 219
• D5 - Internal Space Standards	Page 222
Historic Environment	
• HE1 - Historic Environment and Heritage Assets	Page 223
• HE2 - Conservation Areas	Page 224
• HE3 - Listed buildings and structures and/or their Settings	Page 224
• HE4 - Archaeology	Page 224
• HE5 - Locally Listed Buildings and Non-designated Heritage Assets	Page 225
• HE6 - Heritage at Risk	Page 225
Implementation and Monitoring	Page 225
Glossary	Page 226
Appendices	Page 226
Evidence Base	Page 229
 <b>2.0 Regulation 19 Revised Publication Local Plan Consultation</b>	 Page 237
Introduction	Page 238
Vision and Strategic Priorities	Page 240
Development Strategy	Page 241
Housing Need and Supply	Page 249
• H1 – Housing Provision	Page 249
• FTC3 – Fareham Station East	Page 282
• FTC4 – Fareham Station West	Page 283
• FTC5 – Crofton Conservatories	Page 284
• HA1 – North and South of Greenaway Lane	Page 284
• HA3 – Southampton Road	Page 299
• HA4 – Downend Road East	Page 299
• HA7 – Warsash Maritime Academy	Page 302
• HA9 – Heath Road	Page 303
• HA10 – Funtley Road South	Page 303
• HA13 – Hunts Pond Road	Page 304
• HA17 – 69 Botley Road	Page 304

• HA19 – 399-403 Hunts Pond Road	Page 305
• HA22 – Wynton Way	Page 305
• HA24 – 335-357 Gosport Road	Page 305
• HA27 – Rookery Avenue	Page 306
• HA28 – 3-33 West Street, Portchester	Page 306
• HA31 – Hammond Industrial Estate	Page 306
• HA38 – 68 Titchfield Park Road	Page 307
• HA39 – Land at 51 Greenaway Lane	Page 307
• HA40 – Land west of Northfield Park	Page 308
• HA42 – Land south of Cams Alders	Page 308
• HA43 – Corner of Station Road	Page 309
• HA44 – Assheton Court	Page 309
• HA45 – Rear of 77 Burr ridge Road	Page 310
• FTC7 – Land adjacent to Red Lion Hotel, Fareham	Page 311
• FTC8 – 97-99 West Street, Fareham	Page 312
• FTC9 – Portland Chambers, West Street, Fareham	Page 312
• HA46 – 12 West Street, Portchester	Page 313
• HA48 – 76-80 Botley Road, Park Gate	Page 314
• HA49 – Menin House, Privett Road	Page 314
• HA50 – Land north of Henry Cort Drive	Page 315
• HA51 – Redoubt Court, Fort Fareham Road	Page 318
• HA52 – Land west of Dore Avenue, Portchester	Page 319
• HA54 – Land east of Crofton Cemetery and west of Peak Lane	Page 323
• HA55 – Land south of Longfield Avenue	Page 344
• HA56 – Land west of Downend Road	Page 374
• BL1 – Broad Location for Housing Growth	Page 384
Housing Policies	
• HP1 – New Housing Development	Page 390
• HP2 – New Small-Scale Development Outside the Urban Areas	Page 391
• HP4 – Five Year Housing Land Supply	Page 392
• HP5 – Provision of Affordable Housing	Page 397
• HP6 – Exception Sites	Page 400
• HP7 – Adaptable and Accessible Dwellings	Page 401

• HP8 – Older Persons’ and Specialist Housing Provision	Page 402
• HP9 – Self and Custom Build Homes	Page 402
• HP11 – Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Page 403
Employment	
• E1 – Employment Land Provision	Page 403
• E2 – Faraday Business Park	Page 407
• E3 – Swordfish Business Park	Page 407
• E4 – Solent 2	Page 408
• E4a – Land North of St Margaret’s Roundabout	Page 409
• E4b – Land North of Military Road, Wallington	Page 410
• E4c – Little Park Farm	Page 411
• E4d – Standard Way	Page 412
• E5 – Existing Employment Areas	Page 413
• E6 - Boatyards	Page 415
• E7 – Solent Airport	Page 415
Retail and Community Facilities	
• R1 - Retail Hierarchy and Protecting the Vitality and Viability of Centres	Page 416
• R2 – Out of Town Shopping	Page 416
• R4 - Community and Leisure Facilities	Page 417
Climate Change	
• CC1 – Climate Change	Page 417
• CC2 – Managing Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems	Page 423
• CC3 – Coastal Change Management Areas	Page 425
• CC4 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy	Page 426
Natural Environment	
• NE1 - Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network	Page 427
• NE2 - Biodiversity Net Gain	Page 429
• NE3 - Recreational Disturbance on the Solent Special Protection Areas (SPAs)	Page 433
• NE4 - Water Quality Effects on the Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Ramsar Sites of the Solent	Page 434
• NE5 - Solent Wader and Brent Goose Sites	Page 436
• NE8 - Air Quality	Page 438
• NE9 - Green Infrastructure	Page 440

• NE10 - Protection & Provision of Open Space	Page 441
Transport and Infrastructure	
• TIN1- Sustainable Transport	Page 442
• TIN2 – Highway Safety and Road Network	Page 444
• TIN3 – Safeguarded Routes	Page 448
• TIN4 – Infrastructure Delivery	Page 448
Design	
• D1 – High Quality Design and Placemaking	Page 454
• D4 – Water Quality and Resources	Page 457
• D5 – Internal Space Standards	Page 458
Appendices	Page 459
Evidence Base	Page 460
Policies Map	Page 474



## **1.0     *Regulation 19 Publication Local Plan Consultation***

Over 180 individuals and organisations submitted comments in response to the Regulation 19 Publication Local Plan Supplement Consultation in 2020.

The following tables provide a summary of the consultation responses received by chapter, policy and evidence base document together with the Council's response:

Representations on Introduction Chapter			
Number of representations on policy: 27			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Mrs Katarzyna Bond	1.4	Comments from previous consultations not taken into account.	Comment noted but the Council disagrees. All comments received are considered and responses to these are included in the Council's Statement of Consultation.
Mr James Ireland	1.4	Lack of paper response forms to consultation restrict responses. Previous Consultation responses not taken into account. No response at council meeting to petition.	Comment noted but the Council disagrees. Consultation undertaken in accordance with Council's Statement of Community Involvement and Regulation 19 consultation requirements and The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 No 731. All comments received are considered and responses to these are included in the Council's Statement of Consultation. The petition has not been debated by full council as it was considered that this is a pre-determination issue. It will be debated by Council when the Local Plan was scheduled to come forward for adoption. Instead the lead petitioner is invited to make a deputation at all meetings and any planning application considered in the relevant area references the petition in the officer's report.
Mr Rob Megginson	1.4	Previous Consultation responses not taken into account. No response at council meeting to petition.	Comment noted but the Council disagrees. All comments received are considered and responses to these are included in the Council's Statement of Consultation. The petition has not been debated by full council as it was considered that this is a pre-determination issue. It will be debated by Council when the Local Plan was scheduled to come forward for adoption. Instead the lead petitioner

			is invited to make a deputation at all meetings and any planning application considered in the relevant area references the petition in the officer's report.
Mr R A K Murphy	1.2	Housing need is out of date. Has a long term downward trend.	Noted. The Council are required to use the methodology set by MHCLG to calculate housing need.
Mrs June Ward	1.4	Insufficient methods of consultation provided. Residents views not taken into account.	Noted. Consultation undertaken in accordance with Council's Statement of Community Involvement and Regulation 19 consultation requirements and The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 No 731. All comments received are considered and responses to these are included in the Council's Statement of Consultation.
Mrs Jane Wright	1.4	Lack of paper response forms to consultation restrict responses. Previous Consultation responses not taken into account. No response at council meeting to petition.	Noted. Consultation undertaken in accordance with Council's Statement of Community Involvement and Regulation 19 consultation requirements and The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 No 731. All comments received are considered and responses to these are included in the Council's Statement of Consultation.  The petition has not been debated by full council as it was considered that this is a pre-determination issue. It will be debated by Council when the Local Plan was scheduled to come forward for adoption. Instead the lead petitioner is invited to make a deputation at all meetings and any planning application considered in the relevant area references the petition in the officer's report.
Mrs Christine Wilkinson	1.4	Insufficient methods of consultation. No stands or public events with planning officers available. Fareham Today Magazine not received across the Borough.	Noted. Consultation undertaken in accordance with Council's Statement of Community Involvement and Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012 and The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 No 731.

			Fareham Today was not the consultation document and is not a statutory consultation requirement but an additional form of communication.
Miss Tamsin Dickinson	1.5	Fareham Today Magazine not received across the Borough.	Noted. Consultation undertaken in accordance with Council's Statement of Community Involvement and Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012 and The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 No 731. Fareham Today was not the consultation document and is not a statutory consultation requirement but an additional form of communication.
Mrs Fiona Earle	1.5	Fareham Today Magazine not received across the Borough. Consultation too complicated and time-constrained.	Noted. Consultation undertaken in accordance with Council's Statement of Community Involvement and Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012 and The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 No 731. Fareham Today was not the consultation document and is not a statutory consultation requirement but an additional form of communication.
Mr Rob Megginson	1.5	Restricting consultation to Test for Soundness does not allow for responses with full commentary. Paragraph contradicts information in Fareham Today as doesn't include Legal Compliance or Duty to Cooperate. Community-generated evidence carries less weight than statutory consultants & developers.	Noted. Publication Plan consultation undertaken in accordance with requirements set out in Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012. Consultations undertaken throughout local plan preparation process allowing for full commentary. Local plan quotes para 35 of NPPF to explain test for soundness. Fareham Today and the consultation response survey sought to expand this in more detail. All comments received are considered and responses to these are included in the Council's Statement of Consultation.
Mrs Charlotte Varney	1.5	Paragraph contradicts information in Fareham Today as doesn't include Legal Compliance or Duty to Cooperate.	Noted. Local plan quotes para 35 of NPPF to explain test for soundness. Fareham Today and the consultation response survey sought to expand this in more detail.

Mrs June Ward	1.5	Restricting consultation to Test for Soundness does not allow for responses with full commentary. Paragraph contradicts information in Fareham Today as doesn't include Legal Compliance or Duty to Cooperate.	Noted. Publication Plan consultation undertaken in accordance with requirements set out in Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012. Consultations undertaken throughout local plan preparation process allowing for full commentary. Local plan quotes para 35 of NPPF to explain test for soundness. Fareham Today and the consultation response survey sought to expand this in more detail.
Mrs Jane Wright	1.5	Restricting consultation to Test for Soundness does not allow for responses with full commentary. Paragraph contradicts information in Fareham Today as doesn't include Legal Compliance or Duty to Cooperate.	Noted. Publication Plan consultation undertaken in accordance with requirements set out in Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012. Consultations undertaken throughout local plan preparation process allowing for full commentary. Local plan quotes para 35 of NPPF to explain test for soundness. Fareham Today and the consultation response survey sought to expand this in more detail.
Warsash Inshore Fishermen's Group	1.5	Discriminatory as community-generated evidence carries less weight than statutory consultants & developers.	Comment noted but the Council disagrees. All comments received are considered and responses to these are included in the Council's Statement of Consultation.
Pegasus Group for Bargate Homes (75 Holly Hill Lane, Old Street, HA1) Pegasus Group for King Norris (Brook Avenue)	1.6	Plan does not meet the local housing need based on standard methodology. Lower housing requirement has not been subject of a Sustainability Appraisal. Affordable Housing need not provided for. No statements of common ground prepared.	Noted. The housing requirement and site allocations for the Fareham Local Plan will be amended to meet the need identified in the methodology confirmed in December 2020. A further consultation on the modifications will be undertaken. Statements of Common Ground are in preparation.
Mr Tim Haynes	1.14	Should not base housing need on calculation proposal which has not been adopted.	Noted. The housing requirement and site allocations for the Fareham Local Plan will be amended to meet the need identified in the methodology confirmed in December 2020. A further consultation on the modifications will be undertaken.
Mr Richard Jarman	1.16	No reference is made to the 2017 unadopted plan.	Noted. The draft plan which was consulted on in 2017 was not adopted. The publication plan builds on the work undertaken in 2017.

Mr Russell Prince-Wright	1.16	No reference is made to the 2017 unadopted plan.	Noted. The draft plan which was consulted on in 2017 was not adopted. The publication plan builds on the work undertaken in 2017.
Mrs Charlotte Varney	1.16	No reference is made to the 2017 unadopted plan.	Noted. The draft plan which was consulted on in 2017 was not adopted. The publication plan builds on the work undertaken in 2017.
David Lock Associates for Buckland Development Ltd	1.17	Support the Council's position to not revisit detailed policies of the Welborne Plan. Consideration to unlock Welborne delivery required.	Support welcomed. Planning application in respect of changes to viability and affordable housing provision under consideration.
Pegasus Group for Bargate Homes (75 Holly Hill Lane, Old Street, HA1) Pegasus Group for King Norris (Brook Avenue)	1.17	Welborne plan should be reviewed in accordance with para 33 of NPPF.	Noted. The Council disagrees. As detailed in paragraph 1.17, the Welborne plan was evaluated and found fit for purpose.
Home Builders Federation	1.28	Appears that Council has cooperated with neighbours however outcomes are insufficient to address the cross-boundary issue identified. 847 homes proposed to meet PfSH unmet need of 10,000.	Noted. The Council will work with neighbouring authorities to identify and address housing need based on the standard method.
Mr Richard Jarman	1.28	Local Plan should consider unmet need under duty to cooperate based on confirmed methodology, not proposed.	Noted. The Council will work with neighbouring authorities to identify and address housing need based on the standard method.
Pegasus Group for Bargate Homes (75 Holly Hill Lane, Old Street, HA1) Pegasus Group for King Norris (Brook Avenue)	1.28	The plan does not adequately meet the unmet housing needs of neighbouring authorities in the sub-region.	Noted. The Council disagrees. As set out in paragraph 4.4 and 4.5 of the Local Plan the Council has addressed the needs of neighbouring authorities.
Persimmon Homes	1.28	Statement of Compliance with Duty to Cooperate does not accord with PPG.	Noted. Work is ongoing to produce Statements of Common Ground and will be completed before submission.

		Statements of Common Ground should be agreed and provided as evidence.	
Southern Planning for Raymond Brown	1.28	Fareham are not taking sufficient unmet housing need from PfSH authorities under the duty to cooperate.	Noted. The Council disagrees. As set out in paragraph 4.4 and 4.5 of the Local Plan the Council has addressed the needs of PfSH authorities.
Mr Russ Wright	1.38	Local Plan timetable should be revised to allow for housing figures to be determined by central government	Noted. The Local Plan Timetable will be revised.

## Representations on Chapter 2 : Vision and Strategic Priorities

**Number of representations on chapter: 19**

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Rob Megginson	2.1	Querying the range of methods used to consult the public, and variance from the Statement of Community Involvement. A feeling that previous comments made have been ignored.	Comment does not directly link with para 2.1, but instead para 2.1 of SCI.  Comment noted but the Council disagrees. Consultation has been in line with SCI and all comments to previous consultations have been reviewed as can be seen in Reg 22 report.
Mr R.A.K. Murphy	2.1	Comment is advocating more social housing, and properties within (financial) reach of young families or disabled or veterans.  Comment requests a review of the definition of affordable.	Comment does not directly link to para 2.1  The Council acknowledges the need for all parts of the community, including young families. The definition of affordable housing is taken from the NPPF.

Mr Richard Jarman	2.1	Comment relates to the redrawing of the settlement boundary to accommodate Housing Allocation HA1	Much of this allocation now have some form of planning permission and so it is in line with the methodology of the settlement boundary review to bring into the urban area.
Hilary Megginson	2.1	Querying the range of methods used to consult the public, and variance from the Statement of Community Involvement. A feeling that previous comments made have been ignored.	Comment does not directly link with para 2.1, but instead para 2.1 of SCI.  Comment noted but the Council disagrees. Consultation has been in line with SCI and all comments to previous consultations have been reviewed as can be seen in Reg 22 report.
Mrs Charlotte Varney	2.1	Comment relates to the redrawing of the settlement boundary to accommodate Housing Allocation HA1	Much of this allocation now has some form of planning permission and so it is in line with the methodology of the settlement boundary review to bring into the urban area.
Mr R.A.K. Murphy	2.4	Comment suggests that housing on flood plains and marshland has not been identified, and that 'unsuitable sites' should be included.	The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, which was available at the point of consultation, shows the sites in relation to their level of flood risk. If flood risk has been a factor in the assessment of suitability, this is documented in the SHELAA.
Gladman	2.10	Gladman support the vision and objectives in principle. However, they suggest that the Plan could go further in meeting unmet need from within the wider sub-region.	Support noted. The Council considers its contribution to unmet need to be appropriate considering the development strategy and formal unmet need requests.
Graham Moyse (from Turley)	2.10	Comment supports the vision in 'general terms' but suggests reference to addressing climate change is added, in particular infrastructure delivery that supports the low carbon agenda.	Strategic priority 11 and strategic policy CC1 address this point to the degree applicable for a land use plan.



Hallam (from LRM Planning Ltd)	2.10	Comment suggests that the is framed around meeting Fareham's needs, ignoring its role in the wider sub-region.	The vision and strategic priorities do focus on the need of the residents of the Borough but that does not expressly exclude unmet need. The plan includes provision for unmet need, therefore overall, the plan does not ignore Fareham's wider sub-regional role.
Anne Stephenson	2.12	Comment suggests the priorities should be re-order to put the climate emergency at the top.	The priorities are not written in any priority order, i.e. they are all of equal importance.
Graham Moyse (from Turley)	2.12	Comment supports the vision in 'general terms' but suggests reference to addressing climate change is added, in particular infrastructure delivery that supports the low carbon agenda. A recommendation is made to include specific reference to electric vehicle charging points.	NE8 Air Quality contains a specific requirement for EV charging points. The strategic priorities are meant to be strategic.
Hampshire County Council	2.12	Welcomes reference to affordable housing and specialist housing in the priority and suggests that this is carried through into Strategic Policy H1: Housing Provision.	H1 addresses the scale of housing growth. Specific policies existing in relation the affordable housing and specialist housing in Chapter 5.
Historic England	2.12	Suggest that to accord more closely with the NPPF, reference in Strategic Priority 10 be changed to refer to 'historic environment' not 'historical assets'.	Suggested change.  In Strategic Priority 10, "historical assets" should be replaced with "historic environment".
Hallam (from LRM Planning Ltd)	2.12	Comment suggests that the strategic priorities are framed around meeting Fareham's needs, ignoring its role in the wider sub-region.	The vision and strategic priorities do focus on the need of the residents of the Borough but that does not expressly exclude unmet need. The plan includes provision for unmet need, therefore overall, the plan does not ignore Fareham's wider sub-regional role.

David Mugford	2.12	Comments suggest that town centre developments contribute to a vibrant town centre, but often lead to a reduction in car parking for town centre users. Also greater vision is required to help the town centre survive.	The future of many town centres is a challenging one. Town centre developments are one way to address the changing nature of retail. Appropriate parking levels will be considered as part of any application, but the Council is committed to a re-development of the Osborn road car park in the town centre.
Robin Webb	2.12	Priorities fail to address FBC's commitment to carbon neutrality by 2030. Suggests FBC should take a lead in energy conservation and carbon neutrality by mandating building design policies to reduce emissions.	Strategic priorities are strategic and climate change is referenced. The specifics on mitigation through building design is referenced in policies CC1 and D1.
Mr R.A.K. Murphy	2.12	Suggests that 'high quality design has not been supplied by property speculators to date'.	Comment relates to the efficacy of current planning policy, not the emerging policy to be established through the Local Plan.
Ms Jane Thackker	2.12	Comment suggests HA1 infrastructure is inadequate, and suggests that the allocation should be removed.	Comment does not relate to paragraph 2.12.  HA1 has been determined to be suitable and achievable. Necessary infrastructure contributions are detailed in the various planning permissions, policy HA1 and the IDP.
Mrs Hazel Russell	2.12	Comment queries the plans adherence to the priority of maximising development in urban areas and away from countryside and criticises the review of the settlement boundary to include policy HA1.	The Local Plan has maximised growth in the urban areas but the housing growth required has necessitated some allocations adjacent to existing settlement boundaries.  Much of the HA1 allocation now has some form of planning permission and so it is in line with the methodology of

			the settlement boundary review to bring into the urban area.
<b>Representations on Chapter 3: Development Strategy</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 114</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Unknown	3.1	(Para 3.10) Suggests that there has been a decision to rewild the Stubbington Strategic Gap without consultation.	There has been no decision to rewild the Fareham Stubbington Strategic Gap. A <a href="#">press release</a> was issued on 22 <sup>nd</sup> October about possible initiatives but this was not a decision and is not directly related to the Publication Local Plan.
Mr Richard Jarman	3.1	Suggests that there has been a decision to rewild the Stubbington Strategic Gap without consultation.	There has been no decision to rewild the Fareham Stubbington Strategic Gap. A <a href="#">press release</a> was issued on 22 <sup>nd</sup> October about possible initiatives but this was not a decision and is not directly related to the Publication Local Plan.
Mrs Iris Grist	3.1	Figure 3.1 shows HA4 to be in the countryside but the reports says that there are no allocations in these areas.	The allocation of HA4 is shown on figure 3.1 by the icon of a house, which is referenced in the key.
Mr Russ Wright	3.2	Suggests the calculations for housing need should be updated in line with the updated government 'algorithm'.	A further consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
Mrs Robyn da Silva	3.3	Housing distribution is disproportionate across the Borough, particularly weighted towards HA1.	The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. It is

			accepted that this is not numerically even across the Borough.
Graham Moyse (from Turley)	3.4 & 3.5	Suggests that the concept of good growth should be extended to make specific reference to highway network related infrastructure that promotes electric vehicles.	Disagree. The concept of good growth is more strategic than this comment and suggested amendment points to. The provision of EV charging points alone would not be a sound basis for a development strategy, particularly when policy NE8, and other initiatives, is likely to greatly increase the number of points over the plan period.
Hallam (from LRM Planning)	3.4	Comment suggests that the plan should prioritise locations that are able to achieve the principles of good growth.	Comment noted. The Council believes it has achieved this through its Development Strategy.
Hallam (from LRM Planning)	3.5	Comment summarises the approach to good growth and the link to the Development Strategy.	Comment noted.
Valerie Wyatt	3.9	Comment objects to the exclusion of Egmont nurseries from the ASLQ boundary and claims the planning status for allocation policy HA32 is incorrect.	<p>Noted. The site had planning permission at the time the Publication Plan was published, however, agreed that the planning status as at 1<sup>st</sup> July 2020 is incorrect.</p> <p>Suggested Change</p> <p>Planning status for all sites will be updated as at April 2021</p> <p>As an extant permission, the designation of ASLQ cannot be retrospectively added to the site.</p>
Iris Grist	3.9	Comment relates to Portsdown Hill and the allocation HA4.	Para 3.9 refers to no allocations in the ASLQs, which is correct. HA4 is not within an ASLQ but its presence on the lower slopes of Portsdown Hill,

			some of which is proposed as an ASLQ, is recognised.
June Ward	3.10	Suggests that there has been a decision to rewild the Stubbington Strategic Gap without consultation.	There has been no decision to rewild the Fareham Stubbington Strategic Gap. A <a href="#">press release</a> was issued on 22 <sup>nd</sup> October about possible initiatives but this was not a decision and is not directly related to the Publication Local Plan.
Hallam (from LRM Planning)	3.14	Agreed need to encourage diversity within the housing market and suggests that additional housing allocations are required.	Comment noted.
Mrs Valerie Wyatt	3.14	Suggests that this paragraph gives a 'green light' to any developer wishing to build in the countryside by dividing up sites to be smaller than 1ha. Loopholes for dividing up sites should be closed.	Policy D3 is specifically designed to avoid situations where developers may deliberately present smaller sites to avoid obligations and create piecemeal developments.
Hallam (from LRM Planning)	3.15	Points to the fact that the SA has not considered the lower housing requirement as a reasonable alternative.	The lower housing requirement was assessed within the 2020 Sustainability Appraisal. The increase in housing need since has meant that this option is no longer considered a reasonable alternative.
Raymond Brown (from Southern Planning)	3.19	Object to paragraph 3.19 including figure 3.1.	A further consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
Mr Russ Wright	3.19	Suggests the calculations for housing need should be updated in line with the updated government 'algorithm'.	A further consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
Hampshire County Council	3.19-3.21	Acknowledges that the Publication Local Plan is based on the lower level of housing growth in the August 2020 consultation on a new standard methodology. Supports the removal of HA2 as HCC had previously objected. Supports the	Comment noted.

		removal of the Strategic Growth Area South of Fareham and North of Fareham to which HCC had submitted holding objection.	
Cllr P Raffaelli, Gosport Borough Council	3.20 & 3.21	Refers to concerns raised by Gosport Council in relation to the Strategic Gap.	Noted. GBC's concerns about potential development in this area is noted.
Fareham Labour Party	3.21	Welcomes the reduction in housing numbers on greenfield sites. Development preferred at Welborne and on brownfield sites.	Support noted. The Local Plan Development Strategy is to prioritise urban and brownfield sites and minimise greenfield wherever possible.
Hallam (from LRM Planning)	3.22	Supports the designation of ASLQs but considers that preserving landscape quality should be given more weight in policy terms.	Support noted.
June Ward	3.27	Suggests a disparity between the eight growth areas shown in figure 3.2 and the actual number.	Figure 3.2 is historic demonstrating the eight potential growth areas that were considered in an earlier consultation (2019) and in the SA. Its inclusion is as part of the narrative for preparing the plan.
Unknown	3.27	Suggests a disparity between the eight growth areas shown in figure 3.2 and the actual number.	Figure 3.2 is historic demonstrating the eight potential growth areas that were considered in an earlier consultation (2019) and in the SA. Its inclusion is as part of the narrative for preparing the plan.
Mr Russ Wright	3.27	Suggests the calculations for housing need should be updated in line with the updated government 'algorithm'.	A further consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
Mrs Jill Wren	3.27	Suggests the calculations for housing need should be updated in line with the updated government 'algorithm'.	A further consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
Mrs Charlotte Varney	3.27	Suggests a disparity between the eight growth areas shown in figure 3.2 and the actual number.	Figure 3.2 is historic demonstrating the eight potential growth areas that were considered in an earlier

			consultation (2019) and in the SA. Its inclusion is as part of the narrative for preparing the plan.
Bryan Jezeph	DS1	Comments relates to the lack of policy provision for new education sites within the countryside, with many within the urban areas at or near capacity. Additional wording to DS1d suggested.	Disagree. Para 20 of the NPPF sets out national policy requirements for community facilities and services, which includes education. Policy DS1 criterion c) and d) in DS1 covers provision for new educational facilities in the countryside.
CPRE	DS1	Strong support for countryside-led spatial strategy with suggestion that Green Belt could assist the aspirations. Believes criterion e is unsound as permissions under HP4, HP5 and HP6 would undermine the protection of the countryside. Support for criteria i to iv.	Disagree that criterion e is unsound. Policy HP4 and HP6 directly relate to situations where applications may be submitted for countryside sites and so the additions of these policies are required to help the Council determine those applications. HP5 is about the delivery of affordable housing on a site, rather than its suitability as a countryside site – i.e. applications would be determined against the plan as a whole, not just the provision of affordable housing.
Mary Dwyer-Parker (from Robert Tutton)	DS1	Representation suggests that the urban area boundary should be defined on the western side of Botley Road as well as the east. Recognition that the openness of countryside can only be appreciated beyond the ends of the residential gardens.	Disagree. The Council does not consider the western side of Botley Road to be sufficiently urbanised to be included in the settlement boundary.
Fiona Earle	DS1	Suggests that policy HP4 and the link to DS1 would favour countryside sites over urban and brownfield.	Disagree. Policy HP4 directly relates to situations where applications may be submitted for countryside sites and so the additions of these policies are required to help the Council determine those applications.

Fiona Earle	DS1	The comment relates to the potential for Exemption sites to be permitted in the countryside, particularly the ASLQs, which the respondent says should not be permitted.	Disagree. The inclusion here of reference to HP4 does not prevent the development plan being used to determine the application as a whole. i.e. if Exception sites were proposed in ASLQs the impact on the landscape would need to be considered and policy tests in DS3 applied.
Gladman	DS1	Gladman oppose the use of settlement boundaries as an arbitrary tool that prevent sustainable development. Suggest that development in the countryside is only permitted under a narrow set of circumstances. Suggest a criteria-based policy is required to assess the specific circumstances of each proposal rather than sites being discounted because of an artificial boundary.	Disagree. The urban area boundary is drawn to reflect the principal urban areas of the Borough. Policy DS1 provides a number of criteria under which exceptions may be permitted.
Gosport Borough Council	DS1	While supporting the intention of the policy, GBC are concerned about the effectiveness, particularly in relation to the links to policy HP4, HP5 and HP6, and the potential for unintended development in the countryside. Of particular concern is development affecting the transport corridor to Gosport Borough.	Disagree that criterion e is unsound. Policy HP4 and HP6 directly relate to situations where applications may be submitted for countryside sites and so the additions of these policies are required to help the Council determine those applications. HP5 is about the delivery of affordable housing on a site, rather than its suitability as a countryside site – i.e. applications would be determined against the plan as a whole, not just the provision of affordable housing.
Graham Moyse (from Turley)	DS1	Suggests that the policy should be amended to make specific reference to development that requires a strategic highway network such as infrastructure that promotes electric vehicles.	Disagree. Location aspect already covered by point i. The provision of EV charging points alone would not be a sound basis for an exception to the development strategy unless it related to 'an overriding public need' (see



			DS1h). Provision of EV charging points is covered by policy NE8.
Iris Grist	DS1	Comment relates to the lack of a paper copy of the Local Plan being delivered to each home in the Borough. Also refers to an apparent inconsistency of approach by saying no development on Portsdown Hill but then proposing HA4 Downend Road.	The Council never made a commitment to deliver hard copies of the Local Plan to each address. The respondent confuses the Local Plan with the Fareham Today and there were delivery issues which the Communications Team have tried hard to address (including posting out a copy to those that requested by email or phone during the consultation). The comment relating to the lack of development on Portsdown Hill relates to the ASLQ designation, of which HA4 is not included.
Natural England	DS1	<p>Recommends that this policy cross-references to policy NE1 and NE2.</p> <p>Recommendation that the intrinsic value of soils is made more explicit and reference to a Defra document on protecting soils on construction sites is made.</p>	<p>Disagree. That the Local Plan should be read as a whole is set out in legislation. It is not necessary, nor practical to cross-refer to every policy.</p> <p>Disagree that the changes are necessary regarding important soils. Policy as worded is compliant with the NPPF.</p>
Hammond Family, Miller Homes and Bargate Homes (from Pegasus)	DS1	<p>Not clear what landscapes are being referred to in point ii, nor how to measure how the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside has been recognised.</p> <p>Suggest that point v should include an exemption where land permitted under HP4 and loss of BMV is permitted.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.39 fails to explain how DS1 applies to housing policies.</p>	<p>DS1ii refers to NPPF paras 20d and 170a and applies the same tests.</p> <p>Disagree, HP4 is an exception in itself to DS1, so no need to list all the exceptions e.g. a site permitted under HP4 may not comply with DS1e.</p>

			Disagree re para 3.39 – this paragraph explains that other housing policies apply in addition to DS1.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) 75 Holly Hill	DS1	Not clear what landscapes are being referred to in point ii, nor how to measure how the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside has been recognised. Suggest that point v should include an exemption where land permitted under HP4 and loss of BMV is permitted. Paragraph 3.39 fails to explain how DS1 applies to housing policies.	DS1ii refers to NPPF paras 20d and 170a and applies the same tests.  Disagree, HP4 is an exception in itself to DS1, so no need to list all the exceptions e.g. a site permitted under HP4 may not comply with DS1e.  Disagree re para 3.39 – this paragraph explains that other housing policies apply in addition to DS1.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) Land West of Old Street	DS1	Not clear what landscapes are being referred to in point ii, nor how to measure how the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside has been recognised. Suggest that point v should include an exemption where land permitted under HP4 and loss of BMV is permitted. Paragraph 3.39 fails to explain how DS1 applies to housing policies.	DS1ii refers to NPPF paras 20d and 170a and applies the same tests. Disagree, HP4 is an exception in itself to DS1, so no need to list all the exceptions e.g. a site permitted under HP4 may not comply with DS1e.  Disagree re para 3.39 – this paragraph explains that other housing policies apply in addition to DS1.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) HA1	DS1	Not clear what landscapes are being referred to in point ii, nor how to measure how the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside has been recognised. Suggest that point v should include an exemption where land permitted under HP4 and loss of BMV is permitted. Paragraph 3.39 fails to explain how DS1 applies to housing policies.	DS1ii refers to NPPF paras 20d and 170a and applies the same tests.  Disagree, HP4 is an exception in itself to DS1, so no need to list all the exceptions e.g. a site permitted under HP4 may not comply with DS1e.  Disagree re para 3.39 – this paragraph explains that other housing policies apply in addition to DS1.

Persimmon Homes	DS1	<p>Suggests that the Council should amend settlement boundaries to assist meeting housing need.</p> <p>Comments suggest DS1d is too limited and restricted just to existing educational sites.</p>	<p>Settlement boundaries have been reviewed in line with Publication Local Plan and to meet the need.</p> <p>Disagree. Para 20 of the NPPF sets out national policy requirements for community facilities and services, which includes education. Policy DS1 criterion c) and d) in DS1 covers provision for new educational facilities in the countryside.</p>
Wendy Ball	DS1	<p>Comment states that importance of protecting the countryside from unplanned and large-scale development, and sites of biological/geological importance, agricultural land and undeveloped coastlines.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>
Tobin Rickets (from Varsity Town Planning)	DS1	<p>Promotes land south of Hook Park Road for self-build development (c.50) and suggests that HP9 is another acceptable exception to countryside policy.</p>	<p>The land south of Hook Park Road is included in the SHELAA (Site 3004) as a discounted site.</p> <p>HP9 in itself does not warrant an exception to the development strategy. The Council can evidence that we can meet the SBCB need through the allocations made and policy approach.</p>
Unknown	DS1	<p>Suggests that HA1 should be excluded from the urban area boundary as it does not meet the requirements of DS1.</p>	<p>Disagree. HA1 is one of the allocations within the revised urban area. Therefore, there is no conflict with DS1.</p>
Tim Haynes	DS1	<p>The respondent is concerned with the degree of opinion within the technical evidence that would support a Strategic Gap boundary review within the Fareham-Stubbington Strategic Gap and that the</p>	<p>The Technical Review is a technical piece of work but an element of professional judgment will be involved in the conclusions - but this can be</p>

		link in DS1 to HP5 & 6 would allow developers to gain permission for 100% affordable homes on land in the countryside.	tested through consultation and examination.  HP6 does relate to exception sites which, within national policy, are allowed adjacent to existing settlements (para 71b of the NPPF). HP5 does not carry that same exemption, but to exclude it within DS1 might then dis-apply the AH provision on greenfield sites that may be permitted under exemption.
Iris Grist	DS1	The comment question whether the plan is making provision for the correct number of homes.	A further consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
Fiona Earle	DS1	Objection suggesting that should the Council not have a five year supply, the first 'area of search' would be outside the urban area.	Disagree. Policy HP4 directly relates to situations where applications may be submitted for countryside sites and so the additions of these policies are required to help the Council determine those applications.
Miller Homes (from Terence O'Rourke)	DS1	Concern that the policy is not consistent with national policy. Policy DS1 should not seek to prevent development on BMV agricultural land. Suggests it should be noted that other factors should be taken into consideration such as low-quality agricultural land may not be in accessible locations or suitable for development.  Criterion v) should be deleted as this is already covered by national policy.	Disagree. Paragraph 3.35 provides the justification for point v). However, in the planning balance every site would be considered on its own merit.
Mike Townson	DS1	Strongly support the policy particularly criterion v).	Support noted.
Richard Lundbech (from Robert Tutton)	DS1 (policies map)	Suggesting a revision to the settlement boundary around the boundary of Land West of Anchor House.	See response in summary for Policy HP1.

Mary Dwyer-Parker (from Robert Tutton)	DS1 (policies map)	Suggesting a revision to the settlement boundary along Botley Road	Disagree. The Council does not consider the western side of Botley Road to be sufficiently urbanised to be included in the settlement boundary.
James Morgan	DS1 (policies map)	Suggesting a revision to the settlement boundary along Brook Avenue	Noted. Urban area boundary to remain as proposed.
June Ward	3.37	Suggests a conflict in the definition of small-scale development, and queries if it is either less than 1ha or not more than four dwellings.	Sites of less than 1 ha is specified in the NPPF with an aspiration target of 10% of housing supply. Developments of not more than four dwellings, in policy HP2, is a response to this, but the terms are not conflicting, developments could be either or both.
Unknown	3.37	Suggests a conflict in the definition of small-scale development, and queries if it is either less than 1ha or not more than four dwellings.	Sites of less than 1 ha is specified in the NPPF with an aspiration target of 10% of housing supply. Developments of not more than four dwellings, in policy HP2, is a response to this, but the terms are not conflicting, developments could be either or both.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) 75 Holly Hill	3.39	Paragraph 3.39 fails to explain how the policy works in relation to housing policies.	Disagree. The supporting text explains that residential development in the countryside may be deemed acceptable if it is covered by one of the policies listed in criterion e).
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) Land West of Old Street	3.39	Paragraph 3.39 fails to explain how the policy works in relation to housing policies.	Disagree. The text explains that residential development in the countryside may be deemed acceptable if it is covered by one of the policies listed in criterion e).
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) HA1	3.39	Paragraph 3.39 fails to explain how the policy works in relation to housing policies.	Disagree. The text explains that residential development in the

			countryside may be deemed acceptable if it is covered by one of the policies listed in criterion e).
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) Sustainable Lane and Newgate Lane	3.43	Concern that the Council's interpretation of the NPPF in this paragraph is selective and as such misleading.	Noted.
Hallam Land (from LRM Planning)	3.44	<p>The respondent queries whether it is necessary to consider whether land identified in the current plan as Strategic Gap still requires protection and whether the boundaries can be justifiably amended, and whether any of the land can contribute towards a sustainable pattern of development.</p> <p>Suggests that the land south of Fareham should not be designated as Strategic Gap in this Local Plan as the designation cannot be justified. The site represents an eminently suitable location for development.</p>	<p>The Council has undertaken a Technical Review of the Strategic Gaps in the Borough.</p> <p>A further consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p>
Jim McIntosh	3.45	Concerned about the protection of the Stubbington Strategic Gap.	Noted.
Wendy Ball	DS2	It is essential that the gaps as currently defined prevent the coalescence of urban areas and separate the identities of settlements.	Noted.
Mrs Pamela Charlwood	DS2/3.46	Concern over the comments in the supporting text at paragraph 3.46 regarding the current Strategic Gap boundaries. Suggests that a coherent approach is adopted to resisting erosion around the current boundaries and approach to mitigation bids.	Noted. The Council has undertaken a Technical Review of the Strategic Gaps in the Borough. Policy DS2 is stringent in its approach that development is only permitted in the gap providing it meets the policy requirements.
Mr Jason Cullingham	DS2	Concern that the plan fails to be consistent in relation to the evidence on the strategic gap. Suggest the policy should protect or strengthen the boundary of the Fareham/Stubbington gap in perpetuity. Also concern that any development as a	Noted. The Council has undertaken a Technical Review of the Strategic Gaps in the Borough. Policy DS2 is stringent in its approach that development is only permitted in the

		result to changes in the gap would increase traffic levels, particularly around the Stubbington Bypass.	gap providing it meets the policy requirements.
Hammond Family, Miller Homes and Bargate Homes (from Pegasus)	DS2	<p>Strategic Gap 2 should be redefined to exclude all land to the east of Newgate Lane, between Newgate Lane and the settlement boundary of Bridgemary.</p> <p>Concern on the emphasis of the plan of maintaining the identify of Peel Common, and the attempt to justify the extension of the gap over what was previously HA2. HA2 is not considered to form part of the priority area to maintain the integrity and function of the gap.</p> <p>Study conducted by Pegasus concludes the gap between Peel Common and Bridgemary is weak and under development pressure.</p>	Disagree. The Council's Technical Review evidence base includes an assessment/review of the Fareham-Stubbington Strategic Gap and concludes that the boundaries should remain.
Hill Head Residents Association	DS2	Concern over the comments in the supporting text at paragraph 3.46 regarding the current Strategic Gap boundaries. Suggests that a coherent approach is adopted to resisting erosion around the current boundaries and approach to mitigation bids.	Noted. The Council has undertaken a Technical Review of the Strategic Gaps in the Borough. Policy DS2 is stringent in its approach that development is only permitted in the gap providing it meets the policy requirements.
CPRE	DS2	Suggests a green belt could help achieve the re-definition of strategic gaps in the Borough and wider area.	Noted. This will be addressed at the sub-regional level through the Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH) Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).
Gladman Developments	DS2	Concern that the policy as currently worded is negative, which may affect the consideration of development proposals. Suggest the policy is positively re-worded to allow an exercise to be undertaken to assess any harm to the visual and	Disagree. The focus of Policy DS2 is where development is not acceptable.

		functional separation of settlements against the benefits of a proposal.	
Gosport Borough Council	DS2	Supports the strategic gap which excludes land east of Newgate Lane East and that the formerly identified strategic growth area in the Fareham-Stubbington gap.	Support noted.
David Mugford	DS2	Concern over the assessment of the strategic gaps in the Borough and future decision making on this policy issue.	Noted.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) Sustainable Lane and Newgate Lane	DS2	<p>Concern on the emphasis of the plan of maintaining the identify of Peel Common, and the attempt to justify the extension of the gap over what was previously HA2. HA2 is not considered to form part of the priority area to maintain the integrity and function of the gap.</p> <p>Study conducted by Pegasus concludes the gap between Peel Common and Bridgemary is weak and under development pressure.</p> <p>Strategic Gap should be amended to exclude the Land at Newgate Lane (North and South).</p>	Disagree. The Council consulted on a reduction to the Stubbington-Fareham gap in 2019. The Publication plan shows no extension to the boundary.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) Land West of Old Street	DS2	Policy should only apply to land which provides a spatial function to maintain the separation of settlements and define settlement pattern. Policy DS2 should not apply to the land west of Old Street. This view is supported by the appeal Inspector (APP/A1720/W/18/3200409).	Disagree. The Appeal decision for Old Street demonstrates that the developments passes the strategic gap test, but another development proposal might not.
Persimmon Homes	DS2	Supports the inclusion of the physical and visual separation as a means of determining the gap boundary.	Support noted.
Elberry Properties Ltd (from Smith Simmons)	DS2	Suggest the strategic gap in the vicinity of Southampton Road should be amended.	Disagree. The Council has undertaken a Technical Review of the Strategic



			Gaps in the Borough and concludes that the gap boundaries should remain.
Tim Haynes	DS2	Concern over the uncertainty about the borders of the Fareham/Stubbington Gap which reduces the 'soundness' of the gap.	Noted. The Technical review has identified where gap boundaries could be reviewed in the future.
Mike Townson	DS2	Concern that strategic gaps create false and unnecessary boundaries and the boundaries should be judged by development policy criteria that can be evidence. The Stubbington Gap does not have environmental and landscape policy criteria that would exclude development.	Disagree. The Council has undertaken a Technical Review of the Strategic Gaps in the Borough and the review provides robust evidence for the boundaries to remain as they are. The Review assess the boundaries based on a number of environmental and landscape criteria set out in Chapter 1.
Reside Developments (from Turley)	DS2	Concern that the policy introduces a new strategic gap without justification, and covers the current planning application boundary for the South of Funtley, which the Council's evidence does not support. Suggests the boundary of the gap is amended to exclude the planning application boundary.	Disagree. The justification is within Chapter 3. The strategic gap doesn't include the allocation for HA10.
Winchester City Council	DS2	Considers Policy DS2 to be sound and satisfies the duty to cooperate in so far as it defined and protects the Meon Gap by defining the gap in a consistent way to those in Winchester.	Comment noted.
Stuart Batin	Paragraph 3.49	Suggests that in order to make the plan sound the land south of Romsey Avenue should be classified within the demarcation of the ASLQ. In addition, the recent evidence on landscape and gaps should include the land south of Romsey Avenue to demonstrate commitment to support the environment, particularly the Portsmouth Harbour SPA.	Disagree.

Hallam Land (from LRM Planning)	Paragraph 3.53	Agree that the Meon Valley is a distinctly valued landscape and a formal landscape designation is appropriate.	Comments noted.
Mrs Wendy Ball	DS3	The eight ASLQ's must be protected and enhanced.	Noted.
CPRE	DS3	Supports the intention to define the Borough's varied landscapes as ASLQ's. Suggests that these could be further protected if they formed part of a wider South Hampshire green belt.	Support noted.  This will be addressed at the sub-regional level through the Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH) Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).
Darren Jones	DS3	The respondent has commented to suggest that the ASLQ that includes Wicor Recreation Ground should be enlarged to include the high quality agricultural land (recognised as being high importance for Brent Geese and Solent Waders) to the north of the recreation ground and Portchester football club.	Noted. The ASLQ's have been assessed through the Council's evidence base.
David Lock Associates	DS3	Support the designation of the land to the east of Welborne as an ASLQ.	Support noted.
Graham Moyse (from Turley)	DS3	Suggest the policy would benefit from specific recognition that there will be forms of development that have specific locational requirements. Suggest the policy should include reference to supporting development where landscape impacts are addressed through appropriate landscape strategies.	Noted. Paragraph 3.57 sets out the requirements for development proposals and a landscape assessment would allow the applicant to provide details on landscape impacts/strategy/requirements.
Fiona Gray (Buckland)	DS3	Support the designation of the land to the east of Welborne as an ASLQ.	Support noted.
Historic England	DS3	Support criterion f) as part of the positive strategy for conserving and enhancing the historic environment.	Support noted.
Natural England	DS3	Welcomes the designation of eight ASLQ's within the Borough and the requirement for development	Noted.

		in these areas to meet criteria to protect and enhance landscape.	
Hammond Family, Miller Homes and Bargate Homes (from Pegasus)	DS3	Questions the Council's designation of ASLQ's. By designating the ASLQ's the Council is at risk of creating a policy that is irrelevant. Guidance states that non designated landscapes can be valued, and therefore site by site assessment would be required.	Disagree. The Council successfully defended appeals where the protection of valuable landscapes was a key deciding factor. The Council recognise there are areas of the Borough that have special landscape quality and therefore commissioned the relevant landscape evidence. In addition, the policy identifies landscape quality in line with Para 170a) of the NPPF.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) 75 Holly Hill	DS3	Questions the Council's designation of ASLQ's. By designating the ASLQ's the Council is at risk of creating a policy that is irrelevant. Guidance states that non designated landscapes can be valued, and therefore site by site assessment would be required. Suggests policy is deleted.	Disagree. The Council successfully defended appeals where the protection of valuable landscapes was a key deciding factor. The Council recognise there are areas of the Borough that have special landscape quality and therefore commissioned the relevant landscape evidence. In addition, the policy identifies landscape quality in line with Para 170a) of the NPPF.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) Old Street	DS3	Questions the Council's designation of ASLQ's. By designating the ASLQ's the Council is at risk of creating a policy that is irrelevant. Guidance states that non designated landscapes can be valued, and therefore site by site assessment would be required. Suggests policy is deleted.	Disagree. The Council successfully defended appeals where the protection of valuable landscapes was a key deciding factor. The Council recognise there are areas of the Borough that have special landscape quality and therefore commissioned the relevant landscape evidence. In addition, the policy identifies landscape quality in line with Para 170a) of the NPPF.

Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) HA1	DS3	Questions the Council's designation of ASLQ's. By designating the ASLQ's the Council is at risk of creating a policy that is irrelevant. Guidance states that non designated landscapes can be valued, and therefore site by site assessment would be required. Suggests policy is deleted.	Disagree. The Council successfully defended appeals where the protection of valuable landscapes was a key deciding factor. The Council recognise there are areas of the Borough that have special landscape quality and therefore commissioned the relevant landscape evidence. In addition, the policy identifies landscape quality in line with Para 170a) of the NPPF.
King Norris (from Pegasus) Brook Avenue	DS3	Questions the Council's designation of ASLQ's. By designating the ASLQ's the Council is at risk of creating a policy that is irrelevant. Guidance states that non designated landscapes can be valued, and therefore site by site assessment would be required. Suggests policy is deleted.	Disagree. The Council successfully defended appeals where the protection of valuable landscapes was a key deciding factor. The Council recognise there are areas of the Borough that have special landscape quality and therefore commissioned the relevant landscape evidence. In addition, the policy identifies landscape quality in line with Para 170a) of the NPPF.
Persimmon Homes	DS3	Concern that the first part of the policy significantly restricts development in the Meon Valley area. The justification for the inclusion of the policy is questionable.	Disagree. Para 170A of the NPPF doesn't preclude development.
Portsmouth City Council	DS3	PCC supports the identification of Portsdown Hill as an ASLQ and notes the evidence to support the allocation.	Support noted.
Robert Milliken	DS3	Suggests that Romsey Avenue farmland should be protected under Policy DS3.	Noted. We would support inclusion of this and the adjoining area of farmland within the ASLQ, as it is a primary support area for Brent geese and waders, linked to the Portsmouth Harbour SPA. It would support NPPF

			Para 170 (c) by maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, an important resource within the densely populated borough. The Council are proposing a change to the ASLQ to this area.
Mrs J Hill (from Robert Tutton)	DS3	The urban area of Tideways (No.50 – west of Newton Road) should be excluded from the ASLQ.	Noted. While this site lies within the Urban Settlement Boundary, it is also within the ASLQ, which includes the settlement edge. The woodland within private property along Newtown Road in Warsash forms an important valley edge feature and has been included. For inclusion of urban areas, see ASLQ Methodology Paragraphs 28 and 29. 'Inclusion of areas beyond LCA boundaries' and the definition of 'Landscape'.
Bargate Homes (Terraforma) Holly Hill Lane	DS3	Objects to the inclusion of the ASLQ within the plan. No clear explanation has been provided as why the boundaries of the ASLQ align with those of the Landscape Character Area. Considers that site at 75 Holly Hill Lane does not belong within the ASLQ.	Disagree. The assessment of the Landscape Character Areas (LCA's) is clearly provided in the Council's technical review of the ASLQ's
Mike Townson	DS3	Suggests that the coastal plains at Wicor and Chilling are compared on the maps as both being ASLQ's. Considers the farmland adjacent to Wicor as a supporting habitat to the Portsmouth Harbour SPA and the boundary of the ASLQ should be extended to including this.	Noted. We would support inclusion of this and the adjoining area of farmland within the ASLQ, as it is a primary support area for Brent geese and waders, linked to the Portsmouth Harbour SPA. It would support NPPF Para 170 (c) by maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, an important resource within the densely populated borough. The

			Council are proposing a change to the ASLQ to this area.
Turley on behalf of Reside Developments	DS3	The Council's evidence base does not include justification for the inclusion of the Land south of Funtley in an ASLQ. Considers that ASLQ's should not incorporate areas that could form allocations as it could restrict development and affect housing supply.	Disagree. The justification is within Chapter 3. The ASLQ doesn't include the allocation for HA10.
Mr Tobin Rickets (from Varsity Town Planning)	DS3	Concern that the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment goes too far in setting out where development can be located and should not be relied on as a development management tool. Suggests footnote 12 should be removed from the policy.	Disagree. Policy DS3 does not set out where development cannot be located.
Mrs Valerie Wyatt	DS3	Concern that policy contradicts other parts of the plan as it allows major development in the ASLQ's. Suggest policy is removed or re-written to provide greater protection to landscape.	Disagree. The development strategy, including Policy DS3 sets out where development may be deemed acceptable. <u>All developments</u> would need to undertake a landscape assessment and <u>major</u> development would need to undertake a comprehensive landscaping scheme.
Mr Ronald Wyatt	DS3	Concern that the policy is not consistent and query why major development is allowed in the ASLQ's. Suggests the word 'major' should be replaced with 'any'.	Disagree. The development strategy, including Policy DS3 sets out where development may be deemed acceptable. <u>All developments</u> would need to undertake a landscape assessment and <u>major</u> development would need to undertake a comprehensive landscaping scheme.
Hammond Family, Miller Homes and Bargate Homes (from Pegasus)	Paragraph 3.55	Suggests text is ambiguous and quality is only one aspect of landscape sensitivity.	Disagree. The text links to Policy DS3 which sets out the development should have regard to landscape character, quality and important

			features, which is derived from the GLVIA.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) 75 Holly Hill	Paragraph 3.55	Suggests text is ambiguous and quality is only one aspect of landscape sensitivity.	Disagree. The text links to Policy DS3 which sets out the development should have regard to landscape character, quality and important features, which is derived from the GLVIA.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) Land West of Old Street	Paragraph 3.55	Suggests text is ambiguous and quality is only one aspect of landscape sensitivity.	Disagree. The text links to Policy DS3 which sets out the development should have regard to landscape character, quality and important features, which is derived from the GLVIA.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) HA1	Paragraph 3.55	Suggests text is ambiguous and quality is only one aspect of landscape sensitivity.	Disagree. The text links to Policy DS3 which sets out the development should have regard to landscape character, quality and important features, which is derived from the GLVIA.
King Norris (from Pegasus) Brook Avenue	Paragraph 3.55	Suggests text is ambiguous and quality is only one aspect of landscape sensitivity.	Disagree. The text links to Policy DS3 which sets out the development should have regard to landscape character, quality and important features, which is derived from the GLVIA.
Hammond Family, Miller Homes and Bargate Homes (from Pegasus)	Paragraph 3.56	A specific reference and explanation should be provided as to how criterion a) – g) have been derived from the GLVIA.	Noted. The GLVIA guidance has been used as a basis for the Council's technical review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality. The GVLIA criteria is set out in Chapter 1 of the Review.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) 75 Holly Hill	Paragraph 3.56	A specific reference and explanation should be provided as to how criterion a) – g) have been derived from the GLVIA.	Noted. The GLVIA guidance has been used as a basis for the Council's technical review of Areas of Special

			Landscape Quality. The GVLIA criteria is set out in Chapter 1 of the Review.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) HA1	Paragraph 3.56	A specific reference and explanation should be provided as to how criterion a) – g) have been derived from the GLVIA.	Noted. The GLVIA guidance has been used as a basis for the Council's technical review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality. The GVLIA criteria is set out in Chapter 1 of the Review.
King Norris (from Pegasus) Brook Avenue	Paragraph 3.56	A specific reference and explanation should be provided as to how criterion a) – g) have been derived from the GLVIA.	Noted. The GLVIA guidance has been used as a basis for the Council's technical review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality. The GVLIA criteria is set out in Chapter 1 of the Review.
Hammond Family, Miller Homes and Bargate Homes (from Pegasus)	Paragraph 3.57	Reference to 'a proportionate landscape assessment' should be amended to require the submission of a 'Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment'. Reference to LVIA would be clear as to what is required.	Disagree. This incorporates an LVIA where required.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) 75 Holly Hill	Paragraph 3.57	Reference to 'a proportionate landscape assessment' should be amended to require the submission of a 'Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment'. Reference to LVIA would be clear as to what is required.	Disagree. This incorporates an LVIA where required.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) HA1	Paragraph 3.57	Reference to 'a proportionate landscape assessment' should be amended to require the submission of a 'Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment'. Reference to LVIA would be clear as to what is required.	Disagree. This incorporates an LVIA where required.
King Norris (from Pegasus) Brook Avenue	Paragraph 3.57	Reference to 'a proportionate landscape assessment' should be amended to require the submission of a 'Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment'. Reference to LVIA would be clear as to what is required.	Disagree. This incorporates an LVIA where required.



Representations on Chapter 4: Housing Need and Supply (Except Allocation Policies)			
Number of representations on policy: 57			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Aspbury Planning for Hamilton Russell	H1	Plan should allocate additional housing sites and the Council should seek to maximise housing in Fareham as the Borough's main town.	Noted. The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. The plan supports development of previously developed land and under-utilised buildings including in Fareham Town Centre.
Braddock, Robert	H1	Number of homes planned for Warsash/Locks Heath area unacceptable.	The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. It is accepted that this is not numerically even across the Borough.
Bryan Jezeph Consultancy Planning Burridge	H1	It is likely that the housing figures set out in Policy H1 will need to be revised	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
Bryan Jezeph Consultancy Planning	H1	Allocations should include land adjacent to HA33.	Noted. An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
Charlwood, Pamela (Hill Head Residents Association)	4.2	Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
Cooke, Janet	H1	Identified housing supply contradicts the aspirations of Para 2.12 "Strategic Priorities" which strive to maximise development within the urban area.	The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. The plan supports development of previously developed land.

Councillor Cunningham	4.2	Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
CPRE	H1	<p>Support the use of the latest housing projections from the ONS which show a considerable reduction in estimated local need.</p> <p>Agreeing to take unmet need from Portsmouth is premature as it predates the revised statement of common ground from PfSH,</p> <p>Significant reliance on Welborne which could have an impact on Fareham's overall strategy for delivery of its housing needs in the plan period.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Work with neighbouring authorities and PfSH regarding unmet housing need is ongoing.</p> <p>A delivery buffer has been applied due to the reliance on large sites such as Welborne.</p>
David Lock Associates for Buckland Development Ltd		Buckland committed to delivering Welborne, however, there are funding issues. Support Council's position to not revisit the Welborne Plan, and consider it sound. Consideration must be given to methods to unlock delivery.	Noted.
Eastleigh Borough Council	H1	Should any further changes be introduced to the standard methodology by the Government following this consultation, this Council would expect the proposed housing numbers to be revisited and subjected to further consultation. This should include a reconsideration of the SGAs.	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
Fareham Labour Party	H1	<p>Removal of sites in Portchester and Wallington and preservation of the strategic gap welcomed.</p> <p>Concerned at the level of development proposed for the Western Wards. Disappointed that greenfield sites remain under threat.</p> <p>Prioritising brownfield sites supported, including building higher density housing in existing town centres.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. It is accepted that this is not numerically even across the Borough. There are not sufficient brownfield sites available to meet the housing requirement and</p>

			<p>therefore the identification of greenfield sites is necessary.</p> <p>Support for prioritising brownfield sites noted.</p>
Foreman Homes	4.2, 4.8, 4.19 & H1	<p>Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.</p> <p>Sites with resolution to grant planning permission are not considered deliverable. It is not clear whether these figures have been removed from the projected land supply calculation in the Local Plan 2037.</p> <p>Removal of allocated sites HA16 and H20 is unjustified.</p>	<p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p> <p>The Local Plan is required to identify specific, deliverable sites for years one to five of the plan period and specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth beyond that. Therefore, the projected land supply includes a mixture of deliverable and developable housing sites.</p> <p>HA16 (Military Road) was discounted due to poor pedestrian and cycle links to local services as well as concerns relating to heritage at this site (proximity to Fort Wallington).</p> <p>H20 (North Wallington and Standard Way) was discounted due to noise and air quality concerns due to site's proximity to M27 motorway as well as poor pedestrian and cycle links to local services.</p>
Gladman	4.6, 4.12 & H1	<p>Proposed contribution towards unmet need supported, however, without a signed SOCG difficult to consider whether proposed level of housing is sufficient.</p>	<p>Work with neighbouring authorities and PfSH regarding unmet housing need is ongoing.</p>

		<p>Plan is not sound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.</p> <p>Stepped trajectory not justified or sound as it artificially suppresses housing delivery in the early years of the plan.</p> <p>15% buffer supported in principle; however, it does not provide any contingency due to reduced housing requirement. Given reliance on large sites the buffer should be 20% above the standard method figure.</p>	<p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p> <p>It is felt that the stepped housing requirement is justified in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Support for inclusion of a delivery buffer noted. However, it is considered that 15% is justified.</p>
Goodridge, Anthony	H1	Housing numbers are flawed and out of date.	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
Hampshire County Council Property	H1	Spatial approach to Policy H1 supported. Approach that is positively prepared, justified and deliverable within the Plan period (effective) based on the Borough Council's objectively assessed need and wider Local Plan evidence base.	Support for spatial approach noted.
Hampshire County Council	H1	It is recommended that reference is made to the need to meet a range of housing needs, including those in need of affordable housing and those in need of specialist housing including the elderly and people with disabilities in Strategic Policy H1.	The Local Plan should be read as a whole and there are other policies that address these issues.
Hawkins, Phillip	4.2, 4.7, 4.12, 4.16 & H1	<p>Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.</p> <p>Warsash Neighbourhood Forum were not consulted in relation to the intention to allocate housing. Warsash is taking an unfair share of proposed development.</p>	<p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p> <p>The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. It is</p>

		Despite contingency buffer, there is a heavy reliance on Welborne.	accepted that this is not numerically even across the Borough.  Noted re contingency buffer and reliance on Welborne.
Highways England	H1	Clarification should be sought with regards to the housing figures used within the SRTM model.  No objection to additional proposed allocations, however consideration will need to be given to assessing the cumulative impact of new sites that might be taken forward together with already planned growth in Fareham on the SRN.  The omission of the SGAs addresses some of the concerns previously raised by AECOM.	Comments noted.
Home Builders Federation	H1	Policy unsound as inconsistent with national policy; the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.  Policy does not include minimum required level of housing delivery and instead sets out expected delivery.  The plan does not adequately meet the unmet housing needs of neighbouring authorities.  The plan does not consider whether housing growth will be sufficient to support its economic growth expectations and the impact this would have on in commuting and the need to provide sustainable patterns of growth.  Past under delivery has not been dealt with.	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.  The minimum required level of housing is set out in Table 4.1, Policy H1 seeks to demonstrate how this will be delivered.  Work with neighbouring authorities and PfSH regarding unmet housing need is ongoing.  The affordability adjustment in the standard methodology is applied to take account of past under-delivery. The standard method identifies the minimum uplift that will be required and therefore it is not a requirement to

		<p>There should be evidence published to support the housing trajectory.</p> <p>Contingency buffer is welcomed, we would expect to see a similar level of buffer on the revised housing requirement.</p>	<p>specifically address under-delivery separately.</p> <p>Noted re housing trajectory.</p> <p>Support for level of contingency buffer noted.</p>
Jarman, Richard	4.5, 4.8 & H1	<p>In agreeing to take up a shortfall of 847 homes from Portsmouth, FBC has taken a risk as new method for calculating housing need hasn't been signed off by Government. Fareham have taken too much of a hit and should revisit building targets.</p> <p>Not including Welborne, Warsash is taking an unfair share of proposed development.</p>	<p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p> <p>The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. It is accepted that this is not numerically even across the Borough.</p>
Laws, Helen	H1	<p>Concern that the sewage system is not adequate for the number of new houses proposed.</p>	<p>Southern Water have been consulted on the proposed site allocations.</p>
LRM Planning for Hallam Land		<p>Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.</p> <p>Little evidence of a cogent understanding of the level of unmet need across neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>Significant under delivery in the borough both historically and in recent years.</p> <p>If plan is adopted in 2022, the plan period would be the bare minimum 15 years and not sufficiently flexible to respond to rapid change as per the NPPF.</p>	<p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p> <p>Work with neighbouring authorities and PfSH regarding unmet housing need is ongoing.</p> <p>The affordability adjustment in the standard methodology is applied to take account of past under-delivery. The standard method identifies the minimum uplift that will be required and therefore it is not a requirement to specifically address under-delivery separately.</p>

		<p>Delivery assumptions for Welborne flawed and a number of proposed allocations are not deliverable.</p> <p>Windfall allowance not justified and should be revised down or contingency increased.</p>	<p>There is no requirement for the plan period to be longer than 15 years.</p> <p>Delivery assumptions for Welborne have been based on the planning statement that was provided with the latest planning application.</p> <p>The Local Plan is required to identify specific, deliverable sites for years one to five of the plan period and specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth beyond that. Therefore, the projected land supply includes a mixture of deliverable and developable housing sites.</p> <p>Evidence behind the windfall rate used is set out the Windfall Background Paper.</p>
Maynard, Rose		Plan is unsound as it focusses too much development in one village. Allocations should have consideration to the designated countryside and build on brownfield sites only.	The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. It is accepted that this is not numerically even across the Borough.
Megginson, Hilary (Save Warsash)	4.2,4.5 & H1	<p>Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.</p> <p>Premature to agree to take unmet need from Portsmouth.</p>	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
Megginson, Rob	4.2 & H1	Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.

		Premature to agree to take unmet need from Portsmouth.	Work with neighbouring authorities and PfSH regarding unmet housing need is ongoing.
Metcalf, Steve	4.19	Support Romsey Avenue being removed from proposed allocations	Support noted.
Murphy, R A K	4.3	Existing households have to compete with buyers from anywhere when private property companies are involved, so the aims are unachievable.  Welborne numbers can be piled into first 10 years, so there can be a moratorium on speculative applications for this period.	Comments noted.
National Grid	4.20	One or more proposed allocations are crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets.	Noted.
Nixon, Christopher	H1	Housing requirement used is premature as the Government have not finalised the way the housing requirement is assessed.	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
Pegasus Group for Bargate Homes and Sustainable Land Newgate	4.4, 4.9 & H1	The plan does not adequately meet the unmet housing needs of neighbouring authorities.  Welborne Plan should be reviewed and given the importance of Welborne to housing delivery this is an issue of soundness and legal compliance.  Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.  Stepped trajectory not justified and exacerbate under delivery.	Work with neighbouring authorities and PfSH regarding unmet housing need is ongoing.  The adopted Local Plan Part 3: The Welborne Plan was assessed in line with the progress of the planning application for Welborne and was found to be fit for purpose. The delivery assumptions have been based on the planning statement that was provided with the latest planning application.  An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.



			It is felt that the stepped housing requirement is justified in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the Local Plan.
Pegasus Group for Bargate Homes 75 Holly Hill	4.1-4.20 & H1	<p>Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.</p> <p>The Council committed to an early review of the Local Plan (LP1, LP2 &amp; LP3) which was not done. The Welborne Plan should also be reviewed as delivery is questionable.</p> <p>Quantum of proposed development will not meet affordable housing needs in the Borough.</p> <p>The plan does not adequately meet the unmet housing needs of neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>Phasing outlines in Policy H1 will not meet the overall plan requirement and will exacerbate housing shortfall in the short term.</p>	<p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p> <p>The adopted Local Plan Part 3: The Welborne Plan was assessed in line with the progress of the planning application for Welborne and was found to be fit for purpose. The delivery assumptions have been based on the planning statement that was provided with the latest planning application.</p> <p>Work with neighbouring authorities and PfSH regarding unmet housing need is ongoing.</p> <p>The need for affordable housing in the Borough is based on the number of existing and newly formed households who lack their own housing and cannot afford to meet their housing needs in the market. Through calculating the affordable housing provision in line with the proposed policy (Policy HP5), the Council's affordable need will be met.</p> <p>The proposed stepped housing requirement will meet the housing</p>

			<p>requirement over the plan period and is considered to be justified in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the Local Plan.</p>
<p>Pegasus Group for Bargate Homes Land North and South of Greenaway Lane, Warsash</p>	<p>4.1-4.20 &amp; H1</p>	<p>Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.</p> <p>The Council committed to an early review of the Local Plan (LP1, LP2 &amp; LP3) which was not done. The Welborne Plan should also be reviewed as delivery is questionable.</p> <p>Quantum of proposed development will not meet affordable housing needs in the Borough.</p> <p>The plan does not adequately meet the unmet housing needs of neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>Phasing outlines in Policy H1 will not meet the overall plan requirement and will exacerbate housing shortfall in the short term.</p>	<p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p> <p>The adopted Local Plan Part 3: The Welborne Plan was assessed in line with the progress of the planning application for Welborne and was found to be fit for purpose. The delivery assumptions have been based on the planning statement that was provided with the latest planning application.</p> <p>The need for affordable housing in the Borough is based on the number of existing and newly formed households who lack their own housing and cannot afford to meet their housing needs in the market. Through calculating the affordable housing provision in line with the proposed policy (Policy HP5), the Council's affordable need will be met.</p> <p>Work with neighbouring authorities and PfSH regarding unmet housing need is ongoing.</p> <p>The proposed stepped housing requirement will meet the housing</p>

			<p>requirement over the plan period and is considered to be justified in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the Local Plan.</p>
<p>Pegasus Group for Bargate Homes Old Street, Stubbington</p>	<p>4.1-4.20 &amp; H1</p>	<p>Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.</p> <p>The Council committed to an early review of the Local Plan (LP1, LP2 &amp; LP3) which was not done. The Welborne Plan should also be reviewed as delivery is questionable.</p> <p>Quantum of proposed development will not meet affordable housing needs in the Borough.</p> <p>The plan does not adequately meet the unmet housing needs of neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>Phasing outlines in Policy H1 will not meet the overall plan requirement and will exacerbate housing shortfall in the short term.</p>	<p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p> <p>The adopted Local Plan Part 3: The Welborne Plan was assessed in line with the progress of the planning application for Welborne and was found to be fit for purpose. The delivery assumptions have been based on the planning statement that was provided with the latest planning application.</p> <p>The need for affordable housing in the Borough is based on the number of existing and newly formed households who lack their own housing and cannot afford to meet their housing needs in the market. Through calculating the affordable housing provision in line with the proposed policy (Policy HP5), the Council's affordable need will be met.</p> <p>Work with neighbouring authorities and PfSH regarding unmet housing need is ongoing.</p> <p>The proposed stepped housing requirement will meet the housing</p>

			<p>requirement over the plan period and is considered to be justified in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the Local Plan.</p>
Pegasus Group for Hammond Family, Miller & Bargate	4.1-4.20 & H1	<p>Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is not based on the Standard Methodology and therefore does not meet the objectively assessed need.</p> <p>The Council committed to an early review of the Local Plan (LP1, LP2 &amp; LP3) which was not done. The Welborne Plan should also be reviewed as delivery is questionable.</p> <p>Quantum of proposed development will not meet affordable housing needs in the Borough.</p> <p>The plan does not adequately meet the unmet housing needs of neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>Majority of housing sites identified are not 'deliverable' as defined by the NPPF.</p> <p>Phasing outlines in Policy H1 will not meet the overall plan requirement and will exacerbate housing shortfall in the short term.</p>	<p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p> <p>The adopted Local Plan Part 3: The Welborne Plan was assessed in line with the progress of the planning application for Welborne and was found to be fit for purpose. The delivery assumptions have been based on the planning statement that was provided with the latest planning application.</p> <p>The need for affordable housing in the Borough is based on the number of existing and newly formed households who lack their own housing and cannot afford to meet their housing needs in the market. Through calculating the affordable housing provision in line with the proposed policy (Policy HP5), the Council's affordable need will be met.</p> <p>Work with neighbouring authorities and PfSH regarding unmet housing need is ongoing.</p> <p>The Local Plan is required to identify specific, deliverable sites for years one</p>

			<p>to five of the plan period and specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth beyond that. Therefore, the projected land supply includes a mixture of deliverable and developable housing sites.</p> <p>The proposed stepped housing requirement will meet the housing requirement over the plan period and is considered to be justified in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the Local Plan.</p>
Pegasus Group for King Norris Brook Avenue, Warsash	4.1-4.20 & H1	<p>Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.</p> <p>The Council committed to an early review of the Local Plan (LP1, LP2 &amp; LP3) which was not done. The Welborne Plan should also be reviewed as delivery is questionable.</p> <p>Quantum of proposed development will not meet affordable housing needs in the Borough.</p> <p>The plan does not adequately meet the unmet housing needs of neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>Phasing outlines in Policy H1 will not meet the overall plan requirement and will exacerbate housing shortfall in the short term.</p>	<p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p> <p>The adopted Local Plan Part 3: The Welborne Plan was assessed in line with the progress of the planning application for Welborne and was found to be fit for purpose. The delivery assumptions have been based on the planning statement that was provided with the latest planning application.</p> <p>The need for affordable housing in the Borough is based on the number of existing and newly formed households who lack their own housing and cannot afford to meet their housing needs in the market. Through calculating the affordable housing provision in line with the proposed</p>

			<p>policy (Policy HP5), the Council's affordable need will be met.</p> <p>Work with neighbouring authorities and PfSH regarding unmet housing need is ongoing.</p> <p>The proposed stepped housing requirement will meet the housing requirement over the plan period and is considered to be justified in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the Local Plan.</p>
Persimmon Homes		<p>Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed and doesn't take account of the fact that the proposed methodology increased housing need in neighbouring authorities and therefore may look to Fareham to take more unmet need.</p> <p>The windfall paper does not provide a detailed breakdown of which sites are being considered as windfall, therefore figures can't be scrutinised and should not be included in the supply.</p> <p>Stepped trajectory at odds with NPPF. Policy H1 should be expressed as an average requirement.</p> <p>Questions raised as to deliverability of proposed allocation sites particularly Welborne.</p>	<p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p> <p>Noted re windfall paper. However, the windfall assumptions are supported by evidence which has regard to the strategic housing land availability assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends as per the NPPF.</p> <p>The stepped housing requirement is considered to be justified in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The delivery assumptions for Welborne have been based on the planning statement that was provided with the latest planning application.</p>

Pope, Samantha	H1	The Fareham local plan has used a now defuncted algorithm used to calculate the number of houses proposed within the area. The 800 plus homes allocated to the western wards should be recalculated using the new formula to ensure the western wards isn't saturated with new homes where it isn't required to meet government targets.	<p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p> <p>The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. It is accepted that this is not numerically even across the Borough.</p>
Portsmouth City Council	4.5	Contribution towards unmet need welcomed, however, request for FBC to take 1000. PCC & FBC will continue to work collaboratively to address strategic planning matters including addressing unmet need in the wider area.	Support for unmet need contribution noted. FBC will continue to work with PCC in this regard and work with PfSH is ongoing.
Prince-Wright, Russell	Page 38, 4.19	<p>LPA can consider Housing sites allocated in the previous adopted (extant) Local Plan. Yet, whilst HA1 did not feature in the extant 2015 Plan, page 38 ignores this, stating that housing will be provided through HA1 and other local sites.</p> <p>Housing policies HA(2,5,6,8,11,14,16,18,20,21,25) are no longer proposed allocations. So, why has HA1 been singled out as an allocation and where is the Evidence for the Objectively Assessed Housing Need in the local area to support this site allocation?</p>	<p>Previously identified housing sites from the adopted plan have been carried forward where they are still considered to be available and achievable. However further sites have been identified in order to meet the housing requirement.</p> <p>The housing requirement is a borough-wide figure and the distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites.</p>
Rees, Melvyn	H1	No evidence for removal of certain sites (South of Fareham) or inclusion of certain sites (HA4).	The reasons for sites being discounted in set out in the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal.
RSPB	4.19	Welcome exclusion of land at Romsey Avenue and land between Fareham and Stubbington.	Noted.

Scholes, Richard	H1	Number of homes proposed in Warsash has not been reduced despite an overall reduction in numbers.	The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. It is accepted that this is not numerically even across the Borough.
Smith Simmons for Elberry		<p>Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.</p> <p>Should overall need figure increase, the future contribution of windfall sites could be increased to meet any shortfall. Suggest an additional windfall contingency is allowed for in Policy H1 taking account of the likely capacity of brownfield sites.</p>	<p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p> <p>The windfall assumptions are supported by evidence which has regard to the strategic housing land availability assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends as per the NPPF.</p>
Southern Planning for Raymond Brown	4.1-4.20	<p>Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.</p> <p>The plan does not adequately meet the unmet housing needs of neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>The plan places an over reliance on large sites, particularly Welborne.</p> <p>Quantum of proposed development will not meet affordable housing needs in the Borough.</p> <p>Identified housing supply includes an overreliance on windfall.</p>	<p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p> <p>Work with neighbouring authorities and PfSH regarding unmet housing need is ongoing.</p> <p>A delivery buffer has been included due to the reliance on large sites such as Welborne.</p> <p>The need for affordable housing in the Borough is based on the number of existing and newly formed households who lack their own housing and cannot afford to meet their housing needs in the market. Through calculating the affordable housing provision in line with the proposed</p>



			<p>policy (Policy HP5), the Council's affordable need will be met.</p> <p>The windfall assumptions are supported by evidence which has regard to the strategic housing land availability assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends as per the NPPF.</p>
Terence O'Rourke for Miller Homes	4.2, 4.16 & H1	<p>Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.</p> <p>Stepped trajectory is inconsistent with the NPPF and creates shortfall in earlier part of plan period. Also, insufficient evidence to support the trajectory.</p> <p>There is an over reliance on Welborne and concerns about deliverability.</p>	<p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p> <p>The stepped housing requirement is considered to be justified in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The delivery buffer has been included to manage the risk associated with the reliance on large sites such as Welborne. The delivery assumptions for Welborne have been based on the planning statement that was provided with the latest planning application.</p>
Turley for Reside Developments	H1	<p>South of Funtley (HA10) can help FBC meet housing needs by delivering a greater quantum of development than currently proposed.</p> <p>Policy H1 is unsound as it is not positively prepared as it does not meet the areas objectively assessed needs and it is not in accordance with national policy, NPPF paragraph 60.</p>	<p>Noted re South of Funtley.</p> <p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p>

		Policy H1 does not fully address the duty to cooperate in terms of meeting the unmet needs of local authorities within the housing market area.	Work with neighbouring authorities and PfSH regarding unmet housing need is ongoing.
Turley for Southampton Solent University	H1	<p>Policy H1 is unsound as it does not meet the areas objectively assessed housing needs.</p> <p>Policy H1 does not take sufficient account of the scale of unmet need in adjacent local authority areas.</p> <p>Policy H1 does not take account of economic growth strategies for the wider (PfSH) area.</p>	<p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p> <p>Work with neighbouring authorities and PfSH regarding unmet housing need is ongoing.</p>
Varney, Charlotte	H1, 4.2, 4.8, 4.12, 4.16, 4.19	<p>Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.</p> <p>Para 4.8 Allows the LPA to consider Housing sites allocated in the previous adopted (extant) Local Plan. Yet, whilst HA1 did not feature in the extant 2015 Plan, page 38 ignores this, stating that housing will be provided through HA1 and other local sites. Warsash is taking an unfair share of proposed development. It is unclear why some allocations have been removed but not HA1.</p>	<p>An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.</p> <p>The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. It is accepted that this is not numerically even across the Borough.</p>
Ward, June	4.19	Not clear why HA1 is allocated but a number of other allocations have been removed.	Sites have been assessed through the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal.
Webb, Graham	H1	There should be no more building of houses anywhere in the Gosport/Fareham area.	Noted.
Winchester City Council	H1	Support the intention of Policy H1 to meet the Borough's housing need including providing an element to contribute towards meeting unmet need. However, figure is based on a consultation which is	Support for the intention of Policy H1 to meet the Borough's housing need noted.

		not yet confirmed, and similarly unmet need requirements will also be subject to changes to the standard method. It may be necessary for the Plan to be updated by way of Modifications in order to meet the test of soundness and the Duty to Cooperate in relation to the housing requirement.	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
Wren, Jill	4.2	Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
Wright, Jane	4.8	Paragraph 4.8 allows the LPA to consider housing sites allocated in the previous adopted plan, yet page 38 ignores this, stating that housing will be provided through HA1 and other local sites. Warsash is taking an unfair share of proposed development.	The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. It is accepted that this is not numerically even across the Borough.
Wright, Russ	H1	Housing requirement should be based on NPPF and revise strategic sites such as those in Warsash and Western Wards.	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
WYG for Vistry Group	4.2, 4.19	Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is not based on the standard methodology – further consultation should be undertaken.  HA8 (Pinks Hill) should be included in proposed allocations and remains available and deliverable.	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.  Noted re Pinks Hill.
Unknown Response 2	4.2	Plan is unsound as the housing requirement is based on a figure from a Government consultation that had not yet been agreed.	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.
Unknown Response 3	4.6	In agreeing to take up a shortfall in homes of 847 from Portsmouth, FBC are taking a risk as the new methodology for calculating Housing Need has not been signed off by the Government and the Housing Delivery test will not be available during this public consultation period.	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.  Work with neighbouring authorities and PfSH regarding unmet housing need is ongoing.

Representations on Policy FTC1 – Palmerston Car Park			
Number of representations on policy: 5			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Hampshire County Council Early Years		The plan does not indicate the provision of childcare facilities. These are generally small developments in dispersed locations; however collectively they create 428 dwellings in the Fareham Town Centre Area. A new Full Day Care nursery offering approximately 50 places has opened in Fareham Town Centre which may relieve the pressure on places in the area. The impact of new housing on childcare sufficiency in Fareham Town Centre will need to be closely monitored by SFYC.	Comments noted.
Historic England		A number of grade II listed buildings and structures, as well as a conservation area are located near to the site. These assets should be conserved and enhanced. The historic environment policies in section 12 of the plan and criteria c and d in policy FTC1 are considered appropriate for this purpose.	Comments noted.
Marshall, Robert		There would be an unacceptable loss of town centre parking and would therefore be harmful to the vitality of the town centre and in conflict with the NPPF.	Previous town centre parking survey work identified occupancy capacity at Osborn Road MSCP. It is understood that the MSCP is to be retained and as such capacity is available.

		An indicative yield of 20 dwellings would lead to housing forward of the building line to detriment of the character and appearance of the area generally and the adjoining Osborn Conservation area to the north of Osborn Road.	20 units is an indicative yield and is considered achievable on the site. The policy also requires proposals to respond to the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area.
Mayall, Charlotte		Local sewerage infrastructure to the site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development. There is a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network in order to provide additional capacity. It is recommended the following criterion is added to Policy "Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider."	Comments noted. Through the consideration of planning applications, the Council will ensure that occupation of development aligns with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider. Paragraph 11.53 (in relation to Policy D4) requires development proposals to demonstrate that there is adequate wastewater infrastructure and water supply capacity to serve the development or adequate provision can be made available.
Southern Planning for Raymond Brown		<p>The site is constrained by issues of noise and disturbance from the surrounding roads as well as the service access to the Shopping Centre.</p> <p>The setting of the adjacent Osborn Road Conservation Area to the north will need to be preserved.</p> <p>There doesn't appear to co-ordinated car parking strategy to ensure that the loss of existing car parking sites will not compromise objectives for the town centre.</p> <p>At the very minimum the proposal that this site can deliver up to 20 residential units must be questioned; furthermore, there is no confidence that the site is suitable, available and achievable.</p>	<p>Noise and disturbance from roads are not a constraint to development.</p> <p>The policy requires proposals to respond to the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area.</p> <p>Previous town centre parking survey work identified some occupancy capacity at Osborn Road MSCP. It is understood that the MSCP is to be retained and as such capacity is available.</p> <p>It is considered that the site is suitable, available and achievable as evidenced the Strategic Housing and</p>

			Employment Land Assessment. The council is confident in its delivery trajectory through regular contact with site promoters.
<b>Representations on Policy FTC2 – Market Quay</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 6</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Collins, Alan		Do we really need more retail outlets at Market Quay when there are so many empty retail units in Fareham already? In light of the current pandemic shouldn't the council be rethinking its policy? Retail is moving online we don't want or need more empty shops/charity shops.	The policy provides for approximately 4,000 sq.m (gross) of commercial leisure and retail space, it is considered that this provides sufficient flexibility for a variety of uses that will contribute towards the vitality of the town centre.
Hampshire County Council Early Years		The plan does not indicate the provision of childcare facilities. These are generally small developments in dispersed locations; however collectively they create 428 dwellings in the Fareham Town Centre Area. A new Full Day Care nursery offering approximately 50 places has opened in Fareham Town Centre which may relieve the pressure on places in the area. The impact of new housing on childcare sufficiency in Fareham Town Centre will need to be closely monitored by SFYC.	Comments noted.
Marshall, Robert		Allocation is unsound as the site is considered incapable of accommodating the extent of mixed-use development referred to.	It is considered that the proposed mix of uses is achievable on the site.

		<p>Reservations over the maximum suggested height of development.</p> <p>Given the importance of this town centre site, and the multiplicity of uses suggested a detailed development brief is essential to guide future development of the site to ensure a site that functions well and enhances this part of the town centre. However, the Policy does not set out this requirement.</p> <p>In the absence of evidence to support the building heights proposed reference to specific building heights should be removed. And it should be stated that the Council will support a mixed-use development incorporating some of the uses set out. The allocation should specify that a comprehensive development of the site will only take place in accordance with a detailed development brief.</p>	<p>The max storey height is responsive to the existing context and character of the town, maintaining its integrity and identity as a market town, but providing flexibility to achieve a viable outcome.</p> <p>Comments noted regarding use of a development brief.</p> <p>The max storey height is responsive to the existing context and character of the town, maintaining its integrity and identity as a market town, but providing flexibility to achieve a viable outcome.</p>
Southern Planning for Raymond Brown		<p>This site has been carried forward from the adopted Local Plan Part 2 where it was allocated for some 60 residential units, but has now, without explanation, been increased in the draft Plan to accommodate some 100 units. The site is also expected to deliver approx. 4000 sqm of commercial leisure space together with a new multi storey car park and new town square.</p> <p>The future and viability of town centre strategies may need a comprehensive review in a post Covid</p>	<p>Site capacities have been derived from concept design work and the council is satisfied that the broad quantum of development is realistic.</p>

		<p>era. The site-specific requirements also make reference to the possibility of a hotel which presumably, if brought forward, would impact on the achievement of other elements of the proposal, including the residential. There is no indication that there is any real prospect of bringing the site forward over and above aspirational objectives.</p> <p>At the very minimum the proposal that this site can deliver up to 100 residential units must be questioned; furthermore, there is no confidence that the site is suitable, available and achievable.</p>	<p>Noted that town centre strategies may need reviewing in light of Covid and the impact that may have longer term, however it is too early to be able to do that now.</p> <p>The site is considered to be suitable, available and achievable as evidenced by the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment. The council is confident in its delivery trajectory through regular contact with site promoters.</p>
Stephenson, Anne		<p>Proposed retail shouldn't draw people away from the present shopping areas as at present there are empty outlets in the precinct. Any town square needs feel a safe space and should not detract from the present town square which already seems under used and a bit of a 'ghost town' feel at times. I acknowledge the mention of roof gardens and balconies and think it is important to incorporate a green feel to this area as I think this is lacking in the present town centre. Use of green walls, street trees, water features that will actually work and be enjoyed (I have never seen the only water feature in West Street ever in operation and have lived here for 20 years). For example fountains that come out of the paving in a 'random' way that children could play in. Bearing in mind the projections for climate change bringing dryer and hotter summer we need opportunities for people to enjoy cool and shady areas and areas with a green</p>	<p>Comments noted. The policy provides sufficient flexibility for a variety of uses that will contribute towards the vitality of the town centre.</p>



		and natural feel are known to improve mental health.	
Symons, Penny		Excellent plan to provide housing in this central location. Well located for public transport as well as road access. All new housing in the centre of town is to be welcomed to stimulate reinvigoration, especially shops, cafes and other services.	Support noted.
<b>Representations on Policy FTC3 – Fareham Station East</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 6</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Aggregate Industries		<p>Aggregate Industries depot adjacent to the site is safeguarded in the adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan and this is not referenced in the policy. The depot plays a fundamental role in supplying the South East with aggregates. The policy should include a requirement for any future development proposals to incorporate appropriate stand offs, or other mitigation measures, in accordance with the agent of change principle as set out in paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>Site is complicated with issues around station car parking, station lease area, freight sidings and third-party land interests.</p>	<p>Criterion b) requires that vehicular access should be from the station approach road and should allow for continued use of the depot. Policy D2 will also be relevant to ensure good environmental conditions for all new and existing users of buildings and external space.</p> <p>Comments regarding constraints at the site noted.</p>
Hampshire County Council Early Years		The plan does not indicate the provision of childcare facilities. These are generally small developments in dispersed locations; however collectively they create 428 dwellings in the	Comments noted.

		Fareham Town Centre Area. A new Full Day Care nursery offering approximately 50 places has opened in Fareham Town Centre which may relieve the pressure on places in the area. The impact of new housing on childcare sufficiency in Fareham Town Centre will need to be closely monitored by SFYC.	
Marshall, Robert		This is a sustainable location for housing, an element of retail and café uses would also fit in well. However, concerns over reduction in parking for the train station. The fire station may need to be retained on site if it can't be relocated. Sufficient space is required to ensure a good public realm at the station approach. The adjacent gravel yard would be an issue in terms of noise and dust which has not been taken into account. No evidence has been put forward to show that the maximum 5 storey height would not be too high. It has not been shown how the proposed development at the scale outlined could be satisfactorily achieved.	<p>Support in terms of location noted.</p> <p>The policy requires sufficient parking to be retained, this could be redesigned to provide the same quantum e.g. multi storey.</p> <p>The policy states that a replacement fire and rescue operation is to be provided on site unless acceptable alternative provision is delivered elsewhere.</p> <p>Criterion f) requires new buildings to be set back to allow for high-quality public realm</p> <p>The building heights recognise the potential the station has as a gateway into the town centre. It is a max figure and further modelling work will identify a suitable and varied scale depending on specific siting.</p>
Southern Planning for Raymond Brown		There are questions about the suitability and achievability of this site for the intended development. This site has been carried forward from the adopted Local Plan Part 2 where it was allocated for some 90 residential units, but has	Comments noted. The council has undertaken design concept work that has identified a potential yield.

		<p>now, without explanation, been increased in the draft Plan to accommodate some 120 units. Question site assembly issues both in terms of achievability and timing.</p> <p>This is one of the sites where the issue does not simply relate to whether the site can properly accommodate the number of units being proposed, but the suitability availability and achievability must be questioned.</p>	<p>The site is considered suitable, available and achievable as evidenced in the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment. The council is confident in its delivery trajectory through regular contact with site promoters.</p>
Southern Water (Charlotte Mayall)		<p>Local sewerage infrastructure to the site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development. There is a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network in order to provide additional capacity. It is recommended the following criterion is added to Policy "Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider."</p>	<p>Comments noted. Through the consideration of planning applications, the Council will ensure that occupation of development aligns with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider. Paragraph 11.53 (in relation to Policy D4) requires development proposals to demonstrate that there is adequate wastewater infrastructure and water supply capacity to serve the development or adequate provision can be made available.</p>
Symons, Penny		<p>Excellent plan to provide housing in this central location. Well located for public transport as well as road access. All new housing in the centre of town is to be welcomed to stimulate reinvigoration, especially shops, cafes and other services.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

## Representations on Policy FTC4 – Fareham Station West

Number of representations on policy: 7

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Aggregate Industries		<p>Aggregate Industries depot adjacent to the site is safeguarded in the adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan and this is not referenced in the policy. The depot plays a fundamental role in supplying the South East with aggregates. The policy should include a requirement for any future development proposals to incorporate appropriate stand offs, or other mitigation measures, in accordance with the agent of change principle as set out in paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>Main issue with site is that it currently has operational equipment located on it.</p>	<p>Criterion b) requires that vehicular access should be from the station approach road and should allow for continued use of the depot. Policy D2 will also be relevant to ensure good environmental conditions for all new and existing users of buildings and external space.</p> <p>Comments regarding constraints at the site noted.</p>
Environment Agency (Laura Lax)		<p>Part of this site lies within current day flood zone 2, there is also a culverted watercourse that flows beneath the site. We are supportive of bullet points (i) and (j) within this policy that recognise these key issues and require full consideration of them within any proposal that comes forward. This is essential to allow the safe redevelopment of the site by ensuring that flood risk is not increased and reduced wherever possible.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
Hampshire County Council Early Years		<p>The plan does not indicate the provision of childcare facilities. These are generally small</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

		developments in dispersed locations; however collectively they create 428 dwellings in the Fareham Town Centre Area. A new Full Day Care nursery offering approximately 50 places has opened in Fareham Town Centre which may relieve the pressure on places in the area. The impact of new housing on childcare sufficiency in Fareham Town Centre will need to be closely monitored by SFYC.	
Southern Planning for Raymond Brown		This is a long and very narrow site sandwiched between the railway to the east and protected trees to the west. Multiple constraints include, amongst others, the multiple uses existing on the site, the access constraints including that the existing access crosses land in Flood Zone 2, noise, contamination and amenity issues. Questions over suitability availability and achievability.	Comments noted. The site is considered suitable, available and achievable as evidenced in the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment.
Southern Water (Charlotte Mayall)		Local sewerage infrastructure to the site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development. There is a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network in order to provide additional capacity. It is recommended the following criterion is added to Policy "Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider."	Comments noted. Through the consideration of planning applications, the Council will ensure that occupation of development aligns with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider. Paragraph 11.53 (in relation to Policy D4) requires development proposals to demonstrate that there is adequate wastewater infrastructure and water supply capacity to serve the development or adequate provision can be made available.
Stephenson, Anne		TPOs must be respected as mature trees are so important to maintain biodiversity and landscape value as even if trees are planted in their place it takes a long time for them to grow to replace properly mature trees that are felled. There should	The policy requires TPO trees to be retained. Furthermore, Policy NE6 requires trees, woodland and hedgerow to be replaced where their loss is unavoidable. This is

		also be a 5 new for one policy to replace any trees felled and a requirement for any developer to maintain any trees planted for at least 3 years after planting.	considered to be an appropriate strategy.
Symons, Penny		Excellent plan to provide housing in this central location. Well located for public transport as well as road access. All new housing in the centre of town is to be welcomed to stimulate reinvigoration, especially shops, cafes and other services.	Support noted.
<b>Representations on Policy FTC5 – Crofton Conservatories</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 2</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Hampshire County Council Early Years		The plan does not indicate the provision of childcare facilities. These are generally small developments in dispersed locations; however collectively they create 428 dwellings in the Fareham Town Centre Area. A new Full Day Care nursery offering approximately 50 places has opened in Fareham Town Centre which may relieve the pressure on places in the area. The impact of new housing on childcare sufficiency in Fareham Town Centre will need to be closely monitored by SFYC.	Comments noted.
Southern Planning for Raymond Brown		This site continues to be in active retail use, following the expiry of a temporary permission for retail use and the potential availability of the site is questioned.	The Local Plan is not required to only identify sites that are available immediately for development. Crofton Conservatories is identified as a source of supply later in the plan period.

Representations on Policy FTC6 – Magistrates Court			
Number of representations on policy: 3			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Hampshire County Council Early Years		The plan does not indicate the provision of childcare facilities. These are generally small developments in dispersed locations; however collectively they create 428 dwellings in the Fareham Town Centre Area. A new Full Day Care nursery offering approximately 50 places has opened in Fareham Town Centre which may relieve the pressure on places in the area. The impact of new housing on childcare sufficiency in Fareham Town Centre will need to be closely monitored by SFYC.	Comments noted.
Southern Planning for Raymond Brown		There are potential constraints with a number of the other sites, which may at the very least delay their delivery or even bring into question their achievability. Site FTC6, Magistrates Court at Fareham and allocated for some 45 units is held up by a complicated deal to resolve the nitrates issue, involving land within Winchester District.	The council is confident in its delivery trajectory through regular contact with site promoters.
Symons, Penny		Excellent location and single person/couple accommodation units would be very popular.	Support noted.

Representations on Policy HA1 – North and South of Greenaway Lane			
Number of representations on policy: 28			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Bryan Jezeph Consultancy		<p>Supports uplift in yield for this allocation.</p> <p>Objects to exclusion of 59 Greenaway lane (SHELAA Ref 3189)</p> <p>Object to criterion d (ecology corridor). This should be determined at detailed stage.</p> <p>Treed areas too extensive and not accurate. Object to criterion g protection of trees. More flexibility needed to account for poor quality specimens</p>	<p>Support on yield noted</p> <p>Suggested change</p> <p>Mapping change – bring policy map, allocation map and framework plan in line with allocation policy.</p> <p>Disagree. The framework identifies corridors based on known potential. This can be refined following detailed survey, but the principle of connected corridors and retention and management of future corridors needs to be addressed at this stage.</p> <p>Criterion (g) refers to TPO trees and poor specimen trees can be identified at detailed stage. However, trees are not identified just for visual amenity but their biodiversity and climate change value and included in such areas.</p>



		<p>Green area adjacent to Lockwood Road required for Suds</p> <p>No need for footpath through whole SE corner</p> <p>Object to criterion k off-site sports provision not justified. Alternative wording to criteria suggested.</p>	<p>SuDS is also to be designed for biodiversity and habitat creation and is reflected in submitted nitrogen budget. Suggested Change -amend extent of tree and habitat buffer to include SuDS area</p> <p>Footpath links are indicative and subject to future layout, route quality, and POS integration.</p> <p>Disagree. Obligations SPD seeks on site provision and financial contributions off site. Contributions are for the whole allocation and a proportionate approach is appropriate for individual sites.</p>
Bryan Jezeph for Land and Partners	Fig 4.1	New framework Plan submitted by BJC reflecting changes sought by separate narrative response to HA1 above.	<p>Noted. No change to plan necessary in light of responses to issues raised above.</p> <p>Suggested change</p> <p>Change to boundary at rear of 81 Warsash Road.</p>
CPRE		Allocation is not truly sustainable, relies on the car as the main means of transport. concerned about lack of a masterplan. framework does not fulfil a place making function.	Noted. Car will often be the prime movement mechanism for certain journeys. The framework includes a large connected area of parkland and natural greenspace for leisure trips and links to nearby shopping facilities. Sense of place delivered through central connected open space(s).
Da Silva, Robyn		Does not comply with habitats directive as it will not improve designated sites.	Plan level HRA carried out which concludes with appropriate mitigation

		<p>Insufficient infrastructure to support scale of development</p> <p>Insufficient analysis to support 1500-2000 additional cars on the network</p>	<p>the plan will have no adverse effects on the integrity of designated sites.</p> <p>Disagree. Appropriate infrastructure considered through IDP and suitable on site or financial contributions have/will be sought.</p> <p>TA identifies traffic impact at strategic level and site level through application process.</p>
Dickenson, Tasmin		<p>HA1 has no joined up "Master Plan. developers working in isolation. FBC absolving itself to plan properly for additional community infrastructure pressures.</p> <p>Unclear how objectively assessed need for this site determined.</p> <p>Cannot accord with habitats directive as Does not accord with Habitats directive as development likely to negatively affect identified sites e.g. SAC. Rather than enhanced as policy requires.</p>	<p>A masterplan/framework is shown in Figure 4.1 which sets out key principles and approaches to development but is currently of limited weight. Negotiation and decision making at application stage has regard to masterplan but alternative approaches that meet NPPF and Development Plan policies must be considered.</p> <p>Objectively assessed housing need in calculated on a Borough wide basis and the distribution of sites is a produce of the spatial strategy and availability of suitable sites.</p> <p>A plan level HRA was carried out which concludes with appropriate mitigation the plan will have no adverse effects on the integrity of designated sites.</p>

		<p>HA1 goes against strategic policies to avoid greenfield sites, retain settlement identity and valued landscapes. Urban area boundary should not be redrawn to include this site.</p> <p>Development will negatively affect character of Greenaway lane and would have unacceptable environmental, amenity and adverse traffic and associated site junction safety issues.</p> <p>HA1 does not identify nursery, pre-school or secondary school within the development area. Suggests detailed long-term infrastructure planning to include retail, parking, schools, GP's, traffic to 2037 timeline and which requires FORMAL community consultation at regular intervals.</p> <p>Lessening of proposed number of dwellings to maintain some green space in the village and improve living conditions for all residents, old and new.</p> <p>Requirement to have an integrated plan, not a one by one for individual developers, which lessens community funds and doesn't account for the cumulative impact on the village.</p>	<p>The strategic priorities set out that development in the urban area will be prioritised, however, there are not sufficient brownfield sites to meet the Borough's housing requirement. The site is not within a designated valued landscape.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Appropriate infrastructure considered through IDP and suitable on site or financial contributions have/will be sought. IDP has been consulted on throughout the Local Plan process.</p> <p>Many of the sites already have planning permission or a resolution to grant planning permission.</p> <p>The Indicative Framework Plan in Figure 4.1 provides a framework for individual developers to work to. However, developer contributions are payable relative in scale to each proposal which deals with cumulative impact of housing.</p>
Earle, Fiona		Masterplan not being followed. Greenspaces not being kept.	The masterplan/framework sets out key principles and approaches to

		Insufficient roads, schools, healthcare infrastructure to cope. Only 500 units appropriate.	development but is currently of limited weight. Negotiation and decision making at application stage has regard to masterplan but alternative approaches that meet NPPF and Development Plan policies must be considered.  Disagree. Appropriate infrastructure considered through IDP and suitable on site or financial contributions have/will be sought. TA identifies traffic impact at strategic level and site level through application process.
Foreman Homes		Supports principle and specific policy wording of allocation	Support noted.
Gage, Philip		Insufficient infrastructure and land to deal with increased population eg health, education, parking, road capacity.	Appropriate infrastructure considered through IDP and suitable on site or financial contributions have/will be sought.
Hampshire County Council		Welcomes need for developer contributions to provide additional educational infrastructure where required. Pedestrian and cycle paths should be provided to local schools and existing routes enhanced where necessary to promote active travel to and from schools.  County Council do not require that an application for the site be accompanied by a Minerals Assessment, as outlined in site-specific requirement j).	Infrastructure and contributions will be required in line with Policy TIN4  Suggested change  Remove reference to minerals assessment.
Hampshire County Council (Early Years)		This proposal would generate demand for an additional 50+ childcare places. The respective development allocations within the draft local plan require proposals to address these needs	Infrastructure will need to be provided in line with TIN4. Covered by point k) of the policy.

		either directly or by way of a financial contribution. These places are essential, to meet the needs of working families.	
Hawkins, Philip		<p>Unfair distribution of houses across the borough.</p> <p>Does not accord with habitats directive as development likely to negatively affect identified sites e.g. SAC. Developers working in isolation of each other, increasing the potential adverse harm.</p> <p>Boundaries adjusted to suit developers. Biased approach. HA1 goes against strategic policies to avoid greenfield sites, retain settlement identity and valued landscapes. Development will negatively affect character of Greenaway lane. Development would have intolerable environmental, amenity and adverse traffic and associated site junction safety issues.</p> <p>No justification for junior pitches</p>	<p>Noted. The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites.</p> <p>Plan level HRA carried out which concludes with appropriate mitigation the plan will have no adverse effects on the integrity of designated sites.</p> <p>Noted. Site boundaries are determined by land ownership. The strategic priorities set out that development in the urban area will be prioritised, however, there are not sufficient brownfield sites to meet the Borough's housing requirement.</p> <p>Playing pitch need is evidenced by the Playing Pitch Strategy.</p>
Holford, Rex		<p>Unfair distribution of houses across the borough.</p> <p>Adverse impact on road infrastructure as well as local centre capacity.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites.</p> <p>The TA identifies traffic impact at strategic level and site level through application process.</p>
Maynard, Rose		Number of houses is far too intensive for this site, which is designate countryside and is important site for wildlife. Development numbers should be reduced allowing green space	Comments noted. A large proportion of the site already has planning permission or resolution to grant planning permission. The policy sets a

		<p>to border all road frontages so that the development doesn't impinge on existing residents.</p> <p>(b) There should be more access onto Lockwood Road so that Brook Lane which is a main cycle route for children going to the Secondary School are kept safe.</p>	<p>requirement for wildlife corridors and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Lockwood Road is identified in the policy as an area where primary highways access should be achieved.</p>
Pegasus Group for Bargate Homes		<p>Considers allocation sound and supported.</p> <p>Alterations needed to wording so that it is not interpreted as precluding a primary access onto Greenaway lane, which has been agreed through an outline permission</p> <p>Supports principle of ped and cycle links subject to land control</p> <p>Object to limitation of 2.5 storey buildings</p> <p>Objects to lack of flexibility on protecting all TPO trees.</p> <p>Objects to inclusion of need for minerals safeguarding assessment</p> <p>More flexibility on wording of financial contributions if they are not required. Object to contribution towards health as not justified.</p>	<p>Support for allocation noted.</p> <p>Policy states that primary highways access should be focussed on Brook Lane and Lockwood Road. Access to Greenaway Lane is to be 'limited'.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>2.5 storey considered appropriate for the site in line with the surrounding residential properties (as acknowledged by Bargate's Design and Access statement June 2017)</p> <p>Noted. However, it is considered appropriate to seek to retain all TPO trees.</p> <p>Suggested change</p> <p>Remove requirement for Minerals Assessment in criterion j).</p> <p>Criterion k) considered sufficiently flexible. Justification for contribution sought set out in the IDP.</p>

		Object to provision of junior sports pitches. Not justified. More flexibility required for off-site financial contributions to sports pitches.	The need for junior sports pitches is evidenced in the Playing Pitch Strategy. The SPD would require more to be provided on site; two junior pitches on site is considered a minimum with flexibility for financial contributions for the remainder.
Pope, Samantha		<p>Plan does not include specific transport assessment for HA1 allocation, and no contributions / schemes identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the western wards. This should be undertaken. There is a no reference to reducing congestion by 2036</p> <p>IDP seeks early years and education contributions but no sites identified in HA1.</p> <p>Similar issue for healthcare and local retail to support population demand.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The TA identifies traffic impact at strategic level and site level through application process.</p> <p>Contributions are in place of on-site provision.</p> <p>Appropriate infrastructure considered through IDP and suitable on site or financial contributions have/will be sought.</p>
Russell, Hazel		<p>Unfair distribution of houses across the borough Housing Allocation in an already overburdened area for which no new infrastructure is planned.</p> <p>HA1 has no joined up "Master Plan. Developers working in isolation.</p>	<p>Noted. The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. Appropriate infrastructure considered through IDP and suitable on site or financial contributions have/will be sought.</p> <p>A masterplan/framework is shown in Figure 4.1 which sets out key principles and approaches to development but is currently of limited</p>

		<p>Boundaries adjusted to suit developers. Biased approach.</p> <p>Does not accord with habitats directive as development likely to negatively affect identified sites e.g. SAC.</p> <p>HA1 goes against strategic policies to avoid greenfield sites, retain settlement identity and valued landscapes.</p> <p>Development will negatively affect character of Greenaway lane and would have intolerable environmental, amenity and adverse traffic and associated site junction safety issues.</p> <p>Junior pitches not shown</p>	<p>weight. Negotiation and decision making at application stage has regard to masterplan but alternative approaches that meet NPPF and Development Plan policies must be considered.</p> <p>Site boundaries are determined by land ownership.</p> <p>Plan level HRA carried out which concludes with appropriate mitigation the plan will have no adverse effects on the integrity of designated sites.</p> <p>The strategic priorities set out that development in the urban area will be prioritised, however, there are not sufficient brownfield sites to meet the Borough's housing requirement. The site is not within a designated valued landscape.</p> <p>Comments noted. The TA identifies traffic impact at strategic level and site level through application process.</p> <p>The framework plan is indicative, providing a degree of flexibility. It's for the detail of the planning applications to determine precise location of pitches.</p>
Southern Water		Preliminary assessment of the capacity	Comments noted. Through the consideration of planning applications,



		<p>reveals that existing local sewerage infrastructure to the site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development. Limited capacity is not a constraint to development provided that planning policy and subsequent conditions ensure that occupation of the development is phased to align with the delivery of new wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>Connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of foul flooding unless the requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation.</p> <p>In consideration of the above, we recommend the following criterion is added to Policy HA1; 'Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider.'</p>	<p>the Council will ensure that occupation of development aligns with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider. Paragraph 11.53 (in relation to Policy D4) requires development proposals to demonstrate that there is adequate wastewater infrastructure and water supply capacity to serve the development or adequate provision can be made available.</p>
Stephenson, Anne		<p>Tree Preservation Orders must be respected for biodiversity and landscape value</p>	<p>Criterion g) requires that existing trees subject to a TPO are retained and incorporated within the design and layout of proposals.</p>
Symons, Penny		<p>Ridiculous number of new homes with no nearby public transport, oversubscribed schools, GPs and dentists and grid-locked roads at rush-hours, including M27 junctions. Entrances onto Brook Lane will be very clogged and dangerous.</p> <p>Inadequate parking will be provided so parking spillage in surrounding residential roads will be a nightmare Yellow lines will need to be introduced. Gridlocks also at junctions with A27.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Appropriate infrastructure considered through IDP and suitable on site or financial contributions have/will be sought. The TA identifies traffic impact at strategic level and site level through application process.</p> <p>Parking will be required to be provided in line with the Parking SPD.</p>

Thackker, Jane		<p>Contrary to Plan Policy that seeks to retain settlement identity by linking Warsash and Locks Heath. Seeks no infill in this location.</p> <p>Inadequate education and health facilities to cater for proposal.</p> <p>Suggests reduction in numbers to protect, preserve and enhance character of Warsash.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Appropriate infrastructure considered through IDP and suitable on site or financial contributions have/will be sought.</p> <p>Many of the sites already have planning permission or a resolution to grant planning permission.</p>
Unknown Resident (1)		<p>Unfair distribution of houses across the borough. Not based on objectively assessed need for this area.</p> <p>HA1 has no joined up "Master Plan. developers working in isolation.</p> <p>FBC absolving itself to plan properly for additional community infrastructure pressures.</p> <p>New environmental impact assessment required</p>	<p>Comments noted. The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites.</p> <p>A masterplan/framework is shown in Figure 4.1 which sets out key principles and approaches to development but is currently of limited weight. Negotiation and decision making at application stage has regard to masterplan but alternative approaches that meet NPPF and Development Plan policies must be considered.</p> <p>Appropriate infrastructure considered through IDP and suitable on site or financial contributions have/will be sought.</p> <p>Environmental Impact Assessments relate to planning applications.</p>

		<p>Boundaries adjusted to suit developers. Biased approach.</p> <p>HA1 goes against strategic policies to avoid greenfield sites, retain settlement identity and valued landscapes</p> <p>Development will negatively affect character of Greenaway Lane and would have intolerable environmental, amenity and adverse traffic and associated site junction safety issues. Detailed Transport Assessment needed for this allocation</p> <p>Junior pitches not shown.</p> <p>Numbers should be reduced.</p> <p>Cannot accord with habitats directive as development likely to negatively affect identified sites e.g. SAC. Rather than enhanced as policy requires.</p>	<p>Site boundaries are determined by land ownership.</p> <p>The strategic priorities set out that development in the urban area will be prioritised, however, there are not sufficient brownfield sites to meet the Borough's housing requirement. The site is not within a designated valued landscape.</p> <p>Comments noted. The TA identifies traffic impact at strategic level and site level through application process.</p> <p>The framework plan is indicative, providing a degree of flexibility. It's for the detail of the planning applications to determine precise location of pitches.</p> <p>Many of the land parcels already have planning permission or a resolution to grant planning permission.</p> <p>Plan level HRA carried out which concludes with appropriate mitigation the plan will have no adverse effects on the integrity of designated sites.</p>
Unknown Resident (2)		<p>Unfair distribution of houses across the borough. (proposed at 830 dwellings) to contribute 62% of total. Should be reduced in line with overall</p>	<p>Objectively assessed housing need is calculated at a Borough wide level. The distribution of sites is a product of</p>

		<p>reduction. A separate objectively assessed need for Warsash alone should be conducted.</p> <p>There is no joined up “Masterplan” for HA1 with developers working in complete isolation of one another. Therefore, another environmental impact assessment must be conducted showing the cumulative effect of HA1 in its entirety. Cannot accord with habitats directive as does not accord with Habitats directive as development likely to negatively affect identified sites e.g. SAC. Rather than enhanced as policy requires. Allocation must be consistent with Natural England advice and Habitats directive.</p> <p>HA1 goes against strategic policies to avoid greenfield sites, retain settlement identity and valued landscapes. Such sites should not be allocated until Warsah area objectively assessed need is undertaken.</p>	<p>the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites.</p> <p>A masterplan/framework is shown in Figure 4.1 which sets out key principles and approaches to development but is currently of limited weight. Negotiation and decision making at application stage has regard to masterplan but alternative approaches that meet NPPF and Development Plan policies must be considered. A plan level HRA was carried out which concludes with appropriate mitigation the plan will have no adverse effects on the integrity of designated sites.</p> <p>The strategic priorities set out that development in the urban area will be prioritised, however, there are not sufficient brownfield sites to meet the Borough’s housing requirement. The site is not within a designated valued landscape.</p>
Unknown Resident (3)		<p>HA1 fails to meet criteria e) of HP1 as the proposal would demonstrably have unacceptable environmental, amenity and traffic implications.</p> <p>HA1 Allocation needs to be re-evaluated to ensure the appropriate amount of infrastructure and</p>	<p>Comments noted. HP1 doesn’t have a criteria e). We believe the comment is referring to HP4. The site has been assessed through the SA and transport assessment and it is considered that there would not be unacceptable impacts.</p> <p>Objectively assessed housing need is calculated at a Borough wide level.</p>

		amenities are delivered before any development begins. This should include an objectively assessed need for Warsash only.	The distribution of sites is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites.
Ward, June		<p>No joined up thinking, developers working in isolation with no thought to environmental impact.</p> <p>Boundaries adjusted to suit developers.</p> <p>Biased approach cannot accord with habitats directive as development likely to negatively affect identified sites e.g. SAC.</p>	<p>A masterplan/framework is shown in Figure 4.1 which sets out key principles and approaches to development but is currently of limited weight. Negotiation and decision making at application stage has regard to masterplan but alternative approaches that meet NPPF and Development Plan policies must be considered.</p> <p>Site boundaries are determined by land ownership.</p> <p>Plan level HRA carried out which concludes with appropriate mitigation the plan will have no adverse effects on the integrity of designated sites.</p>
Warsash Inshore Fishermen		HA1 contributes around 69.6% of the entire allocation proposed by the Plan, excluding Welborne. This allocation is a massively unrealistic distribution and will lead to a number of negative impacts locally and therefore unsound	Comments noted, however, the distribution of sites is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites.
Wright, Jane		Development will negatively affect character of Greenaway lane. Development would have intolerable environmental, amenity and adverse traffic and associated site junction safety issues.	Comments noted. The TA identifies traffic impact at strategic level and site level through application process.
Wyatt, Ronald		HA1 is still in the extant development plan (2015). as countryside. HA1 should be stopped. Housing should be more evenly distributed in the borough	Comments noted. The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites.

		It is a large site yet designated for over 800 houses but being developed in a piecemeal way. unsound without an overarching environmental assessment. It requires an overall strategy for environmental, recreational, road and school issues	Transport, infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP and HRA. These have been undertaken on a plan wide basis and so have considered the cumulative impacts of development.
Wyatt, Valerie		HA1 fails to meet criteria e) of HP1 as the proposal would demonstrably have unacceptable environmental, amenity and traffic implications. HA1 should be removed.	Comments noted. HP1 doesn't have a criteria e). We believe the comment is referring to HP4. The site has been assessed through the SA and transport assessment and it is considered that there would not be unacceptable impacts.

### Representations on Policy HA3 – Southampton Road

Number of representations on policy: 5

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Hampshire County Council		The identification for developer contributions for education and ensuring safe walking/cycling route to local schools are provided is welcomed. HCC also notes the site does not sit within the Minerals and Waste Consultation Area and therefore an application does not need to be accompanied by a Mineral Assessment.	Support welcomed.  Suggested change  Remove requirement for Minerals Assessment in criterion K)
Hampshire County Council (Early Years)		This proposal would generate demand for an additional 20+ childcare places. The respective development allocations within the draft local plan require proposals to address these needs either	Infrastructure will need to be provided in line with Policy TIN4 as set out in criterion I).

		directly or by way of a financial contribution towards the expansion of existing provision. These places are essential, to meet the needs of working families.	
Hampshire County Council (Property)		HCC supports the inclusion of the allocation and has provided information through the Local Plan process to date to support the allocation. HCC re-affirms that its land within HA3 is available and deliverable within the plan period.	Support welcomed.
Mugford, David		Queries what will happen to the current businesses within the development outline.	Sites have been promoted by the landowners and are therefore deemed to be available for residential development.
National Grid		The development site is in close proximity to a National grid asset (400k overhead transmission line).	Noted.

#### Representations on policy HA4 – Downend Road East

**Number of representations on policy: 22**

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Ananin, Matt		Remove the single developer for the site allowing more self builds meaning a nicer array of different property types.	Policy HP9 requires that on sites of 40 dwellings or more, 10% of the overall dwellings are provided through the provision of plots for sale to address local self or custom build need.
Borrow, C		In light of the most recent planning application for the site being refused and the associated environmental and highways issues with development here, the Policy should be removed from the Plan.	Comments noted. The site has been subject to a SA, HRA, TA and the Council considers this to be a sustainable location for development.

Brierley, Anne		In light of the most recent planning application for the site being refused and the associated environmental and highways issues with development here, the Policy should be removed from the Plan.	Comments noted. The site has been subject to a SA, HRA, TA and the Council considers this to be a sustainable location for development.
Brown, Ashley		In light of the most recent planning application for the site being refused and the associated environmental and highways issues with development here, the Policy should be removed from the Plan.	Comments noted. The site has been subject to a SA, HRA, TA and the Council considers this to be a sustainable location for development.
Chapman Lily Planning on behalf of Blackbrook Estates Ltd		In relation to bullet point g). The responsibility for mitigation and enhancement lies solely with the developers of the allocation, any third-party ownership should not be expected to play a role in this.	Noted.
Cooksley, Thomas		The area to the East of Downend should be removed from the Local Plan.	Comments noted. The site has been subject to a SA, HRA, TA and the Council considers this to be a sustainable location for development.
Cullen, Dr Barry		Concerns regarding traffic and resulting air pollution. The plan is not legally compliant with the obligation to safeguard the well-being of residents.	Policy NE8 ensures development complies with legal limits set for pollutants through requiring major development to contribute to the improvement of local air quality.
Dedman, Gordon		There is nothing in the plan for the additional infrastructure required to support the increase in traffic that can be expected at the junction of Downend Road and the A27. Policy conflicts with the 2008 Ambient Air Quality Directive.	Policy NE8 ensures development complies with legal limits set for pollutants through requiring major development to contribute to the improvement of local air quality.
Foote, Geoffrey		In light of the most recent planning application for the site being refused and the associated environmental and highways issues with development here, the Policy should be removed from the Plan.	Comments noted. The site has been subject to a SA, HRA, TA and the Council considers this to be a sustainable location for development.



Grist, Iris		Portsdown Hill is an area of special landscape quality and should not be built on. HA4 conflicts with paragraph 3.9 and 3.52.	HA4 is not within an Area of Special Landscape Quality as set out in the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and Strategic Gaps (2020).
Hampshire County Council		The allocated housing site sits within the safeguarded buffer zone of Warren Farm and Down End Quarry, a safeguarded waste site operated by Veolia Environmental Services (UK) Plc. Additional wording to policy recommended requiring any planning application for the site to take into account the safeguarded sites and provide mitigation measures as appropriate.	Criterion h) requires the design of the development to take account of the close proximity to the waste transfer station and the indicative framework Plan shows a 100m amenity impact buffer from the waste transfer station.
Hampshire County Council (Early Years)		This proposal would generate demand for an additional 20+ childcare places. The respective development allocations within the draft local plan require proposals to address these needs either directly or by way of a financial contribution towards the expansion of existing provision. These places are essential, to meet the needs of working families. In our Spring 2020 Childcare Sufficiency Audit Portchester West was identified as an area to be closely monitored due to the collective new and planned housing developments in the area.	Infrastructure will need to be provided in line with TIN4. Covered by point m) of the policy.
Hawkins, Dr Alan		Plan is out of date; it shows the status of this application up to July 2020. Since then a 'new' application has again been rejected with a suggestion that an appeal would be inappropriate. This valuable farm land should be classified as protected under the proposed new Government classifications.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Suggested Change</p> <p>Planning status for all sites will be updated as at April 2021</p> <p>The Borough would not be able to meet its identified housing and employment needs on brownfield land, and greenfield sites of lower</p>

			agricultural quality, alone. For this reason, the allocation of residential development on BMV agricultural land in this Plan has been necessary to meet the identified housing and employment need.
Healey, Professor Richard		Insufficient transport and highways infrastructure to mitigate impacts of development. Suggestion of additional policy criteria to address vehicular access and wider highways issues.	TA identifies traffic impact at strategic level and site level through application process.
Historic England		Support for policy criteria b) and g)	Support noted and welcomed.
Isherwood, Jonathan		Amend bullet point c) to read primary highway access shall be focused on a new access road to be provided to J11 of the M27;	A new access road to be provided to J11 of the M27 would not be feasible.
Millett, Nick		Concerns regarding traffic and resulting air pollution. Questions raised over traffic modelling used, not convinced they model accurately for peak traffic combined with bad weather.	Comments noted. Air quality issues are dealt with by Policy NE8 which ensures development complies with legal limits set for pollutants through requiring major development to contribute to the improvement of local air quality. The Plan is supported by an industry standard transport assessment which considers increase in traffic as a result of local plan development. Individual applications will be supported by localised transport assessments.
Rees, Melvyn		In light of the most recent planning application for the site being refused and the associated environmental and highways issues with development here, the Policy should be removed from the Plan.	The site has been subject to a SA, HRA, TA and the Council considers this to be a sustainable location for development.
Southern Planning Practice on Behalf of Raymond Brown Minerals and Recycling Ltd		Questioned whether the Council should be relying on the site as a housing allocation which the Council	The site is considered suitable, available and achievable as evidenced by the Strategic Housing and

		has found, in the form of the most recent applications, unacceptable.	Employment Land Availability Assessment.
Southern Water.		Local sewerage infrastructure to the site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development. There is a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network in order to provide additional capacity. It is recommended the following criterion is added to Policy "Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider."	Comments noted. Through the consideration of planning applications, the Council will ensure that occupation of development aligns with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider. Paragraph 11.53 (in relation to Policy D4) requires development proposals to demonstrate that there is adequate wastewater infrastructure and water supply capacity to serve the development or adequate provision can be made available.
Terence O'Rourke on behalf of Miller Homes.		In order to make sound, bullet points g) and j) and the wording 'or footbridge' within bullet point l) should be deleted.	It is considered that criterion g) and j) are justified. Criterion l) states 'a pedestrian footway <i>or</i> footbridge' which is considered to provide sufficient flexibility.
Veolia ES (UK) Ltd		Amend bullet point h) and make reference in the supporting text to the Agent of Change. The policy needs to go much further in directly referencing the Agent of Change principle. At present, the Policy it is not consistent with national policy	The local Plan should be read as a whole and Policy D2 (Ensuring Good Environmental Conditions) would apply. This policy requires that development ensures good environmental conditions for all new and existing users of buildings and external space.

Representations on policy HA7 – Warsash Maritime Academy			
Number of representations on policy: 8			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Environment Agency		Supportive of criteria (m) within the policy	Support noted and welcomed.
Hampshire County Council (Early Years)		The plan does not indicate the provision of childcare facilities. Depending on the housing mix and age demographic of the residents, a small number of additional childcare places for age 2-4 yr olds could be needed. In our Spring 2020 Childcare Sufficiency Audit Warsash was identified as an area to be closely monitored due to the collective new and planned housing developments in the area. Existing settings are close to capacity, including Out of School provision. These places are essential, to meet the needs of working families.	Infrastructure will need to be provided in line with TIN4. Covered by point n) of the policy.
Historic England		Welcome criteria f) and g) but consider they do not go far enough to protect the listed buildings on site. Proposed amended wording suggested for criterion f). Additionally, while development to the west of the listed buildings may be less likely, due to the presence of notable restrictions. It is considered that no development should be located to the west of the listed buildings is made explicit, through a policy requirement.	Support for criterion f) and g) noted.  Suggested change  Change criterion (f) to: “f) Provision of a heritage statement (in accordance with Policy HE3) that assesses the potential impact of proposals on the significance of the Grade II Listed Buildings and their setting; and”  Add new criterion:

			"No development should be located to the west of the listed buildings"
Maynard, Rose		The indicative capacity of the site is too intensive and should be reduced to a more acceptable number.	The yield is indicative, and it is felt that an indicative yield of 100 units is appropriate and achievable on the site.
Southern Planning on behalf of Raymond Brown Minerals and Recycling Ltd.		Due to the identified ecology and highway issues and problems associated with converting listed buildings, the viability and achievability of this site is questioned.	The Council is confident in the achievability of the site within the plan period.
Stephenson, Anne		<p>TPOs must be respected. There should also be a 5 new for one policy to replace any trees felled and a requirement for any developer to maintain any trees planted for at least 3 years after planting.</p> <p>Queries if it is a realistic site for development considering projected sea level changes</p>	<p>The policy requires that trees subject to an Area TPO should all be retained as well as boundary trees and hedgerows on the western boundary.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which has shown that safe development can be accommodated on site.</p>
Turley on behalf of Southampton Solent University.		<p>Supportive of Policy in principle but it is considered that there are certain detailed requirements within the policy that need to be amended to ensure that the Policy is effective and that development on the site is deliverable and is not unnecessarily constrained.</p> <p>Policy should acknowledge that the site includes two Listed Buildings (Shackleton and Moyana).</p> <p>Bullet point a). Flexibility is sought in terms of other uses that might be provided within these buildings</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Listed buildings on the site are shown on the site plan and referenced in criterion f) and g).</p> <p>The site is allocated for housing. Should an application come forward with other compatible uses the</p>

		<p>(Use Classes C1, C2, C2a C3 and C4 E Class and F1 and F2 Class).</p> <p>The indicative yield of 100 units is an underestimate of site capacity. The site could potentially accommodate around 150 homes.</p> <p>The agreement of Historic England to proposals for re-use of the buildings is not required for bullet point g).</p> <p>Bullet point j) Object to the requirement for all trees on the site to be retained. Amended to require the submission of a tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment.</p>	<p>application will be assessed on its merits.</p> <p>The yield is indicative, and it is felt that an indicative yield of 100 units is appropriate.</p> <p>Suggested change</p> <p>Remove '(subject to agreement with agreement with Historic England)' from criterion g).</p> <p>The site is subject to an Area TPO and as such it is considered that the tress should be protected.</p>
Webb, Robin		Consider protection of the 'Coastguard' buildings on the site.	Comment noted.

### Representations on Policy HA9 – Heath Road

**Number of representations on policy: 6**

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Hampshire County Council		HCC notes the site is not within the boundary of the Minerals and Waste Consultation Area and therefore an application does not need to be accompanied by a Mineral Assessment.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Suggested change</p> <p>Remove requirement for Minerals Assessment in criterion g).</p>

Hampshire County Council (Early Years)		The plan does not indicate the provision of childcare facilities. Depending on the housing mix and age demographic of the residents, a small number of additional childcare places for age 2-4 yr olds could be needed.	Infrastructure will need to be provided in line with Policy TIN4 as set out in criterion h).
Hampshire County Council (Property)		HCC supports the allocation of HA9. The site has the resolution to grant planning permission for 70 dwellings. Evidence suggest the site is capable of being delivered in the early stage of the plan period. The site is available and achievable.	Support welcomed. Comments noted.
Natural England		Acknowledge this site has resolution to grant planning permission for 70 dwellings. Recommended that policy includes a requirement to secure an appropriate level of offsite compensation to address the loss of secondary woodland on site.	Comments noted. Policy NE6 requires replacement of trees, woodland and hedgerows where their loss is unavoidable.
Sims, Joan		The proposed development area is unsound. Suggest the allocation is removed as a proposed development site. If this is no possible suggest a large area of natural habitat is designated, specify rainfall run off depression, no vehicle exists onto Heath Road and retain the trees along the Southern boundary of Heath Road.	The site has a resolution to grant planning permission.
Stephenson, Anne		Suggest there is a new policy to replace any trees felled and a requirement for the developer to maintain any trees planted for at least 3 years after planting.	Comments noted. Policy NE6 requires replacement of trees, woodland and hedgerows where their loss is unavoidable.

Representations on Policy HA10 – Funtley Road South			
Number of representations on policy: 3			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Hampshire County Council (Early Years)		The plan does not indicate the provision of childcare facilities. Depending on the housing mix and age demographic of the residents, a small number of additional childcare places for age 2-4 yr olds could be needed.	Infrastructure will need to be provided in line with Policy TIN4 as set out in criterion k).
Stephenson, Anne		Rewrite bullet point G to change its emphasis. Ensure development and its associated infrastructure does not have an impact on, and prevent damage to, the <u>existing woodland</u> on-site not the other way around.	It is considered that the current wording of criterion g) offers sufficient protection to existing woodland on the site.
Turley on behalf of Reside Developments.		<p>Policy not consistent with national policy as it does not make most efficient use of land. Indicative yield should be amended to 125 dwellings and the site boundary should be realigned.</p> <p>Bullet point c) of policy not justified by evidence.</p> <p>Bullet point e) regarding the vehicle loop is not justified or effective.</p> <p>Requirement under bullet point j) was not conditioned under the existing outline consent for</p>	<p>The Council considers the yield to be appropriate given the sites location in a sensitive landscape and the need to minimise visual impact on the Meon Strategic Gap.</p> <p>The council believe the building height limit is justified due to the site's location in a sensitive landscape.</p> <p>The council considers that the vehicle loop is appropriate in order to achieve pedestrian and cycle permeability across the site.</p> <p>Disagree, there is a small overlap with a safeguarded site. The housing</p>



		the site. Therefore, the requirement is not considered necessary or reasonable, and should be deleted.  Support for all other bullet point requirements under the policy	allocation policy recognises that planning permission has been granted.  Support noted.
<b>Representations on Policy HA12 – Moraunt Drive</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 0</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
<i>No comments received</i>			

## Representations on Policy HA13 – Hunts Pond Road

Number of representations on policy: 2

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Hampshire County Council (Property)		Hampshire County Council as a landowner supports the inclusion of this draft allocation and has provided information that confirms this site is available, deliverable. This allocation will contribute (indicative yield 38 dwellings) to the supply of housing required over the plan period for the borough.	Support noted.
Southern Planning for Raymond Brown		Under the Local Plan Part 2 this site was allocated under Policy DSP53 for Community Uses as part of a larger scheme to include education and open space. It is understood that the site is no longer required by Hampshire County Council for educational purposes, but there is no confirmation that a proper assessment has been undertaken of the continued need of this land for local community uses.	The site been promoted to us and it is considered to be suitable, available and achievable as evidenced by the SHELAA. HCC no longer require the site for educational purposes. Furthermore, it is considered that the plan makes adequate provision for community facilities.

## Representations on Policy HA15- Beacon Bottom West

Number of representations on policy: 1

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Foreman Homes		Policy is sound. Allocation allows for 29 dwellings which make a significant contribution toward the 5YHLS. The policy is consistent with para 61 which states housing needed for different groups in the	Support noted.

		community. Policy also compliant with para 67 of the NPPF. Site specific policies are positively prepared and effective in accordance with para 35 of the NPPF. Current planning app for 29 dwellings P/18/1258/FP.	
<b>Representations on Policy HA17 – 69 Botley Road</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 1</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Southern Water		Local sewerage infrastructure to the site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development. There is a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network in order to provide additional capacity. It is recommended the following criterion is added to Policy "Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider."	Comments noted. Through the consideration of planning applications, the Council will ensure that occupation of development aligns with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider. Paragraph 11.53 (in relation to Policy D4) requires development proposals to demonstrate that there is adequate wastewater infrastructure and water supply capacity to serve the development or adequate provision can be made available.

Representations on Policy HA19 – 399-403 Hunts Pond Road			
Number of representations on policy: 3			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Environment Agency		Policy is sound. It is correctly recognised within the plan that part of this site lies within current day flood zones 2 and 3. We are pleased to see that a development criteria (f) has been included to specify that no development or site access should be within these areas. This will ensure the development and its occupants are not at increased risk of flooding.	Support noted.
National Grid		Asset map only submitted	Noted.
Stephenson, Anne		Should this include some reference to the trees in the area so trees with TPOs are retained?	Noted. The development plan is written as a whole and Policy NE6 (Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows) will apply.

Representations on Policy HA22- Wynton Way			
Number of representations on policy: 2			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Hampshire County Council (Property)		Policy is sound. Hampshire County Council as a landowner supports the inclusion of this draft allocation and has provided information that confirms this site is available and deliverable. This allocation will contribute (indicative yield 13 dwellings) to the supply of housing required over the Plan period for the borough.	Support noted.
Stephenson, Anne		Should be re-written to change the emphasis- The design and layout of dwellings, roads, footpaths or other infrastructure proposals should be in a manner that does not impact on, and prevents damage to, the existing woodland on-site which shall be retained and incorporated within the development.	Comments noted. The policy requires existing trees to be retained and incorporated within the design and layout of proposals.
Representations on Policy HA23 – Stubbington Lane			
Number of representations on policy: 0			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
No comments received			

Representations on Policy HA24- 335-337 Gosport Road			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Hampshire County Council (Property)		Policy is sound. HCC as a landowner supports the inclusion of this draft allocation and has provided info that confirms this site is available, deliverable, and developable. Allocation will contribute (indicative yield 8 dwellings) to the supply.	Support noted.
Representations on Policy HA26- Beacon Bottom East			
Number of representations on policy: 3			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Bryan Jezeph Consultancy		Policy is unsound as currently written. There is continued support for housing allocation HA26 and the site promoter is grateful that the Council has increased the indicative yield of the allocation to reconcile with the planning application and SHELAA submission of 9 dwellings, but there is an objection to some of the criteria within the policy. Criterion h) is also objectionable and is currently misleading. A development proposal for fewer than 10 dwellings and on a site measuring	Support for allocation noted.  Comments noted. Criterion h) is a consistently worded criteria that points applicants to TIN 4. The size of the development and what contributions and infrastructure would be required would be assessed against this policy.

		less than 0.5 hectares would not normally have to provide any of the financial contributions listed, although a contribution to mitigate the impact of a development on the Solent Special Protection Areas would be required for a scheme of any size in line with Policy NE3.	The respondent notes that reference to NE3 is appropriate.
Marshall, Robert (Fareham Society)		<p>Site is sound in relations to its proximity to public transport and shops.</p> <p>Proposed site allocated is unsound given the indicative yield on 9 dwellings. There would thus be conflict with NPPF requirements that: planning should ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area and be sympathetic to local character (NPPF para 127); and on the prevention of harm to Heritage Assets (paras 193/4). The allocation should either be withdrawn from the Plan or alternatively the indicative yield deleted or substantially reduced in number.</p>	<p>Support in terms of the site's location noted.</p> <p>9 dwellings is considered appropriate and achievable on the site. Criterion f) requires a Heritage Statement detailing impact on the setting of the locally listed building in accordance with Policy HE5.</p>
Stephenson, Anne		No mention of preservation of trees not even those with TPOS which seem to be part of the site	Comment noted. The development plan is written as a whole and Policy NE6 (Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows) will apply.
<b>Representations on Policy HA27- Rookery Avenue</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 3</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Foreman Homes		This policy is sound as it is consistent with national policy. Allocation allowing for 32 dwellings will make	Support noted.

		a significant contribution towards the 5YHLS. Policy is consistent with Para 61 and compliant with para 67 of the NPPF. There is a current planning application for 32 dwellings which meets the policy requirements and is supported by the Council. The site is developable.	
Symons, Penny		Policy is sound. Good to have 27 houses in this location with good road access and local shops etc	Support noted.
Woodland Trust		Site is adjacent to ancient woodland at Gull Coppice and we recommend a minimum 50M buffer should be maintained between development and woodland. Unless the applicant can demonstrate how a smaller buffer would suffice or a large buffer may be required. Proposed amendment - Proposals should seek to enhance the Gull Coppice SINC, while maintaining a 50m protective buffer.	Comments noted.  Suggested change:  Add requirement for appropriate buffer protect TPO trees within the Gull Coppice to promote biodiversity and connectivity of existing habitats.
<b>Representations on Policy HA28 – 3-33 West Street, Portchester</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 0</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
<i>No comments received</i>			



Representations on Policy HA29 - Land East of Church Road			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Natural England		Much of this site shows as Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland priority habitat on the Ecological Network mapping for Hampshire. Part of the site is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) according to the Policy map. The Policy outlines a requirement for ecological mitigation for the site-specific construction and operational impacts of a development proposal. It is advised the Policy outlines a requirement to secure an appropriate level of offsite compensation to address any loss of priority habitat on site to ensure compliance with Policy NE1.	Comments noted. The Local Plan should be read as a whole and therefore Policy NE1 would apply to all development proposals.
Representations on Policy HA30 – 33 Lodge Road			
Number of representations on policy: 0			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
No comments received			

Representations on Policy HA31- Hammond Industrial Estate			
Number of representations on policy: 2			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Gillings Planning (on behalf of Frontier Estates)		<p>Proposed site allocation HA31 supported but request that the following comments on the detail of this allocation policy are reflected in the final draft of the submission plan for examination.</p> <p>Residential dwellings on Stubbington Lane should not be included in red line boundary and indicative yield should be amended to reflect planning application (68 bed care home).</p> <p>Points a), b), c), d), e), f), h) and j) in the site-specific requirement for the policy are supported.</p> <p>Point g) refers to the need for a contamination assessment due to the site's close proximity to Solent Airport. It is not considered relevant to specify Solent Airport in this point and so we respectfully request that point h) is amended to read as follows:</p> <p><i>'g) A Contamination Assessment demonstrating no unacceptable adverse impact on future occupiers and users of the development shall accompany any application; and'</i></p>	<p>Support for allocation noted.</p> <p>Suggested change</p> <p>Site boundary to change to reflect planning application red line boundary and yield amended to reflect application.</p> <p>Support for criterion a), b), c), d), e), f), h) and j) noted.</p> <p>Suggested change</p> <p>Remove reference to Solent Airport from criterion g).</p>

		<p>Point i) refers to the need for a Construction Environment Management Plan. It is noted that this is something that is normally secured through planning condition and we respectfully request that this is reflected in point i) as follows:</p> <p><i>'i) A Construction Environmental Management Plan to avoid adverse impacts of construction on the Solent designated sites shall be secured through an appropriately worded planning condition; and'</i></p> <p>Point k) refers to infrastructure provision and specifies health, education and transport. We note that the relevant infrastructure provision and contributions will be determined on a case by case basis and will depend on the nature of development proposed. Notwithstanding, it should be noted that Class C2 care home uses do not give rise to a demand for education and so it is respectfully requested that reference to education is removed from point h).</p> <p>Furthermore, the reference to NE3 relates to the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project which is considered to be irrelevant in this case. Again, C2 care homes do not give rise to additional recreational pressure.</p>	<p>Criterion i) is a consistently worded requirement with other policies and it is not considered that there is a need to specify how it would be secured.</p> <p>Criterion k) is a consistently worded requirement that points applicants to TIN 4. The size of the development and what contributions and infrastructure would be required would be assessed against this policy.</p> <p>Care homes may need to address recreational disturbance impact both alone and in-combination, depending on the level of care provided. Such development will be assessed on a case by case basis.</p>
Natural England		The policy should ensure the impact of nutrients in wastewater is addressed to ensure compliance with Policy NE4.	The plan should be read as a whole and as such Policy NE4 would address this issue.

## Representations on Policy HA32 – Egmont Nursery

Number of representations on policy: 15

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Beadsworth, Andy		<p>HA32 Allocation should be removed from the development plan. HA32 is an allocation in the Hamble Valley of special landscape quality. Para 3.9 says 'there remain no development allocations in these areas.' Inclusion of HA32 contradicts paragraph 3.9.</p> <p>Planning status of HA32 as noted in the Development plan reads 'Planning Status as at 1st July 2020: Outline planning permission granted (P/18/0592/OA). This is not true.</p> <p>HA32 Is the subject of Judicial Review because it did not comply with the policies in the extant plan, the Nitrate calculation included as mitigation relies on untenable assumptions, the application does not include land needed to reach the public highway.</p>	<p>The site was not included in the ASLQ as it already had planning permission (resolution to grant from August 2020) before the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and Strategic Gaps was published (September 2020).</p> <p>The site had planning permission at the time the Publication Plan was published, however, agreed that the planning status as at 1<sup>st</sup> July 2020 is incorrect.</p> <p>Suggested Change</p> <p>Planning status for all sites will be updated as at April 2021</p> <p>The JR is relevant to the application and the site's impact on Natura 2000 sites has been considered through the Local Plan HRA. The principle of development has been established through the granting of planning permission.</p>

			<p>The site has benefit of a private right of way over Brook Avenue and the proposed development would generate significantly less traffic than the previous commercial use of the Site therefore there is nothing to indicate that the proposed access would not enable suitable vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access to the proposed development.</p>
Beardsall, Alastair		<p>HA32 Allocation should be removed from the development plan. HA32 is an allocation in the Hamble Valley of special landscape quality. Para 3.9 says 'there remain no development allocations in these areas.' Inclusion of HA32 contradicts paragraph 3.9.</p> <p>Planning status of HA32 as noted in the Development plan reads 'Planning Status as at 1st July 2020: Outline planning permission granted (P/18/0592/OA). This is not true.</p> <p>HA32 Is the subject of Judicial Review because it did not comply with the policies in the extant plan, the Nitrate calculation included as mitigation relies on untenable assumptions, the application does not include land needed to reach the public highway.</p>	<p>The site was not included in the ASLQ as it already had planning permission (resolution to grant from August 2020) before the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and Strategic Gaps was published (September 2020).</p> <p>The site had planning permission at the time the Publication Plan was published, however, agreed that the planning status as at 1<sup>st</sup> July 2020 is incorrect.</p> <p>Suggested Change</p> <p>Planning status for all sites will be updated as at April 2021</p> <p>The JR is relevant to the application and the site's impact on Natura 2000 sites has been considered through the Local Plan HRA. The principle of development has been established</p>

			<p>through the granting of planning permission.</p> <p>The site has benefit of a private right of way over Brook Avenue and the proposed development would generate significantly less traffic than the previous commercial use of the Site therefore there is nothing to indicate that the proposed access would not enable suitable vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access to the proposed development.</p>
Bonney, Gordon		<p>The outline planning permission granted on site HA32 is currently subject to the beginning of a judicial review as the site is not considered deliverable and therefore should not be included in the housing allocation. Removing a site of only 8 houses with an unlawful planning permission will make the Local plan more sound &amp; legally compliant.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The JR is relevant to the application and the site's impact on Natura 2000 sites has been considered through the Local Plan HRA.</p>
Chase, Andrea		<p>HA32 Allocation should be REMOVED from the development plan because it is situated within the countryside within the Hamble Valley Area of Special Landscape Quality.</p> <p>HA32 is situated in a Private Road and is the subject of a JUDICIAL REVIEW because: 1. The application does not include land needed to reach the highway. FBC and the applicant continually ignore this requirement despite it being pointed out by a Planning Consultant and a Q.C. on numerous</p>	<p>The site was not included in the ASLQ as it already had planning permission (resolution to grant from August 2020) before the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and Strategic Gaps was published (September 2020).</p> <p>The JR is relevant to the application and the site's impact on Natura 2000 sites has been considered through the Local Plan HRA. The principle of development has been established</p>

		occasions. 2. The Nitrate calculation included as mitigation relies on untenable assumptions. 3. HA32 is the subject of a Judicial Review because it did not comply with the policies in the extant plan. 4. The site is considered by residents, and a leading planning Q.C. to be UNDELIVERABLE due to a number of reasons and therefore should NOT be included in the housing allocations.	<p>through the granting of planning permission.</p> <p>The site has benefit of a private right of way over Brook Avenue and the proposed development would generate significantly less traffic than the previous commercial use of the Site therefore there is nothing to indicate that the proposed access would not enable suitable vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access to the proposed development.</p>
Chase, John		HA32 should be removed. HA32 is an allocation in the Hamble Valley of special landscape quality. Para 3.9 says 'there remain no development allocations in these areas.' Inclusion of HA32 contradicts para 3.2 development plan. It does not comply with the policies in the extant plan, the Nitrate calculation included as mitigation relies on untenable assumptions and being within a Private Road the application does not include land needed to reach the public highway. This latter fact has been pointed out to FBC and the applicant by both the eminent QC and a Planning Consultant and has been repeatedly ignored.	<p>The site was not included in the ASLQ as it already had planning permission (resolution to grant from August 2020) before the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and Strategic Gaps was published (September 2020).</p> <p>The JR is relevant to the application and the site's impact on Natura 2000 sites has been considered through the Local Plan HRA. The principle of development has been established through the granting of planning permission.</p> <p>The site has benefit of a private right of way over Brook Avenue and the proposed development would generate significantly less traffic than the previous commercial use of the Site therefore there is nothing to</p>

			indicate that the proposed access would not enable suitable vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access to the proposed development.
Earle, Fiona		HA32 Housing allocation is undeliverable, it is also in an area this plan designates as special landscape character countryside & therefore should not be included. The site is undeliverable as there is no established right of way to the public Highway, removing HA32 would prevent an undeliverable site being included in the development plan.	<p>The site was not included in the ASLQ as it already had planning permission (resolution to grant from August 2020) before the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and Strategic Gaps was published (September 2020).</p> <p>The site has benefit of a private right of way over Brook Avenue and the proposed development would generate significantly less traffic than the previous commercial use of the Site therefore there is nothing to indicate that the proposed access would not enable suitable vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access to the proposed development.</p>
Fiorentino, Gianmarco		<p>HA32 Allocation should be removed from the development plan. HA32 is an allocation in the Hamble Valley of special landscape quality. Para 3.9 says 'there remain no development allocations in these areas.' Inclusion of HA32 contradicts paragraph 3.9.</p> <p>Planning status of HA32 as noted in the Development plan reads 'Planning Status as at 1st July 2020: Outline planning permission granted (P/18/0592/OA). This is not true.</p>	<p>The site was not included in the ASLQ as it already had planning permission (resolution to grant from August 2020) before the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and Strategic Gaps was published (September 2020).</p> <p>The site had planning permission at the time the Publication Plan was published, however, agreed that the planning status as at 1<sup>st</sup> July 2020 is incorrect.</p>



		<p>HA32 Is the subject of Judicial Review because it did not comply with the policies in the extant plan, the Nitrate calculation included as mitigation relies on untenable assumptions.</p> <p>The application does not include land needed to reach the public highway.</p>	<p>Suggested Change</p> <p>Planning status for all sites will be updated as at April 2021</p> <p>The JR is relevant to the application and the site's impact on Natura 2000 sites has been considered through the Local Plan HRA. The principle of development has been established through the granting of planning permission.</p> <p>The site has benefit of a private right of way over Brook Avenue and the proposed development would generate significantly less traffic than the previous commercial use of the Site therefore there is nothing to indicate that the proposed access would not enable suitable vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access to the proposed development.</p>
Jackson, Peter		<p>HA allocation should be removed from the development plan. HA32 allocation in the Hamble Valley area of special landscape quality. Inclusion of HA32 contradicts para 3.9.</p> <p>HA32 is the subject of judicial review. Nitrate mitigation relies on untenable assumptions and the</p>	<p>The site was not included in the ASLQ as it already had planning permission (resolution to grant from August 2020) before the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and Strategic Gaps was published (September 2020).</p> <p>The JR is relevant to the application and the site's impact on Natura 2000 sites has been considered through the</p>

		<p>application does not include land needed to reach the public highway.</p>	<p>Local Plan HRA. The principle of development has been established through the granting of planning permission.</p> <p>The site has benefit of a private right of way over Brook Avenue and the proposed development would generate significantly less traffic than the previous commercial use of the Site therefore there is nothing to indicate that the proposed access would not enable suitable vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access to the proposed development.</p>
Marshall, Melissa		<p>HA32 should be removed. HA32 is an allocation in the Hamble Valley of special landscape quality. Para 3.9 says 'there remain no development allocations in these areas.' Inclusion of HA32 contradicts paragraph 3.9.</p> <p>Planning status of HA32 as noted in the Development plan reads 'Planning Status as at 1st July 2020: Outline planning permission granted (P/18/0592/OA)'. This is not true.</p>	<p>The site was not included in the ASLQ as it already had planning permission (resolution to grant from August 2020) before the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and Strategic Gaps was published (September 2020).</p> <p>The site had planning permission at the time the Publication Plan was published, however, agreed that the planning status as at 1<sup>st</sup> July 2020 is incorrect.</p> <p>Suggested Change</p> <p>Planning status for all sites will be updated as at April 2021</p>

		<p>HA32 Is the subject of Judicial Review because it did not comply with the policies in the extant plan, the Nitrate calculation included as mitigation relies on untenable assumptions, the application does not include land needed to reach the public highway.</p>	<p>The JR is relevant to the application and the site's impact on Natura 2000 sites has been considered through the Local Plan HRA. The principle of development has been established through the granting of planning permission.</p> <p>The site has benefit of a private right of way over Brook Avenue and the proposed development would generate significantly less traffic than the previous commercial use of the Site therefore there is nothing to indicate that the proposed access would not enable suitable vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access to the proposed development.</p>
Read, John		<p>HA32 should be removed. HA32 is an allocation in the Hamble Valley of special landscape quality. Para 3.9 says 'there remain no development allocations in these areas.' Inclusion of HA32 contradicts paragraph 3.9.</p> <p>Planning status of HA32 as noted in the Development plan reads 'Planning Status as at 1st July 2020: Outline planning permission granted (P/18/0592/OA). This is not true.</p>	<p>The site was not included in the ASLQ as it already had planning permission (resolution to grant from August 2020) before the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and Strategic Gaps was published (September 2020).</p> <p>The site had planning permission at the time the Publication Plan was published, however, agreed that the planning status as at 1<sup>st</sup> July 2020 is incorrect.</p> <p>Suggested Change</p>

		<p>HA32 Is the subject of Judicial Review because it did not comply with the policies in the extant plan, the Nitrate calculation included as mitigation relies on untenable assumptions, the application does not include land needed to reach the public highway.</p>	<p>Planning status for all sites will be updated as at April 2021</p> <p>The JR is relevant to the application and the site's impact on Natura 2000 sites has been considered through the Local Plan HRA. The principle of development has been established through the granting of planning permission.</p> <p>The site has benefit of a private right of way over Brook Avenue and the proposed development would generate significantly less traffic than the previous commercial use of the Site therefore there is nothing to indicate that the proposed access would not enable suitable vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access to the proposed development.</p>
Read, Lois		<p>HA32 should be removed. HA32 is an allocation in the Hamble Valley of special landscape quality. Para 3.9 says 'there remain no development allocations in these areas.' Inclusion of HA32 contradicts paragraph 3.9 Planning status of HA32 as noted in the Development plan reads 'Planning Status as at 1st July 2020: Outline planning permission granted (P/18/0592/OA). This is not true. HA32 Is the subject of Judicial Review because it did not comply with the policies in the extant plan, the Nitrate calculation included as mitigation relies on untenable assumptions, the application does not include land needed to reach</p>	<p>The site was not included in the ASLQ as it already had planning permission (resolution to grant from August 2020) before the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and Strategic Gaps was published (September 2020).</p> <p>The site had planning permission at the time the Publication Plan was published, however, agreed that the planning status as at 1<sup>st</sup> July 2020 is incorrect.</p>

		the public highway.	<p>Suggested Change</p> <p>Planning status for all sites will be updated as at April 2021</p> <p>The JR is relevant to the application and the site's impact on Natura 2000 sites has been considered through the Local Plan HRA. The principle of development has been established through the granting of planning permission.</p> <p>The site has benefit of a private right of way over Brook Avenue and the proposed development would generate significantly less traffic than the previous commercial use of the Site therefore there is nothing to indicate that the proposed access would not enable suitable vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access to the proposed development.</p>
Sherman, Chris		<p>HA32 Allocation should be removed from the development plan. HA32 is an allocation in the Hamble Valley of special landscape quality. Para 3.9 says 'there remain no development allocations in these areas.' Inclusion of HA32 contradicts paragraph 3.9.</p> <p>Planning status of HA32 as noted in the Development plan reads 'Planning Status as at 1st July 2020: Outline planning permission granted (P/18/0592/OA). This is not true.</p>	<p>The site was not included in the ASLQ as it already had planning permission (resolution to grant from August 2020) before the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and Strategic Gaps was published (September 2020).</p> <p>The site had planning permission at the time the Publication Plan was published, however, agreed that the</p>

		HA32 Is the subject of Judicial Review because it did not comply with the policies in the extant plan, the Nitrate calculation included as mitigation relies on untenable assumptions, the application does not include land needed to reach the public highway.	<p>planning status as at 1<sup>st</sup> July 2020 is incorrect.</p> <p>Suggested Change</p> <p>Planning status for all sites will be updated as at April 2021</p> <p>The principle of development has been established through the granting of planning permission.</p> <p>The site has benefit of a private right of way over Brook Avenue and the proposed development would generate significantly less traffic than the previous commercial use of the Site therefore there is nothing to indicate that the proposed access would not enable suitable vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access to the proposed development.</p>
Symons, Penny		This is supposed to be countryside is not adj to the urban boundary. Traffic will increase. This site should not be developed and should continue to be protected as being in the countryside zone.	The principle of development has been established through the granting of planning permission.
Wyatt, Valerie		Housing allocation should be removed from the plan pending the outcome of Judicial Review that is underway. Planning status on pg 98 is untrue. This site is not adj to the urban boundary, is in a sensitive location less than 200m from Nautura 200 sites. Ancient woodland is located 34M from the boundary of the site. Area of SLQ has this allocation shown to the north of Warsash and the west of Locks Heath as a small cut out. This is the	<p>The site had planning permission at the time the Publication Plan was published, however, agreed that the planning status as at 1<sup>st</sup> July 2020 is incorrect.</p> <p>Suggested Change</p>

		only such cut out and does not make sense. It is also counter to the strategic properties points 2 and 9 in 2.12.	<p>Planning status for all sites will be updated as at April 2021</p> <p>The site was not included in the ASLQ as it already had planning permission (resolution to grant from August 2020) before the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and Strategic Gaps was published (September 2020).</p>
Wyatt, Ronald		<p>This site is shown in Hamble Valley of Special Landscape quality yet para 3.9 says that there “remain no development allocations in these areas”. HA32 is subject to a live judicial review as it fails Fareham’ own extant plan requirements. It is not adj to the urban boundary (Against DSP40). HA32 is 200M from the protected Natura 2000 sites and only 34M from ancient woodland.</p>	<p>The site was not included in the ASLQ as it already had planning permission (resolution to grant from August 2020) before the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and Strategic Gaps was published (September 2020).</p> <p>The principle of development here has been established through the granting of planning permission.</p> <p>For Local Plan purposes the site has been assessed through the HRA, the site-specific impacts of construction noise was considered likely which is why point d) was added to avoid adverse impacts on the Natura 2000 sites.</p>

Representations on Policy HA33- Land East of Bye Road			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Steven Richard Dunleavy SSAS (BJC Planning)		Policy is sound. There is no reason to believe the plan has not met the legal requirements for plan making as set out by planning laws. Onus is on FBC to demonstrate that the plan complies with duty to cooperate. Outline permission has been granted for 7 custom build dwellings.	Comments noted.
Representations on Policy HA34- Land South West of Sovereign Crescent			
Number of representations on policy: 3			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Foreman Homes		Policy is sound & consistent with national policy 38 dwellings would make a significant contribution towards the 5YHLS. Policy is consistent with Para 61 & compliant with para 67 of the NPPF. Site specific policies are positively prepared and effective in accordance with Para 35 of the NPPF. There is a resolution to grant app which meets the requirements and is supported by the Council.	Support noted.
Goodwin, J		I disagree with the proposed allocation of houses at the SW of Sovereign Crescent in principle -	Comments noted. It is acknowledged that criterion e) is lengthy but it is not unfinished as it links to criterion f).



		However - it is impossible to tell if point 'e' is complete or is an unfinished sentence?	<p>Suggested change:</p> <p>Amend point e) to say 'Proposals should take <b><u>account</u></b> of the two SINC's...'</p> <p>Also replace comma with semicolon in point e) to say 'a 9m wildlife corridor should run along the centre of the site linking them; and</p>
Stephenson, Anne		No mention of preservation of trees with TPOs which seem to be part of the site	TPOs are referenced on the site plan and Policy NE6 will be applicable.
<b>Representations on Policy HA35 – Former Scout Hut, Coldeast Way</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 0</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
<i>No comments received</i>			

Representations on Policy HA36 – Locks Heath District Centre			
Number of representations on policy: 4			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Ashdown, Martin		The proposed allocation is not in alignment with policy R1. The proposed allocation will remove parking for the shopping centre and add additional housing units. Note also that some 800-1000 new units are proposed in the catchment areas so demand for access and parking will increase whilst it is already stretched at peak. Remove HA36 or require provision of at least same number of parking units displaced by it.	The policy includes a requirement for the reconfiguration of car parking to consider the requirements of the existing shopping centre. This will ensure appropriate car parking provision for the district centre.
Marshall, Robert (Fareham Society)		This allocation is unsound as it would result in the loss of car parking for the Locks Heath District Centre. The loss of a substantial portion of the car park would thus be detrimental to the Centre's health and vitality. This would be contrary to Strategic Policy R1 of the emerging Local Plan which says that any development that would significantly harm the vitality and viability of a defined centre will not be permitted. The allocation should be removed.	The policy includes a requirement for the reconfiguration of car parking to consider the requirements of the existing shopping centre. This will ensure appropriate car parking provision for the district centre.
QA Planning LTD on behalf of Simon Dawkins		NRR support the principle of the proposed housing allocation. NRR are also currently consulting on the changes to the highways infrastructure that would be required to facilitate the delivery of this site, which could be brought forward quickly if the application is approved. This would fulfil part (g) of the draft policy. NRR's only request is to ensure	Support noted.  It is considered that the policy allows sufficient flexibility to allow design adaptations – the yield is indicative.

		that sufficient flexibility is built into the policy to allow for future applications to adapt their design to make the best use of this brownfield land and therefore improve its effectiveness. Modification- policy revised to ensure flexibility in design	
Webb, Robin		This allocation takes over a significant portion of the Locks Heath Centre Car Park, as does HA37 which is represented separately. There is no evidence that the car park under-utilised. On the contrary, cars using the centre overflow inconveniently onto adjacent roads at the busiest periods. Subpara (g) of HA36 states reconfiguration of car parking needs to consider requirements and functions of the existing shopping centre; The existing 'requirements and functions' therefore show this allocation to be without merit.	The policy includes a requirement for the reconfiguration of car parking to consider the requirements of the existing shopping centre. This will ensure appropriate car parking provision for the district centre.
<b>Representations on Policy HA37- Former Locks Heath Filing Station</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 5</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Ashdown, Martin		Proposed allocation is not in alignment with policy R1. The proposed allocation will remove parking for the shopping centre and add additional housing units. Note also that some 800-1000 new units are proposed in the catchment areas so demand for access and parking will increase whilst it is already stretched at peak.	Comments noted.  Suggested change  Include requirement that the reconfiguration of car parking needs to consider requirements and functions of the existing shopping centre.

Marshall, Robert (The Fareham Society)		The loss of a substantial portion of the car park would thus be detrimental to the Centre's health and vitality. This would be contrary to Strategic Policy R1 of the emerging Local Plan which says that any development that would significantly harm the vitality and viability of a defined centre will not be permitted. It would also be contrary to the NPPF which seeks to ensure the vitality of town centres and which, although recognising the role that housing can play in such areas says that this must be on appropriate sites. The allocation should be removed.	Comments noted.  Suggested change  Include requirement that the reconfiguration of car parking needs to consider requirements and functions of the existing shopping centre.
Natural England		This site is adjacent to an area of Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland priority habitat as shown on the Ecological Network mapping. The Policy should ensure that impacts on priority habitats and protected species are considered and addressed.	The Local Plan should be read as a whole and Policy NE1 (Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network) would apply which seeks to protect priority habitats and species.
QA Planning LTD on behalf of Simon Dawkins		NRR support the principle of the proposed housing allocation. NRR's only request is to ensure that sufficient flexibility is built into the policy to allow for future applications to adapt their design to make the best use of this brownfield land and therefore improve its effectiveness. The policy provides for 30 dwellings and a maximum height of 3 storeys on this site. Whilst a simple 'storey height' limit is a helpful guide, when considering adjacent buildings, it is important to consider the roof pitch, floor to ceiling height and finished floor levels. As such, a well-designed building that exceeds 3 storeys should not be resisted if it makes the best use of land and relates well to the surrounding area. This in turn could potentially result in a higher dwelling yield. Revision to the policy conditions to ensure there is flexibility in design.	Comments noted. The yield is indicative and a guide only.

Webb, Robin		This allocation takes over a significant portion of the Locks Heath Centre Car Park, as does HA36 which is represented separately. There is no evidence that the car park under-utilised. On the contrary, cars using the centre overflow inconveniently onto adjacent roads at the busiest periods.	Comments noted.  Suggested change  Include requirement that the reconfiguration of car parking needs to consider requirements and functions of the existing shopping centre.
<b>Representations on Policy HA38- 68 Titchfield Park Road</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 2</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Marshall, Robert (Fareham Society)		This is a sound site for housing in locational terms. However, the site appears too small to accommodate the indicative yield of 9 dwellings without unacceptable tree loss and harm to the living conditions of those directly to the north. The allocation should either be withdrawn from the Plan or alternatively the indicative yield deleted or substantially reduced in number.	Comments noted. 9 dwellings are considered achievable on this site. The trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders and the policy requires an arboricultural impact assessment.
Stephenson, Anne		It should clearly state the need to retain existing trees.	The trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders and the policy requires an arboricultural impact assessment.

Representations on Policy HA39 – Land at 51 Greenaway Lane			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Symons, Penny		This is agricultural land and should be left as such - especially as so many houses have already been given pp in this immediate area. Too much traffic etc.	Comments noted. The Borough would not be able to meet its identified housing and employment needs on previously developed (brownfield) land, and greenfield sites of lower agricultural quality, alone. For this reason, the allocation of residential development on BMV agricultural land in this Plan has been necessary to meet the identified housing and employment need.
Representations on Policy HA40 – Land west of Northfield Park			
Number of representations on policy: 2			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Stephenson, Anne		This policy should be re written; Existing trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order should be retained and incorporated within the design and layout of proposals in a manner that does not impact on the trees	The policy requires that existing trees subject to a TPO should be retained.

Tutton, Robert (on behalf of Barbara Trimmings)		Mrs Trimmings wholeheartedly supports this housing allocation and would be pleased to bring forward the proposal for 22 aged persons park homes at the earliest opportunity.	Support noted.
<b>Representations on Policy HA41 – 22-227a Stubbington Green</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 1</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Mugford, David		Queries where the residents of the development park their cars without denying parking space to shoppers?	Comment noted. The Parking SPD will be applicable. The SPD allows for residential development that provides less than the standards in areas of high accessibility. Such proposals must be accompanied by suitable and detailed evidence and must not have an adverse impact on the surrounding area.
<b>Representations on Policy HA42 – Land South of Cams Alders</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 7</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Historic England		The whole of the proposed allocation is considered to be located within the setting of Fort Fareham. The setting of the fort has already been significantly compromised by development in its	Comments noted.  Suggested changes:

		<p>setting, as well as within the monument itself. Therefore it is likely that the proposed development will affect the significance of the monument, through development in its setting. given that the impact of the proposed allocation is recognised as 'negative' in the high level assessment result, in the historic environment objective, the policy should reflect the NPPF requirement to mitigate, as set out in para 32. Therefore, the site allocation should require a mitigation plan to offset harm to the setting of Fort Fareham. Without this, we consider the policy to be <b>inconsistent with national policy and therefore unsound</b> with regard to "conservation and setting..." and "grade II scheduled monument". Fort Fareham is not a grade II scheduled monument: this classification does not exist. It is both a scheduled monument, AND a grade II listed building. Without amendment, we consider the policy to be <b>inconsistent with national policy and therefore unsound</b>.</p>	<p>Include requirement for mitigation plan in criterion h)</p> <p>Amend criterion h) to reference the fact that Fort Fareham is both a grade II listed building and scheduled monument.</p>
Leech, Robert		<p>Fort Fareham Rd will not be able to cope with any additional traffic this development may cause. Lack of parking is already an issue and this will impact the local wildlife.</p>	<p>The TA hasn't flagged up a particular issue with this site. Localised impact in terms of the junction/parking would be dealt with at the planning application stage.</p>
Marshall, Robert (Fareham Society)		<p>Most of the allocation is in a SINC area. Development of the site would be harmful to the ecological interest of the SINC and potentially harmful to the setting of the ancient monument. As such the allocation would conflict with the objectives of the NPPF on ecology, the protection of Heritage Assets and on securing attractive spaces.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The policy requires that a buffer is incorporated between the development and the retained SINC. The policy also requires a Heritage Statement to support any development proposal in order to consider the impacts on heritage assets.</p>



Natural England		This allocation site is located on “Fort Fareham Grassland” SINC that supports woodland and meadow communities and lies adjacent to Fort Fareham SINC known for supporting wet woodland communities.	Comments noted. We acknowledge that part of the site is on a SINC and criterion b) requires buffer to mitigate impact.
Scobell, Mary		Why is there need to encroach on this SINC site when there are other allocated areas that are not of such high importance. Increased noise, traffic and light pollution would also be detrimental to the surrounding wildlife.	Comments noted. We acknowledge that part of the site is on a SINC and criterion b) requires buffer to mitigate impact.
Stephenson, Anne		This is taking place on land identified as important for nature conservation. The Council should avoid such areas as the Government has noted the need to keep biodiversity and green space. This development should occur on a brown field site e.g. the town centre where retail units are closing.	Comments noted. We acknowledge that part of the site is on a SINC and criterion b) requires buffer to mitigate impact and criterion c) requires the retention and strengthening of existing tree lined buffer around the perimeter of the site. The development strategy seeks to maximise development on brownfield sites, however there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the Borough’s housing need.
Williams, Alan		HA42 is unsound and potentially illegal in its allocation of land identified as a SINC, and in relation to the drainage of the area identified as the allocation which could result in flooding of any new development or cause flooding to neighbouring development. The proximity of the allocation to the SAM also make this allocation unsound.	Comments noted. We acknowledge that part of the site is on a SINC and criterion b) requires buffer to mitigate impact. Criterion g) ensures that adequate surface water drainage is provided on site. A Heritage Statement is also required by criterion h) to address any impacts on heritage assets.

Representations on Policy HA43 – Corner of Station Road, Portchester			
Number of representations on policy: 0			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
No comments received			

Representations on Policy HA44- Assheton Court			
Number of representations on policy: 2			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Environment Agency		Site lies partially within flood zone 2 & 3 the risk is likely to increase with climate change. Does not feel enough evidence has currently been produced to demonstrate that this site could be delivered in a safe manner. If this site is to be allocated for redevelopment then there should be no increase in occupancy, which would increase the number of people residing within an area of potentially significant flood risk. In the strategic flood risk assessment document, the column regarding whether the sequential test has been passed or not is blank. We feel that the council should give consideration as to whether this is the correct type of development in this location.	Discussions with the Environment Agency have since taken place and safe development is considered to be achievable onsite with appropriate mitigation and careful design.

		It should be demonstrated that flood risk can be adequately managed for the site and there is no increase in risk to the site and its occupants. It would therefore be compliant with paragraphs 155 - 161 of the NPPF and policy CC2 of this plan.	
Southern Water		Southern Water has undertaken a preliminary assessment of the capacity of the existing infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for this proposal. The assessment reveals that existing local sewerage infrastructure to the site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development. Limited capacity is not a constraint to development provided that planning policy and subsequent conditions ensure that occupation of the development is phased to align with the delivery of new wastewater infrastructure. Proposals for 60 dwellings at this site will generate a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network in order to provide additional capacity to serve the development. Connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of foul flooding unless the requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation. We recommend the following criterion is added to Policy HA44; 'Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider.'	Comments noted. Through the consideration of planning applications, the Council will ensure that occupation of development aligns with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider. Paragraph 11.53 (in relation to Policy D4) requires development proposals to demonstrate that there is adequate wastewater infrastructure and water supply capacity to serve the development or adequate provision can be made available.

## Representations on Policy HA45 – Land at rear of 77 Burrridge Road

**Number of representations on Policy HA45: 9**

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Burrridge and Swanwick Residents Association		Concern over the lack of public consultation in respect of the allocated site and therefore fails the tests of soundness. There is no explanation for the change in relation to sites in H10 in the 2017 Plan to the allocation of HA45. Concerned over the location of the 3 pitches, these should be spread across different locations across the borough. Also concerned the Council ignore the findings of the 2019 appeal. Furthermore, the site does not address onsite parking and the significant effect the site would have on European sites.	The Plan has been subject to six weeks statutory consultation. The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current family and owners of the site at this location. The planning considerations for the site have been informed by the most recent appeal for the site as described by paragraph 5.100. The allocation would be subject to other policies in the plan such as D1 High Quality Design and TIN2 Highways safety and Road Network, NE3, NE4 etc.
David Barry		Policy HA45 should seek to be inclusive. The allocation of the site appears to be a convenient solution for the Council rather than meeting the needs of the communities and the gypsies and travellers. The 3 pitches should inclusive and spread across the whole borough instead of solely for one family group. Concern that the site allocation will not provide an integrated community and the policy does not meet the principles for inclusive design. Furthermore, the site does not meet all the criteria for Policy HP11.	Noted. The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current family and owners of the site at this location. Allocation would be subject to other policies in the plan such as D1 High Quality Design etc.
Graham Bell		The site is not appropriate to accommodate 3 pitches. The site constantly floods contrary to	Concerns noted. The site has been assessed for flood risk issues. Policy

		<p>criterion f) of Policy HP11 and the adjoining land is designated SINC. The site has poor accessibility contrary to criterion b) of Policy HP11. The site contains a number of vehicles and is already overcrowded and has an unsafe access point. The proposed allocation is not in keeping with the surrounding area. Concern whether the family's requirement for 3 pitches meets the definition in the PPTS. Furthermore, the access road is owned by a third party rather than the Council.</p>	<p>contains a requirement to implement a biodiversity mitigation and enhancement plan to ensure the remaining SINC designation is protected and enhanced. Highways and access are considered adequate for the quantum of development at the site but will be subject to other policies in the plan such as D1, TIN2 etc.</p> <p>The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current family and owners of the site at this location.</p>
Michael Edwards		<p>Concern that the site and the location of Burrage is not suitable to provide 3 pitches. In addition, the short term need for the site is not justified. Suggest other sites in the Borough are examined and the site is removed from the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Noted. The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current family and owners of the site at this location.</p>
Toby King		<p>The site has poor accessibility contrary to criterion b) of Policy HP11. Concern over parking and access on site. Concern that the site and the location of Burrage is not suitable to provide 4 dwellings. The 3 pitches should inclusive and spread across the whole borough</p>	<p>Disagree. The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current family and owners of the site at this location. The allocation would be subject to other policies in the plan such as D1 High Quality Design and TIN2 Highways safety and Road Network etc.</p>
Vivian Holt		<p>Concern over the lack of public consultation in respect of the allocated site. Suggest other sites in the Borough are examined and HA45 is removed from the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Noted. The Plan has been subject to six weeks statutory consultation. The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current family and owners of the site at this location.</p>
Vivian Holt	Para 5.100	<p>The Council has failed to comply with NPPF para 61 and the Procedure Guide for Local Plan Examinations in allocating sites for development.</p>	<p>Disagree. The preparation of the Plan has complied with all relevant regulations.</p>

The Fareham Society	Para 5.101	Allocation of the site is contrary to NPPF requirements for conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Suggest the site allocation is removed from the Plan.	Policy contains a requirement to implement a biodiversity mitigation and enhancement plan to ensure the remaining SINC designation is protected and enhanced. The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current family and owners of the site at this location.
Vivian Holt	Para 5.101	Concern that the supporting text to the policy misrepresents the Inspectors views at the 2019 appeal. Suggest site is removed from the plan.	Disagree. The planning considerations for the site have been informed by the most recent appeal for the site as described by paragraph 5.100.

### Representations on Policy HP1 – New Residential Development

**Number of representations on Policy HP1: 11**

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
James Morgan	Para 5.3	The urban area boundary on Brook Avenue should be moved to include Yorkdale, Cawtes Reach and Egmont Nurseries and the land in between the properties. The land has outline planning permission.	Noted. Urban area boundary to remain as proposed.
LRM Planning (For Hallam Land)	Para 5.3	The existing settlement boundaries are unable to be amended over the plan period. Settlement boundaries should be amended accordingly over time.	Noted. The urban area boundaries have been comprehensively reviewed as part of the Local Plan process.
Robert Tutton (For Richard LundBech)	Para 5.3	Amend the urban area boundary to include the southern boundary of the Land west of Anchor House. Including the land would reiterate the sites development potential.	Noted. Urban area boundary to remain as proposed.

Smith Simmons (For Elberry Properties)	Para 5.3	The urban area boundaries could be further expanded to include PDL, particularly on sustainably located residential gardens in built up areas. Land to the south of 320 Southampton Road (SHELAA site 3064) should be included within the urban area boundary.	Noted. Urban area boundary to remain as proposed.
Turley (For Reside Developments)	Para 5.3	The urban area boundary should be amended to include the Land south of Funtley which is proposed under planning application P/20/1168/OA. The site results in sustainable development and would contribute to the Councils housing land supply.	Noted.
Gladman Developments		Policy is not positively prepared as it restrictive and does not significantly boost the supply of housing. The policy should be amended to be more flexible.	Noted.
Pegasus Group (For Hammond, Miller and Bargate)		The policy should cross refer to Policy HP4 which allows housing to come forward on land outside urban area boundaries if the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply.	Disagree. Policy HP4 is a contingency policy to be used in the event that the Council does not have a 5-year Housing Land Supply.
Pegasus Group for Bargate Homes		The policy should cross refer to Policy HP4 which allows housing to come forward on land outside urban area boundaries if the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply.	Disagree. Policy HP4 is a contingency policy to be used in the event that the Council does not have a 5-year Housing Land Supply.
Pegasus Group for King Norris		The policy should cross refer to Policy HP4 which allows housing to come forward on land outside urban area boundaries if the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply.	Disagree. Policy HP4 is a contingency policy to be used in the event that the Council does not have a 5-year Housing Land Supply.
Richard Jarman	5.6	Notes that policy requirements do not apply to Policy HA1 and therefore appears to be a convenient alternative for FBC to redraw the urban area boundary.	Noted.
The Fareham Society		Policy is unsound as it does not restrict the size of replacement dwellings or house extensions. Larger replacement dwellings and extended dwellings can detract from the undeveloped rural character and appearance of the countryside. The policy wording	Noted. Policy HP10 refers to Ancillary Buildings. Criterion b) of Policy HP10 refers to the scale of the building.

		therefore fails to have regard to the NPPF. Suggest a floorspace limit on replacement and extended dwellings.	
<b>Representations on Policy HP2 – New Small Scale Development Outside Defined Urban Areas (paragraphs 5.12-5.17)</b>			
<b>Number of representations on Policy HP2: 10</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Bryan Jezeph Consultancy	Para 5.15 Policy HP2	Supports policy as it facilitates delivery of small windfall sites	Welcomed
Foreman Homes	Para 5.15 Policy HP2	Supports principle of small windfall site delivery. Suggests increase of threshold to 10 units to reflect NPPF definition of minor development	Support Welcomed. However, disagree with raising threshold to 10. Purpose of the policy is to encourage windfall sites for self-build in sustainable locations. It is not intended as a reflection of 'minor development' as defined in the NPPF. A higher threshold would require sites to be identified and allocated within the plan. The policy is permissive subject to meeting certain criteria. The limited number is also intended to ensure a more successful integration with existing character.
Gladman Developments	Para 5.15 Policy HP2	Supports principle of small scale development beyond urban area boundary. Suggests policy should have no limitations on size. Contradicts HP1 and criteria should be incorporated into HP2	Support Welcomed. However, disagree with removing limitation on numbers. Purpose of the policy is to encourage windfall sites for self-build in sustainable locations. A higher threshold would require sites to be identified and allocated within the



			<p>plan. The policy is permissive subject to meeting certain criteria. The limited number is also intended to ensure a more successful integration with existing character.</p> <p>Policy DS1 clarifies where development in the countryside is acceptable.</p>
Home Builders Federation	Para 5.15 Policy HP2	<p>Supports principle of small scale development. Preference for the council to identify and allocate sites.</p> <p>Suggests increase of threshold to 10 units to reflect NPPF definition of minor development</p>	<p>Support in principle welcomed. However, disagree with raising threshold to 10. Purpose of the policy is to encourage windfall sites for self-build in sustainable locations. It is not intended as a reflection of 'minor development' as defined in the NPPF. A higher threshold would require sites to be identified and allocated within the plan. The policy is permissive subject to meeting certain criteria. The limited number is also intended to ensure a more successful integration with existing character.</p>
James Morgan	Para 5.15 Policy HP2	<p>Supports policy. Identifies small scale development as important in providing necessary bespoke housing to an area.</p>	Welcomed
Ronald Wyatt	Para 5.15 Policy HP2	<p>Policy poorly worded leading to small housing developments almost anywhere there is an existing house. Wording is too open to subjective interpretation eg well related to existing settlement. Suggest policy relates to 'within' existing housing areas.</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>The policy is flexible but sufficiently limited to prevent housing being developed 'almost everywhere'. It is limited to sustainable locations, with distances identified in para 5.16. 'areas of housing', excludes isolated existing single or two/three house locations. Greater clarity could be</p>

			provided by way of definition. Criterion 5c also precludes extending settlement frontages along the road. In essence, the policy limits development to small numbers, in sustainable locations and in character with the existing area.
Smith Simmons for Elberry Properties	Para 5.15 Policy HP2	Policy is too limiting in terms of numbers of units and too prescriptive relating to urban form. Suggests policy altered to 10 units.	Disagree with raising threshold to 10. Purpose of the policy is to encourage windfall sites for self-build in sustainable locations. It is not intended as a reflection of 'minor development' as defined in the NPPF. A higher threshold would require sites to be identified and allocated within the plan. The policy is permissive subject to meeting certain criteria. The limited number is also intended to ensure a more successful integration with existing character. There is overlap with Policy D1 but consider form specifics of this policy should be identified.
The Fareham Society	Para 5.15 Policy HP2	Policy should be deleted as it will: harm the rural character and appearance of the countryside; blur the important distinction between the countryside and the urban area; and not contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. Suggests alternative to limit development to infill existing continuous frontages and not to the rear.	Disagree. Limiting development to existing frontages allows for housing in unsustainable locations. Proposed policy is specifically limited to sustainable locations as identified in paragraph 5.16. development behind frontages will only be permitted where this is responsive to the existing character and pattern of development, by way of existing buildings. Criterion

			5c also precludes extending settlement frontages along the road.
Valerie Wyatt	Para 5.15 Policy HP2	Unsound policy. Wording is subjective and open to interpretation. Eg 'high frequency', 'well related' and 'spaces between dwellings'. More definition needed.	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>The policy wording allows some flexibility but is also clearly defined where appropriate.</p> <p>High frequency is acknowledged by CIHT, Traffic Commissioners as between 4 and 6 buses per hour, equivalent to 'turn up and go'. this level of service would limit potential development in Fareham severely. It is proposed to amend the reference to a 'reasonable bus service that links with local employment, community services and facilities, which could provide an alternative to car use'. In the context of Fareham, this is regarded as a minimum of 2 buses per hour in both directions, throughout the day.</p> <p>Agree. Suggested amended wording "within reasonable walking distance to a good bus service route"</p> <p>Well related' is a common planning term allowing flexibility of design approach. Space between dwellings is easily measured.</p>
Foreman Homes	Para 5.16	Sustainability distances should reflect those set out in manual for streets and include cycling	The distances set out within para 5.16 do reflect Manual for Streets. Whilst cycling has a greater range and could be added, the policy rightly focuses on the need for sites to be within walking

			distances, which are shorter. It would not be appropriate for sites to be deemed sustainable based on the distance that can be travelled by cycling alone. The parameters do not prevent future occupiers cycling to high frequency bus stops, rail stations of local centres.
<b>Representations on Policy HP3 – Change of Use to Garden Land</b>			
<b>Number of representations on Policy HP3: 1</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>  Noted/welcomed/disagree/covered by another policy/unsupported by evidence Suggested minor modification (typo/error)
The Fareham Society (Robert Marshall)		Ancillary buildings on garden land, can lead to changes of use detracting from the character and appearance of the countryside. Seeks reference to be made to the impact of ancillary buildings.	Noted. This is covered by the policy and Policy HP10.

Representations on Policy HP4 – Five year Housing Land Supply			
Number of representations on Policy HP4: 16			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Bryan Jezeph Consultancy		Supports the policy in principle. However, there is no attempt to provide guidance on an assessment of sustainability, which contrasts with the guidance provides for Policy HP2.	Noted.
CPRE		Significant concerns regarding the unintended consequences of this policy, specifically it's link with Policy DS1. Concern that sites may be selected outside of the urban area in the first instance.	Disagree. Policy HP4 and the link to Policy DS1 directly relate to situations where applications may be submitted for countryside sites and so the additions of these policies are required to help the Council determine those applications.
Foreman Homes		The policy is sound and consistent with national policy.	Support welcomed.
Gladman		Gladman supports this approach in principle, with some modifications. Suggest that the policy wording is amended from 'may be' to 'will be'. Also suggest that in criterion a) the reference to scale is removed to allow for additional flexibility in the housing supply. Considers criterion b) to be too onerous as sites well related to existing settlement could be considered to be sustainable.	Comments noted. Amend 'may be' to 'will be' in the Policy text.  Criterion a and b) are required to help the Council determine applications that come forward where the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply.
Gosport Borough Council		Objects to the wording of Policy HP4 as it has the potential to significantly undermine the Local Plan's policies which protect the countryside and the Strategic Gap. The policy is not considered to be effective for delivering cross-boundary objectives.	Disagree. Criterion c) of the Policy provides sufficient wording in relation to protecting the integrity of the Strategic Gap.

		Concern that the policy implies that if the Council does not meet its 5-year housing land supply the first area of search is outside of the urban area boundary. Other sites that are more sustainable such as brownfield sites should be identified in the policy as preferable.	
Home Builders Federation		Supports the policy. However, suggest the phrase 'in the short term' is unnecessary in relation to criterion d) and should be deleted as it could cause confusion to applicants and decision-makers.	Support welcomed. Disagree the 'phrase' in the short term would ensure that the site is deliverable before 5 years.
June Ward		Policy HA1 does not conform with Policy HP4. Policy HA1 has a demonstrable impact on the environment, traffic and has amenity implications.	Noted. Policy HP4 is a contingency policy to be used in the event that the Council does not have a 5-year Housing Land Supply.
Lee Residents Association		Object to the wording of the policy. Further encroachment onto the strategic gap will be detrimental and significant. If further housing is required this should be provided in urban areas or at Welborne.	Noted. Policy HP4 is a contingency policy to be used in the event that the Council does not have a 5-year Housing Land Supply.
Pegasus Group (For Hammond, Miller and Bargate)		Policy is inappropriate because it adds restrictions which may prevent sustainable sites from coming forward. Suggest criteria c of Policy HP4 is replaced by criterion iii of DSP40 from the Adopted Local Plan.	Disagree. Criterion b) of the Policy provides sufficient wording in relation to a site being located sustainably.
Pegasus Group (For Bargate Homes and Sustainable Land)		Considers that the policy is not justified in seeking to apply additional requirements on development if the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. Suggest that criterion a, c, d and e should be deleted to avoid repetition and confusion.	Disagree. The Council has successfully applied adopted Policy DSP40 at planning appeals. Policy HP4 applies the same principles.
Pegasus Group (For Bargate Homes)		Policy is inappropriate because it adds restrictions which may prevent sustainable sites from coming forward. Suggest criteria c of Policy HP4 is replaced by criterion iii of DSP40 from the Adopted Local Plan.	Disagree. Criterion b) of the Policy provides sufficient wording in relation to a site being located sustainably.

Pegasus Group (For King Norris)		Policy is inappropriate because it adds restrictions which may prevent sustainable sites from coming forward. Suggest criteria c of Policy HP4 is replaced by criterion iii of DSP40 from the Adopted Local Plan.	Disagree. Criterion b) of the Policy provides sufficient wording in relation to a site being located sustainably.
Persimmon Homes		Suggest that the policy wording is amended from 'may be' to 'will be'. Further clarification is sought in respect of criterion b which states that a development should be 'integrated into the existing settlement' as to whether this is a physical integration or in design terms. Suggest that the wording for criterion c) is deleted and replaced with a cross reference to Policy DS2.	Noted. Amend 'may be' to 'will be' in the Policy text.  Disagree. Paragraph 5.27 provides further detail and sufficient flexibility in relation to criterion b) of the policy.  And the criterion provides more detail than DS2.
Tim Haynes		Policy HP4 appears to look at areas in the countryside rather than in the urban areas first. Brownfield sites should be used first rather than putting the countryside at risk.	Noted. Policy HP4 is a contingency policy to be used in the event that the Council does not have a 5-year Housing Land Supply.
Turley (For Reside Developments)		Policy is supported. However, we would urge the Council to consider increasing the number of homes allocated at Funtley South (HA10) to contribute towards the Council's deficit in 5 year housing land supply.	Support noted. Noted.
Valerie Wyatt		Policy replaces DSP40 in the Adopted Local Plan which has not been effective. Considers HP4 not to be effective as HA1 and HA32 are included in the Local Plan but do not meet the criteria for development in this policy. A plan with these contradictions is unsound and not legally compliant.	Disagree. The Council has successfully applied adopted Policy DSP40 at planning appeals. Policy HP4 applies the same principles.  Policy HP4 is a contingency policy to be used in the event that the Council does not have a 5-year Housing Land Supply.

Representations on Policy HP5 – Provision of Affordable Housing			
Number of representations on Policy HP5: 10			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Fareham Labour Party		Do not agree that the provision of affordable homes is adequate. Further brownfield sites and town centre sites should be identified for affordable housing. Question whether the plan accounts for growth in demand over the plan period and a bare minimum in providing good living conditions for families.	<p>Noted. Policy HP5 includes a percentage of homes to be delivered as affordable on town centre and brownfield sites.</p> <p>Any development scheme coming forward must comply with the Plan's Design Policies in Chapter 11 which seek high quality design in new development.</p> <p>The Council's affordable housing need includes a 'quota' for growth over the plan period.</p>
Hampshire County Council		Policy or supporting text should encourage the provision of housing to meet a range of needs, including specialist housing such as older persons housing.	<p>Noted. The Council's Viability Study concludes that older persons housing is not viable to support affordable housing.</p> <p>Text added to Paragraph 5.33 'The Viability Study concludes that affordable housing is not viable for older persons and specialist housing. Therefore, policy HP5 does not apply</p>



			to specialist housing or older persons housing.
Home Builders Federation		Policy is unsound in its percentage requirement for affordable housing and its treatment of older persons housing. Policy criterion requiring 10% of affordable home ownership is inconsistent with the NPPF and should be amended.	Disagree. The criterion in relation to affordable home ownership is consistent with the NPPF.  Text added to Paragraph 5.33 The Viability Study concludes that affordable housing is not viable for older persons and specialist housing. Therefore, policy HP5 does not apply to specialist housing or older persons housing.
Pegasus Group (For Hammond, Miller and Bargate)		The policy is not sufficiently flexible. Suggest the wording in relation to the proportion of affordable housing required and the tenure provision in the policy is changed to 'shall normally provide' rather than 'must provide'.	Disagree. The supporting text provides enough flexibility in relation to the provision of affordable housing.
Pegasus Group (For Bargate Homes)		The policy is not sufficiently flexible. Suggest the wording in relation to the proportion of affordable housing required and the tenure provision in the policy is changed to 'shall normally provide' rather than 'must provide'.	Disagree. The supporting text provides enough flexibility in relation to the provision of affordable housing
Pegasus Group (For King Norris)		The policy is not sufficiently flexible. Suggest the wording in relation to the proportion of affordable housing required and the tenure provision in the policy is changed to 'shall normally provide' rather than 'must provide'.	Disagree. The supporting text provides enough flexibility in relation to the provision of affordable housing
Persimmon Homes		Policy HP5 should provide a viability review mechanism to provide enough flexibility. The Council's website shows considerably different need for each area in the borough and therefore the tenure mix proposed is too prescriptive and does not reflect the evidence base. Concern over the amount of affordable home ownership sought in the	Noted.  The supporting text notes that in some instances the tenure mix may not be appropriate.

		policy requirements, which may create issues for Registered Providers. Reference to LHA should be deleted in relation to 80% of the market rent to ensure the policy is in conformity with the NPPF.	Disagree. The criterion in relation to affordable home ownership is consistent with the NPPF.  Maintaining a cap at LHA or 80% of market rent, whichever is the lower, is essential to ensure that affordable housing is actually affordable for local need and households in receipt of certain benefits and is compliant with the NPPF.
QP Planning for Simon Dawkins		The proportion of affordable housing for Fareham Town Centre should be applied to all town centres and district centre in the borough.	Disagree. The Viability Study tests all site typologies and shows that 35% is viable for brownfield sites in the Boroughs district centres.
Turley (For Reside Developments)		Policy criterion requiring 10% of affordable home ownership is unsound as it is inconsistent with the NPPF.	Disagree. The criterion in relation to affordable home ownership is consistent with the NPPF.
White Young Green (For Vistry Developments)		Supports the wording of criterion iv) of the policy. Suggests that market signals should also be included as part of the considerations.	Support noted.
<b>Representations on Policy HP6 – Exception Sites</b>			
<b>Number of representations on Policy HP6: 6</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
CPRE		The use of the word OR in criterion c) could allow for significantly larger sites to be allowed. There should be a fixed upper limit.	Noted. Policy criterion c) is consistent with Paragraph 71 (criterion b) of the NPPF on entry-level exception sites.

Gosport Borough Council (GBC)		Object to the wording as it has potential to undermine the Local Plan's policies which aim to protect the countryside and the strategic gap. Concerned the proposed wording will undermine the effectiveness of the strategic gap between Fareham, Gosport, Lee-on-the-Solent and Stubbington. Concern that the policy could be used to enable much larger scale development and that it could lead to a series of 1ha entry home exception sites developed adjacent to the GBC boundary. Suggest amending policy to include Fareham settlements only and include an upper limit of what constitutes 'small sites'.	Disagree. The link HP6 directly relate to situations where applications may be submitted for countryside sites and so the additions of these policies are required to help the Council determine those applications. In addition, HP6 is consistent with national policy requirements.
Hampshire County Council		HCC supports the opportunity for exception type development in specific circumstances in this policy.	Support welcomed.
Lee Residents Association		Object to Exception sites being directed towards the strategic gap.	
Tim Haynes		Concern about the link between HP6 and DS1. It could allow for developers to build multiple small dwellings which are all affordable and build multiple dwellings for first time buyers. The ambiguity in the policy in relation to the location of exception development should be removed. Exception sites should be adjacent to existing settlements within the Borough.	Disagree. The link between DS1 and HP6 directly relates to situations where applications may be submitted for countryside sites and so the additions of these policies are required to help the Council determine those applications.  Policy criterion c) is consistent with Paragraph 71 (criterion b) of the NPPF on entry-level exception sites.
The Fareham Society		Policy is unsound as its wording and the explanatory text refers to rural areas. The district is not categorised as a rural authority. The rural	Noted.

		exception sites policy should be deleted from the plan.	Additional wording added to the glossary definition for rural exception sites to include. 'in the countryside'.
<b>Representations on Policy HP7 – Adaptable and Accessible Dwellings</b>			
<b>Number of representations on Policy HP7: 10</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Gladman Developments		Note that the policy would need to be justified by robust evidence and does not consider a general reference to an ageing population to be sufficient justification for of the policy requirements. The Council need to be aware of the impact that these requirements have on scheme viability and the knock-on effects on the delivery of housing and should demonstrate that consideration has been given to this requirement within the viability study. PPG demonstrates that M4(3) standards should only be applied to affordable homes within the Councils control.	Disagree. The Specialist Housing Needs Background paper provides robust evidence to support the inclusion of Policy HP7.  In addition, an addendum to the Council's Viability Study includes a breakdown on M4 (2 and 3) policy costs.  Criterion b) of Policy HP7 amended to <b>'On schemes of over 100 dwellings (gross), at least 2% of private housing and 5% of affordable housing shall be provided as wheelchair accessible Category 3 properties.'</b>
Hampshire County Council		The proposed percentage of housing including at Policy HP7 is modest, and it will be a very long time before a significant supply of accessible housing is available in the Borough. The likelihood of a person who develops mobility impairment will find themselves in a home that can meet their needs is	Noted. The proportion of M4 (2) housing sought is considered sufficient to meet the Borough's needs.

		low. Suggest increasing the requirement for a larger proportion of stock to be built to Category 2 standards would better meet changing needs.	Disagree. The Specialist Housing Needs Background paper provides robust evidence to support the inclusion of Policy HP7.
Pegasus Group (For Hammond, Miller and Bargate)		The policy is not sufficiently flexible and must allow for circumstances arising which means that these requirements cannot be delivered (fully or otherwise).	Disagree. M4 (2 and 3) standards have been tested through the Council's Viability Study and sites remain viable.
Pegasus Group (For Bargate Homes – 75 Holly Hill Lane, Old Street and Warsash sites)		The policy is not sufficiently flexible and must allow for circumstances arising which means that these requirements cannot be delivered (fully or otherwise).	Disagree. M4 (2 and 3) standards have been tested through the Council's Viability Study and sites remain viable.
Pegasus Group (For King Norris)		The policy is not sufficiently flexible and must allow for circumstances arising which means that these requirements cannot be delivered (fully or otherwise).	Disagree. M4 (2 and 3) standards have been tested through the Council's Viability Study and sites remain viable.
Persimmon Homes		The evidence base should be updated to reflect households with a long term health problem or disability. Considers that the Council's evidence in relation to the requirement for M4(3) standards is weak. Concern that Registered Providers are less willing to take on wheelchair dwellings as they can be difficult to occupy and the unit could be left empty for a significant period.	Noted. The Specialist Housing Needs Background Paper has been updated to include further evidence for the justification for M4 (3) standards.  Policy is not relevant to Registered Providers as detailed in the PPG.
Terence O'Rourke (For Miller Homes)		Policy should provide greater flexibility in meeting the percentage of dwellings meeting M4(2 and 3) standards to reflect changing need and site circumstances. Policy does not take into consideration the requirements of the PPG. Policy should be amended to provide greater flexibility.	Noted.  <b>Criterion b) of Policy HP7 amended to 'On schemes of over 100 dwellings (gross), at least 2% of private housing and 5% of affordable housing shall be provided as wheelchair accessible Category 3 properties.'</b>
Pegasus Group (For Hammond, Miller and Bargate)	Para 5.57	Statement in relation to the costs of Category 2 and 3 is strongly disputed. Concerned that these costs	Disagree. The Specialist Housing Needs Background paper provides

		will not be factored into a developer's viability calculations. Category 3 requirements must be substantiated by quantified evidence of the need for such units in the borough.	<p>robust evidence to support the inclusion of Policy HP7.</p> <p>In addition, an addendum to the Council's Viability Study includes a breakdown on M4 (2 and 3) policy costs.</p> <p>Criterion b) of Policy HP7 amended to <b>'On schemes of over 100 dwellings (gross), at least 2% of private housing and 5% of affordable housing shall be provided as wheelchair accessible Category 3 properties.'</b></p>
Pegasus Group (For Bargate Homes – 75 Holly Hill Lane, Old Street and Warsash sites)	Para 5.57	Statement in relation to the costs of Category 2 and 3 is strongly disputed. Concerned that these costs will not be factored into a developer's viability calculations. Category 3 requirements must be substantiated by quantified evidence of the need for such units in the borough.	<p>Disagree. The Specialist Housing Needs Background paper provides robust evidence to support the inclusion of Policy HP7.</p> <p>In addition, an addendum to the Council's Viability Study includes a breakdown on M4 (2 and 3) policy costs.</p> <p>Criterion b) of Policy HP7 amended to <b>'On schemes of over 100 dwellings (gross), at least 2% of private housing and 5% of affordable housing shall be provided as wheelchair accessible Category 3 properties.'</b></p>
Pegasus Group (For King Norris)	Para 5.57	Statement in relation to the costs of Category 2 and 3 is strongly disputed. Concerned that these costs will not be factored into a developer's viability	Disagree. The Specialist Housing Needs Background paper provides

		calculations. Category 3 requirements must be substantiated by quantified evidence of the need for such units in the borough.	<p>robust evidence to support the inclusion of Policy HP7.</p> <p>In addition, an addendum to the Council's Viability Study includes a breakdown on M4 (2 and 3) policy costs.</p> <p>Criterion b) of Policy HP7 amended to <b>'On schemes of over 100 dwellings (gross), at least 2% of private housing and 5% of affordable housing shall be provided as wheelchair accessible Category 3 properties.'</b></p>
<b>Representations on Policy HP8 – Older Persons' and Specialist Housing Provision</b>			
<b>Number of representations on Policy HP8: 3</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Hampshire County Council		The inclusion of an enabling policy is welcomed. It is recommended that there is specific mention of specialist provision for affordable housing. HCC considers that sites HA42/43 and 44 may also be suitable for other forms of specialist housing and recommends that policies are amended to reflect this. HCC supports the opportunity for exception type development in specific circumstances in this policy.	<p>Noted and support welcomed. The Council's Viability Study concludes that affordable housing is not viable for older persons housing.</p> <p>The inclusion of the sheltered housing allocations (HA42/43 and 44) in the plan are robustly justified by the Specialist Housing Background Paper.</p>

Persimmon Homes		Considers the Specialist Housing Needs Background Paper has not considered windfall sites and allocated sites permissible under Policy SP8. Also considers that the policy requirement should be restricted to highly accessible locations such as Fareham Town Centre and the district centres.	Disagree. The SHN background paper considers all housing supply options in relation to specialist housing.  Restricting specialist housing to the town and district centres does not provide enough flexibility in the policy.
The Fareham Society		Notes the policy opens up the possibility of specialist housing being provided in the countryside. The policy as worded fails to have regard to NPPF para 170 which seeks to ensure that new development contributes and enhances the natural and local environment.	Disagree. Policy HP8 focuses older persons and specialist housing provision within the urban area boundary, <u>unless</u> it can be demonstrated by the developer that the need can be met elsewhere.

### Representations on Policy HP9 – Self and Custom Build Homes

**Number of representations on Policy HP9: 13**

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Bryan Jezeph Consultancy		HP9 seeks a significant increase in the provision of self build plots. Many of the sites have been granted planning permission and it is desirable to make specific provision to meet the deficit. Proposing an extension to HA33 to provide more self-build housing.	Noted. The proposed extension will be assessed through the SHELAA process.
Foreman Homes		Policy is unsound. The requirement for sites over 40 to provide 10% as self-build is unjustified. Evidence suggests the Council is supporting sufficient plots to come forward without imposing restrictions on major development. The requirement for a development to wait 12 months before selling a dwelling is also unjustified.	Noted however the Council disagrees. Although sufficient permissions were achieved to meet the first base period requirement, the average number of entrants on the register is increasing, however the average number of applications is not. In addition, the



			local plan must take into account those individuals on part 2 of the register, whereas the base period requirements do not. More detail is set out in the Self and custom build background paper.
Gladman Developments		Support the inclusion of policy HP9. However, raise concerns regarding the evidential justification for 40 dwellings being the trigger for self and custom build provision. Request re-wording that if up-to-date evidence indicates that there is a demand in the particular location then scheme is encouraged to make provision.	Support noted. The evidence to support the requirement for sites of 40 dwellings is set out in the Self and custom build background paper. The broad spread of demand indicated by the register does not indicate a requirement to specify a location.
Home Builders Federation		Considers a significant proportion of demand for self build plots will be met through windfall sites. The requirement for setting 10% of sites over 40 is not justified. Considers Policy HP2 will support delivery of additional sites for self and custom build housing. Welcomes a review of the self build register as concerned that there is not a significant demand for plots on large housing sites. Suggest that the Council should utilise its own land or seek to engage with landowners to identify suitable sites to deliver plots.	Noted. Although sufficient permissions were achieved to meet the first base period requirement, the average number of entrants on the register is increasing, however the average number of applications is not. In addition, the local plan must take into account those individuals on part 2 of the register, whereas the base period requirements do not. More detail is set out in the Self and custom build background paper, including data gathered from the register that there is interest in plots on larger developments.
Mr James Morgan		Support policy.	Support welcomed.
Pegasus Group (For Hammond/Miller and Bargate)		Concern that 40 dwellings is too small a threshold due to the construction management implications that will arise. Prefer Council to allocate specific sites for self and custom build instead. Strategic allocations such as Welborne provide the ideal opportunity for land to be allocated for plots.	Noted. Self and Custom Build register survey indicates interest in plots on developments as well as specific sites. This provides market choice.

Pegasus Group (For Bargate Homes – 75 Holly Hill, Old Street and Warsash sites)		Concern that 40 dwellings is too small a threshold due to the construction management implications that will arise. Prefer Council to allocate specific sites for self and custom build instead. Strategic allocations such as Welborne provide the ideal opportunity for land to be allocated for plots.	Noted. Self and Custom Build register survey indicates interest in plots on developments as well as specific sites. This provides market choice.
Pegasus Group (For King Norris)		Concern that 40 dwellings is too small a threshold due to the construction management implications that will arise. Prefer Council to allocate specific sites for self and custom build instead. Strategic allocations such as Welborne provide the ideal opportunity for land to be allocated for plots.	Noted. Self and Custom Build register survey indicates interest in plots on developments as well as specific sites. This provides market choice.
Persimmon Homes		Notes that it seems excessive to require a policy to further increase self/custom build supply. Concern that this could result in over provision of a product where there is no clear market demand. There are also a number of practical implications that the plan fails to acknowledge such providing clarification on the definition of serviced, providing further detail on who is responsible for setting out the design parameters and there a number of additional practical and management issues.	Noted. Self and Custom Build Register indicates the clear market demand. More detail can be found in the Self and Custom Build Background Paper. Information regarding requirements for a serviced plot are set out in How the policy works. Definition of Serviced Plots can be found in Planning Practice Guidance. Footnote to be added to link to the guidance.
Terence O'Rourke for Miller Homes		Questions the requirement for the policy because of the practical implications of delivery and the lack of need. Concern that the policy could provide an oversupply of self and custom build units. Considers it extremely challenging to incorporate self and custom build plots into strategic sites, specific sites should be identified for this sole purpose. The policy should be supported with appropriate evidence to demonstrate such a demand and parameters should be established within the policy.	Noted.
Turley (For Reside Developments)		The evidence indicates that the demand for self and custom build often arises on smaller sites, so	Noted.

		focusing on sites of over 40 may not respond to demand. Therefore, the policy requirements are unjustified. Suggest 5% is a more reasonable level to apply to larger sites. Reside have proposed 6 self build units on land south of Funtley Road.	
Varsity Town Planning for O & H Properties		Policy limits self-build housing to predominantly being delivered via a percentage target on larger sites. It is contended that flexibly should be built into the policy to consider proposals for self build in the countryside.	Noted however the Council disagrees. The first part of the policy outlines that proposals that provide for self and custom build homes within the urban area will be supported.
White Young Green (For Vistry Group)		The policy fails to take account of particular needs and it is not clear if the Council has considered different approaches to the delivery of self build plots. If a quota based policy is the preferred approach to meeting self build need, a more flexible approach should be adopted. Considers it to be questionable as to whether there is high demand within a wider residential estate. It is suggested that the fall back is reduced to six months to reduce potential expensive delays on site.	Noted however the Council disagrees. The policy has considered the need of the self and custom build register as set out in the self and custom build background paper.
<b>Representations on Policy HP10 – Ancillary Accommodation</b>			
<b>Number of representations on Policy HP10: 1</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
The Fareham Society (Mr Robert Marshall)		Seeks more of the supporting text to be included in the policy. Policy should require ancillary accommodation to be close to the principal dwelling. Paragraph 5.82 should be worded more clearly to say than an unrelated unit of	Noted. Policy HP10 a) requires ancillary accommodation to be within the curtilage of the principal dwelling.

		accommodation is in effect a new dwelling and will not be regarded as ancillary accommodation.	
<b>Representations on Policy HP11 – Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</b>			
<b>Number of representations on Policy HP11: 3</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
East Hampshire District Council (EHDC)		Suggests the removal of 'lawful' under Policy HP11 of the Local Plan unless it is equally used in reference to bricks and mortar housing. Also suggest the supporting text is reviewed and removal of any references to a Traveller or person being 'lawful'. Criterion a) of the policy should be reviewed as it is not compliant with the PPTS.	<p>Disagree. The word 'lawful' was not intended to be used in relation to a person. Policy and supporting text references to 'lawful' to be removed.</p> <p>Disagree criterion a) of Policy HP11 is compliant with the PPTS.</p> <p>(See Below)</p> <p>Local planning authorities should consider the following issues amongst other relevant matters when considering planning applications for traveller sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the existing level of local provision and need for sites</li> <li>b) the availability (or lack) of alternative accommodation for the applicants</li> <li>c) other personal circumstances of the applicant</li> </ul>

Winchester City Council (WCC)		Considers policy to be sound as it provides for the needs of gypsies and travellers to be met. Welcomes that the Local Plan has been able to identify sites to meet the Borough's needs for traveller sites. The explanatory text is not clear whether suitable sites have been sought to meet the unmet need for travelling showpeople's sites in the Winchester District.	Support welcomed.  Add additional wording to para 5.89 after second sentence... "No additional sites were promoted to the Council for G&T Pitches". Then additional wording for the third sentence... no identified need for travelling showpeople and no sites were promoted to the Council".
East Hampshire District Council	Para 5.98	Contend that the Council is meeting the minimum number of pitches and the need is likely to be higher. Suggest the Council relook at the need to see if further provision can be made. Also suggest the GTAA should be updated to support the submission version of the Local Plan.	Noted. The Council is content that the evidence to support the policy is robust. Paragraph 5.89 states that it is anticipated that an updated GTAA will be undertaken during the plan period. The Council consider this an appropriate approach.
<b>Representations on Policy HA45 – Land at rear of 77 Burr ridge Road</b>			
<b>Number of representations on Policy HA45: 9</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Burr ridge and Swanwick Residents Association		Concern over the lack of public consultation in respect of the allocated site and therefore fails the tests of soundness. There is no explanation for the change in relation to sites in H10 in the 2017 Plan to the allocation of HA45. Concerned over the location of the 3 pitches, these should be spread	The Plan has been subject to six weeks statutory consultation. The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current family and owners of the site at this location. The planning considerations for the site

		across different locations across the borough. Also concerned the Council ignore the findings of the 2019 appeal. Furthermore, the site does not address onsite parking and the significant effect the site would have on European sites.	have been informed by the most recent appeal for the site as described by paragraph 5.100. The allocation would be subject to other policies in the plan such as D1 High Quality Design and TIN2 Highways safety and Road Network, NE3, NE4 etc.
David Barry		Policy HA45 should seek to be inclusive. The allocation of the site appears to be a convenient solution for the Council rather than meeting the needs of the communities and the gypsies and travellers. The 3 pitches should inclusive and spread across the whole borough instead of solely for one family group. Concern that the site allocation will not provide an integrated community and the policy does not meet the principles for inclusive design. Furthermore, the site does not meet all the criteria for Policy HP11.	Noted. The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current family and owners of the site at this location. Allocation would be subject to other policies in the plan such as D1 High Quality Design etc.
Graham Bell		The site is not appropriate to accommodate 3 pitches. The site constantly floods contrary to criterion f) of Policy HP11 and the adjoining land is designated SINC. The site has poor accessibility contrary to criterion b) of Policy HP11. The site contains a number of vehicles and is already overcrowded and has an unsafe access point. The proposed allocation is not in keeping with the surrounding area. Concern whether the family's requirement for 3 pitches meets the definition in the PPTS. Furthermore, the access road is owned by a third party rather than the Council.	Concerns noted. The site has been assessed for flood risk issues. Policy contains a requirement to implement a biodiversity mitigation and enhancement plan to ensure the remaining SINC designation is protected and enhanced. Highways and access are considered adequate for the quantum of development at the site but will be subject to other policies in the plan such as D1, TIN2 etc.  The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current family and owners of the site at this location.

Michael Edwards		Concern that the site and the location of Burr ridge is not suitable to provide 3 pitches. In addition, the short term need for the site is not justified. Suggest other sites in the Borough are examined and the site is removed from the Local Plan.	Noted. The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current family and owners of the site at this location.
Toby King		The site has poor accessibility contrary to criterion b) of Policy HP11. Concern over parking and access on site. Concern that the site and the location of Burr ridge is not suitable to provide 4 dwellings. The 3 pitches should inclusive and spread across the whole borough	Disagree. The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current family and owners of the site at this location. The allocation would be subject to other policies in the plan such as D1 High Quality Design and TIN2 Highways safety and Road Network etc.
Vivian Holt		Concern over the lack of public consultation in respect of the allocated site. Suggest other sites in the Borough are examined and HA45 is removed from the Local Plan.	Noted. The Plan has been subject to six weeks statutory consultation. The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current family and owners of the site at this location.
Vivian Holt	Para 5.100	The Council has failed to comply with NPPF para 61 and the Procedure Guide for Local Plan Examinations in allocating sites for development.	Disagree. The preparation of the Plan has complied with all relevant regulations.
The Fareham Society	Para 5.101	Allocation of the site is contrary to NPPF requirements for conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Suggest the site allocation is removed from the Plan.	Policy contains a requirement to implement a biodiversity mitigation and enhancement plan to ensure the remaining SINC designation is protected and enhanced. The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current family and owners of the site at this location.
Vivian Holt	Para 5.101	Concern that the supporting text to the policy misrepresents the Inspectors views at the 2019 appeal. Suggest site is removed from the plan.	Disagree. The planning considerations for the site have been informed by the most recent appeal for the site as described by paragraph 5.100.

Representations on policy HP12 – Development Proposals within Solent Breezes Holiday Park			
Number of representations on policy: 0			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
		No comments received	
Representations on Strategic Policy E1 Employment Land Provision			
Number of representations on policy: 13			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Warsash Inshore Fisherman	6.3	Plan fails to consider likely significant impact to local fishing businesses with regard to seaweed overgrowth impacts and potential bacterial/viral shellfish contamination from untreated sewage overflows.	Disagree. Covered by another policy NE4: Water Quality Effects on the Special Protection areas, Special Areas of Conservation and Ramsar Sites of the Solent.
Arlington Business Parks	6.15, 6.17 and Table 6.3	The split across employment use classes is too restrictive on allocated sites and may act as a barrier to development. 6.3 is contrary to 'flexibility and choice', is too restrictive and hinders the ability to rapidly respond to change. It should be amended to remove the floorspace 'caps' on each type of business use. This would enable the Borough to meet market demand should it come forward within a particular use class, particularly when other sites may not be available for development now, and	The allocations don't specify use class, just overall floorspace numbers for the site and proposed use as employment so there is flexibility in the allocation. Table 6.3 provides the clarity for delivering floorspace need identified in Table 6.2 and Policy E1. Allocation policy states that any development will need to be in accordance with extant permission,



		therefore there are limited opportunities within the Borough.	any new application will need to consider the policy requirements in 5
Southern Planning Practice (Fribished)	6.1 to 6.23 and Policy E1	<p>Clear lack of available supply of sites in the market to meet market demand, as well as the lag time in being able to meet demand indicates that rather than artificially reducing the potential supply of employment sites and floorspace, and relying on a very small number, some with long lead in times, the Council should be providing a much greater range of sites, with an emphasis on those that appear to be capable of delivering in the earlier years of the Plan period. The Plan also fails to recognise differences across the Borough in terms of Employment sub-areas. The need for a wide range of sites capable of meeting a range of employment needs cannot be over-emphasised.</p> <p><b>Little Park Farm</b> promoted to deliver choice, flexibility and early plan delivery.</p>	<p>The Development Strategy has been updated to reflect up to date evidence on employment need. The updated evidence published by PfSH shows an increase in requirement as well as a shift in focus of use class with an increase in logistics type uses. The evidence also simplifies the requirement by showing a need for 'offices' and 'industry' – which includes logistics. Changes to the development strategy include the addition of sites based on the LSH site scoring, to provide a greater choice in terms of type and location of site and to provide contingency against perceived deliverability issues.</p>
Foreman Homes	E1	<p>Policy is unsound as it is not in accordance with national policy. The reliance on three allocations does not allow for flexibility if these sites do not come forward. The floorspace required over the plan period does not take into consideration fluctuation in the employment market, therefore, further allocation should be included in the policy.</p> <p><b>Standard Way</b> site promoted for 2000m2 of flexible employment floor space.</p>	<p>The Development Strategy has been updated to reflect up to date evidence on employment need. The updated evidence published by PfSH shows an increase in requirement as well as a shift in focus of use class with an increase in logistics type uses. The evidence also simplifies the requirement by showing a need for 'offices' and 'industry' – which includes logistics. Changes to the development strategy include the addition of sites based on the LSH site scoring, to provide a greater choice in terms of type and location of site and to provide</p>

			contingency against perceived deliverability issues.
Gosport Borough Council	E1	Gosport Borough Council supports the employment allocations at Daedalus.	Noted.
Graham Moyes (Turley)	E1	<p>Employment policy is wholly focussed on a numerical approach to employment provision over the Plan period but fails to recognise qualitative matters including specific locational requirements and new employment is restricted to a number of sites. Employment strategy should make specific allowance for the broad needs of businesses with a presumption in favour of investment in employment generating development and should not be viewed as a maximum provision.</p> <p><b>Down Barn Farm</b> promoted as an employment allocation as well related to SRN and provides unique opportunity to accommodate users who are dependent on such a location.</p>	The Development Strategy has been updated to reflect up to date evidence on employment need. The updated evidence published by PfSH shows an increase in requirement as well as a shift in focus of use class with an increase in logistics type uses. The evidence also simplifies the requirement by showing a need for 'offices' and 'industry' – which includes logistics. Changes to the development strategy include the addition of sites based on the LSH site scoring, to provide a greater choice in terms of type and location of site and to provide contingency against perceived deliverability issues.
Michael Sparks (Cambria Land Ltd)	E1	<p>The Policy identifies that 104,000 sqm of new employment floorspace will be provided across the plan period. This is contrary to the amount of floorspace that is identified by the Partnership for South Hampshire, which recommends 130,000 sqm. Plan is considered to be undersupplying employment land and not offering a flexible supply of employment land as required by the NPPF.</p> <p><b>Down Barn Farm</b> should be allocated for development to provide flexible source.</p>	Disagree. Paragraph 6.11 and Table 6.1 provide a comparison of employment floorspace between the PfSH Spatial Position Statement (SPS) and the Publication Local Plan. Whilst the absolute number is higher in the SPS this is because it covers a period 9 years longer than the Local Plan. Paragraph 6.11 describes how the Plan will deliver more employment floorspace per annum than the PfSH SPS. Therefore, contend that the Plan is not undersupplying employment land as suggested. Policy E1 has also

			now been updated to reflect updated PfSH evidence on employment need.
Robert Marshall (Fareham Society)	E1	Policy is sound in all but one respect on the two Daedalus allocations. The emerging Policy does not promote the idea of advanced manufacturing for the site, and without doing so there is a danger that this valuable site could be lost to commercial uses less valuable to the economy.	Noted. Addition of text to include reference in the allocation and supporting text to uses being in line with the Daedalus Vision.
Portsmouth City Council	E1	Supports allocations for employment land in Policy E1, particularly the sites at Daedalus which are of sub-regional importance to the local market.	Noted.
Tim Haynes	E1	Notable that policy E1 does not do anything to suggest that there should be any preference for types of employment that acknowledges the government's Green Agenda and true sustainability. Would have been encouraging to see any of the identified sites, including Daedalus, being suggested as a potential home for green industry, whether manufacture of energy generating technology, environmental remediation, R & D or just green-related consumer business.	Noted. Strategy is flexible to meet demands and requirements of the market. Addition of text to Daedalus allocations to include a reference to uses being in-line with the Daedalus Vision which states a preference for types of employment.
Winchester City Council	E1	Supports the continued allocation of land at Solent 2 for employment use and considers this to be sound and supportive of the duty to cooperate.	Noted.
Eastleigh Borough Council	E1	Welcome the contribution of the proposed employment allocations for meeting both local and wider strategic employment needs. The sub-regional importance of the Solent Enterprise Zone at Daedalus also continues to be recognised in terms of the wider employment, skills and training opportunities this will continue to provide. Would welcome a reference in the Plan to the 'cities first' approach supported by PfSH in reflecting the cities as the main focus for new office development across the sub-region.	Noted. Development Strategy and Policy E1 have been updated to reflected the most recent up to date PfSH employment needs study.

David Mugford	E1	Two development sites are on Solent airfield, and the third at Whiteley. None of these is served by any form of public transport, so private transport will be essential. Does this fit with climate change? Or is it assumed e-vehicles of one sort or another will be commonplace after 2037?	Any applications at these sites will be required to be accompanied by travel plans including sustainable transport measures.
<b>Representations on Policy E2 Faraday Business Park</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 5</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Gosport Borough Council	E2	Gosport Borough Council supports the employment allocations at Daedalus.	Noted.
Hampshire County Council	E2	A site-specific requirement should be added to this allocated site policy so that any forthcoming planning application would need to be accompanied by a Minerals Resource Assessment: <i>The site is within a Minerals Consultation Area. Minerals extraction may be appropriate, where environmentally suitable, subject to confirmation of the scale and quality of the resource.</i>	Noted. Add additional point to policy criteria.
Highways England	E2	Floorspace capacity identified within the policy is in excess of that proposed within the LP supplement and may result in a more significant impact on the SRN than previously reported as part of the LP Supplement evidence base.	Unclear as to what the reference to LP Supplement is in regard to, but the floorspace figures identified within the Plan are within an acceptable range of the Do Minimum land use assumptions in the Transport Assessment modelling.
Southern Planning Practice (Frobisher)	E2	Site E2 is heavily invested in by the Council and Solent LEP. It is not suggested that they do not and will not have a role to play in the area's overall	Noted.

		employment provision. However, and even with the completion of the Stubbington bypass the view of commercial agents, Vail Williams and others is that the distance of the site from the motorway and journey times will be unacceptable to those companies reliant on many traffic movements per day. These two sites are therefore likely to serve a more local market than sites much closer to the motorway. In short, these sites are serving a difference purpose and submarket to sites closer to and with easy access to the motorway. Alternative site promoted.	
Pegasus (Hammond Miller Bargate)	E2	The two site-specific reasons for the deletion of housing allocation HA2 Newgate Lane South given in the Fareham SHLAA are that the site lies within a Strategic Gap and that the site is designated as a Low Use site for Brent Geese and Waders. Given the proposed allocation at the Faraday Business Park, a site's designation as of Low Use status for Solent Waders and Brent Geese clearly does not prevent a site from being allocated for development.	Noted. Omission site justification.
<b>Representations on Policy E3 Swordfish Business Park</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 5</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Gosport Borough Council	E3	Gosport Borough Council supports the employment allocations at Daedalus.	Noted.
Hampshire County Council	E3	A site-specific requirement should be added to this allocated site policy so that any forthcoming	Noted. Add additional point to policy criteria.

		<p>planning application would need to be accompanied by a Minerals Resource Assessment:</p> <p><i>The site is within a Minerals Consultation Area. Minerals extraction may be appropriate, where environmentally suitable, subject to confirmation of the scale and quality of the resource.</i></p>	
Highways England	E3	Floorspace capacity identified within the policy is in excess of that proposed within the LP supplement and may result in a more significant impact on the SRN than previously reported as part of the LP Supplement evidence base.	Unclear as to what the reference to LP Supplement is in regard to, but the floorspace figures identified within the Plan are within an acceptable range of the Do Minimum land use assumptions in the Transport Assessment modelling.
Southern Planning Practice (Frobisher)	E3	Site E3 is heavily invested in by the Council and Solent LEP. It is not suggested that they do not and will not have a role to play in the area's overall employment provision. However, and even with the completion of the Stubbington bypass the view of commercial agents, Vail Williams and others is that the distance of the site from the motorway and journey times will be unacceptable to those companies reliant on many traffic movements per day. These two sites are therefore likely to serve a more local market than sites much closer to the motorway. In short, these sites are serving a difference purpose and submarket to sites closer to and with easy access to the motorway. Alternative site promoted.	Noted.
Pegasus (Hammond Miller Bargate)	E3	The two site-specific reasons for the deletion of housing allocation HA2 Newgate Lane South given in the Fareham SHLAA are that the site lies within a Strategic Gap and that the site is designated as a Low Use site for Brent Geese and Waders. Given the proposed allocation at the Swordfish Business Park, a site's designation as of Low Use status for	Noted. Omission site justification.

		Solent Waders and Brent Geese clearly does not prevent a site from being allocated for development.	
<b>Representations on Policy E4 Solent 2</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 4</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Highways England	E4	Policy E4 outlines the details for Solent 2 and states an employment space capacity of 23,500m2 which is the same as proposed within the LP Supplement. This site is almost adjacent to M27 Junction 9.	Noted.
Natural England	E4	Acknowledged that the site is an existing allocation and the current Policy outlines a requirement for development to protect existing woodland and avoid habitat severance and appropriate mitigation and compensation for any loss of protected trees. However, it is our view that a significant area of habitat, including mature woodland, is likely to be lost as a result of development. The Policy should ensure that it is compliant with Strategic Policy NE1 with regards to impacts on the local ecological network in this locality.	Noted. Add addition wording to point c) in allocation policy to strengthen link to Policy NE1.
Winchester City Council	E4	The City Council supports the continued allocation of land at Solent 2 for employment use and considers this to be sound and supportive of the duty to cooperate.	Noted.
Southern Planning Practice (Frobisher)	E4	Although the Local Plan refers to an extant outline planning permission for the site, it must be questioned whether the outline permission could	Noted. The permission is live on the site. Omission site justification.

		now actually be implemented. Given how long has passed since these permissions were granted, it would be most unlikely that they would suit current market requirements. The constraints are potentially increasing in terms of access and congestion and the ecological constraints. A question mark remains over the likelihood of this site coming forward, its capacity and market interest.	
<b>Representations on Policy E5 Existing Employment Areas</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 4</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Gosport Borough Council	E5	Supports Policy E5. It is important that existing employment sites in Fareham including a number on the Gosport Peninsula are protected including those along Newgate Lane and close to Fareham Town Centre as they provide employment to Gosport residents and are potentially accessible by bus, cycling or walking.	Noted.
Hampshire County Council	E5	Wishes to clarify its position as landowner for the above site under Policy E5 linked to the separate written representation from Frobisher Developments Limited. The County Council's Executive Member for Policy and Resources took the decision on 25 April 2019 to make its land available and offer improved access rights over Little Park Farm Road to support the delivery of a range of employment use within the site, subject	Noted. Omission site justification.



		to planning, that would be commensurate with its current allocation under Policy DSP18 of the Fareham Local Plan (part 2).	
Michael Sparks Associates (Cambria Land Ltd)	E5	Existing, established employment sites perform an important function and they should be afforded flexibility to help them grow, adapt and support economic growth. Down Barn Farm site is not identified as an Existing Employment Area even though activity at the site is consistent with an employment use and the adjacent barn is in use as offices. Down Barn Farm should also be identified as an existing Employment Area.	Disagree. Waste uses are not considered as suitable for Existing Employment Area designation. This is consistent across the borough.
Lyons+Sleeman+Hoare (Cams Hall)	E5	Policy E5 is considered overly restrictive in reference to Cams Hall and does not allow the flexibility to consider other uses and other public benefits that may accrue through future changes of use and / or related development that may be required to retain the viability and beneficial continuing use of the Grade II* listed Hall in a manner that will best secure its long-term future. Seek the removal of the Cams Hall itself, together with its listed grounds and curtilage from the policy allocation. The maximum level of flexibility should be allowed for the owners to find and deliver the most beneficial uses / development at the Hall site.	Disagree. Existing policy allows for release from employment use where conditions are met. Viability considerations for listed building are covered by iii. of the Policy.

Representations on Policy E6 Boatyards			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Gosport Borough Council	E6	This policy is supported as the availability of waterfront sites around the Solent is limited and the marine businesses, they support contribute to one of the key sectors of the sub-regional economy of which Gosport marine sites form part of a cluster.	Noted.
Representations on E7 Solent Airport			
Number of representations on policy: 3			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Tim Haynes	E7	Request removal of nonsensical reference to an airport. It is at present an airfield that handles a bearable (for nearby residents) amount of traffic. Fareham Borough Council and the operators of the airfield have applied for up to 40,000 aircraft movements per year; that is approximately 110 per day over 365 days. They also include in their plans the possibility of jet aircraft using the airfield. This presents an unacceptable level of activity on a small airfield bordered closely by residential areas	Disagree. Established airport uses and types of use are regulated by legal agreement rather than the Local Plan. The Local Plan policy will protect the airfield for airport related uses, irrespective of the level of activity on the site, in line with the Daedalus vision.

		and in a part of the country which the UK government has made clear is not appropriate for further expansion of runway availability.	
Gosport Borough Council	E7	It is important that the airfield is retained to support a large number of employers at the Daedalus site which provides one of the key reasons for many businesses to locate and expand on the site. The justification text highlights that the Solent Airport has consent for up to 40,000 flight movements per year. There are no indications in the FLP2037 that any changes will be sought on this matter.	Noted. The Policy refers to the aspirations of the Vision and seeks to safeguard the airside part of the site for airfield related uses.
Jason Cullingham	E7	Noted that the Council is primarily proposing to increase aviation-based employment inclusive of an increase to the number of flights making use of the runway. By continuing to target aviation related employment the council would appear to be encouraging one of the least Green and most polluting forms of transportation, contrary to current Government policy to promote the development and use of Green Energy sources and achieve zero carbon production by 2050. FBC would better serve its residents by championing more environmentally based employment opportunities in support of Government Climate Change policies."	The Policy relates to the airside element of the wider site and is therefore focused on related facilities and infrastructure to support such use. The two employment allocation E2 and E3 relate to the wider employment opportunities on the site. The Local Plan approach to Climate Change is covered in CC1 and CC4 and air quality in NE8.

## Representations on R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Protecting the Vitality and Viability of Centres

Number of representations on policy: 3

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Samantha Pope	7.13	Local retail/commercial figures do not cater for additional houses in Warsash. Plan should include retail floorspace for western wards.	Noted. The Retail and Commercial Leisure Study 2017 and Update 2020 provide projections on future need for retail floorspace in the Borough, taking into account the ONS population projections upon which the Borough's housing need is also based. The report indicates that the current vacant floorspace levels can support the need to 2027. Future local plan reviews will consider the need beyond 2027, as supported by the Retail and Commercial Leisure Study 2017 and in accordance with para 85d of the NPPF.
Tamsin Dickinson	7.13	Local retail/commercial figures do not cater for additional houses in Warsash. Plan should include retail floorspace for western wards.	Noted. The Retail and Commercial Leisure Study 2017 and Update 2020 provide projections on future need for retail floorspace in the Borough, taking into account the ONS population projections upon which the Borough's housing need is also based. The report indicates that the current vacant floorspace levels can support the need to 2027. Future local plan reviews will consider the need beyond 2027, as

			supported by the Retail and Commercial Leisure Study 2017 and in accordance with para 85d of the NPPF.
Unknown Resident	7.13	Local retail/commercial figures do not cater for additional houses in Warsash. Plan should include retail floorspace for western wards.	Noted. The Retail and Commercial Leisure Study 2017 and Update 2020 provide projections on future need for retail floorspace in the Borough, taking into account the ONS population projections upon which the Borough's housing need is also based. The report indicates that the current vacant floorspace levels can support the need to 2027. Future local plan reviews will consider the need beyond 2027, as supported by the Retail and Commercial Leisure Study 2017 and in accordance with para 85d of the NPPF.

Representations on R2 – Out of Town Shopping			
Number of representations on policy: 3			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Tamsin Dickinson	7.18	Out of town shopping is not defined. Out of town shopping takes custom from local shopping areas.	Noted, however the Council disagrees. The policies map defines the Borough's retail centres and parades in line with the retail hierarchy set out in policy R1 (see footnote 45). Policy R2 refers to proposals outside these centres and parades. Policy R2 aims to ensure that appropriate retail is retained in the centres by requiring that any proposals for retail other than in the defined centres must provide a full sequential test demonstrating that there are no available suitable or viable sites within the existing centres. In addition, any out of town proposal over 500sq.m is required to provide an impact assessment to demonstrate that there is no adverse effect on the existing retail centres.
Jane Wright	7.18	Out of town shopping is not defined. Out of town shopping takes custom from local shopping areas.	Noted, however the Council disagrees. The policies map defines the Borough's retail centres and parades in line with the retail hierarchy set out in policy R1 (see footnote 45). Policy R2 refers to proposals outside these centres and parades. Policy R2 aims

			to ensure that appropriate retail is retained in the centres by requiring that any proposals for retail other than in the defined centres must provide a full sequential test demonstrating that there are no available suitable or viable sites within the existing centres. In addition, any out of town proposal over 500sq.m is required to provide an impact assessment to demonstrate that there is no adverse effect on the existing retail centres.
Unknown Resident	7.18	Out of town shopping is not defined. Out of town shopping takes custom from local shopping areas.	Noted however the Council disagrees. The policies map defines the Borough's retail centres and parades in line with the retail hierarchy set out in policy R1 (see footnote 45). Policy R2 refers to proposals outside these centres and parades. Policy R2 aims to ensure that appropriate retail is retained in the centres by requiring that any proposals for retail other than in the defined centres must provide a full sequential test demonstrating that there are no available suitable or viable sites within the existing centres. In addition, any out of town proposal over 500sq.m is required to provide an impact assessment to demonstrate that there is no adverse effect on the existing retail centres.

Representations on Policy R4 – Community & Leisure Facilities			
Number of representations on policy: 5			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Hampshire County Council – Property Services		Policy is not sound as overly restrictive/not sufficiently flexible for public service providers. Propose additional point: <i>iv. the proposals are part of a public service provider's plans to re-provide or enhance local services and the proposal will clearly provide sufficient community benefit to outweigh the loss of the existing facility, meeting evidence of a local need.</i>	Noted. The policy will be modified to make the policy clearer.
Hampshire County Council – Children Services		Important that impact of additional housing is assessed and where necessary developer contributions are provided for additional childcare places.	Noted. This aspect is covered by TIN4.
Lichfield for David Lloyd Leisure		David Lloyd Leisure - business need review has identified requirement in Fareham for health & racquets club.	Noted. The Playing Pitch Strategy is the evidence base for sports provision in the Borough which has assessed the Borough's needs.
Sport England		Not Sound, not consistent with NPPF para 97. Robust assessment should be provided to evidence why a facility would no longer be needed. Concern that loss of sport facility could be allowed if alternative community use proposed. Policy should also refer to quantity of any replacement provision to ensure equivalent quantitative basis.	Noted however the Council disagrees, para 7.36 requires evidence to demonstrate there is no longer a need. The policy sets out that any provision should be sufficient or better in terms of function.



Theatres Trust	7.36	Support Policy. Criteria by which evidence of lack of need can be established should be included.	Support welcomed. Para 7.36 suggests the type of evidence required.
<b>Representations on Strategic Policy CC1 – Climate Change</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 13</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Hampshire County Council.	8.1	Questions if the Plan goes far enough in respect of supporting the Government and HCC's policies on climate change. How will Local Plan proposals in relation to transport and travel, contribute to the long-term goal of achieving carbon neutrality and building resilient networks and systems?	Policy CC1 states how the Plan promotes mitigation and adaptation to climate change such as having a development strategy that is based upon the principle of accessibility and sustainability. This is further echoed within Strategic Priorities 11 and 12 in the Plan and Policies TIN1 and TIN4 which promotes sustainable travel and contributions towards associated infrastructure.
Turley on behalf of Graham Moyse.	8.3	Include specific reference within the chapter to the need to support the transition to a net zero highway network, with a specific policy that promotes the delivery of related infrastructure, including electrical charging facilities.	Disagree. The plan, to the degree applicable for a land use plan, is supportive of a shift towards a net zero highway network such as requiring active travel and sustainable transport modes and EV charging points within residential and commercial developments.
Alan Williams.		The Policy omits significant developments in climate change policy such Future Homes Standard and increased energy efficiency standards. Policy needs to be strengthened to ensure new build	The plan is supportive of new development that wishes to exceed Building Regulations and the Future Homes and Building Standard.

		residential and commercial is built to a higher energy and carbon reduction standard.	Suggested additional wording within bullet point e) to reflect the wording contained in paragraph 11.35 of the Plan.
Charlotte Varney.		The plan should set carbon reduction and sustainability standards/targets to ensure developers are designing for sustainability and carbon reduction in line with national obligations.	Disagree. Current national policy and legislation do not require the setting of specific carbon reduction targets which tracks national and international obligations in Local Plans. However, the Plan contains policies and measures designed to secure the mitigation and adaption of climate change in accordance with the relevant policy and legislative framework.
CPRE.		Inclusion of a Climate Change policy is fully endorsed. However, criterion a) of the policy does not go far enough. It must be a fundamental tenet of the Plan that no development should be permitted that relies on the car as its main means of access.	Support noted and welcomed. The Plan contains policies such as TIN1 Sustainable Transport which promotes sustainable and active modes of transport. TIN1 ensures new development is designed and provides for the delivery and access to sustainable and active travel modes, thus reducing the reliance on the private motor car.
The Environment Agency.		Very supportive of the policy, happy to see it is cross cutting and has specific reference to flood risk, water efficiency and green/blue infrastructure.	Support noted and welcomed.
Turley on behalf of Graham Moyse.		The policy is inadequate as it fails to recognise the importance of supporting the transition of road vehicles towards net zero. Amend the policy to include a bullet point that recognises the importance of infrastructure delivery associated with the transition of the road vehicles to net zero, including appropriate supporting infrastructure.	Disagree. The plan, to the degree applicable for a land use plan, is supportive of a shift towards a net zero highway network such as requiring active travel and sustainable transport modes and EV charging

			points within residential and commercial developments.
Hampshire County Council.		Support for policy however, the supporting text needs more detail with reference to the County Council's adopted Climate Change Strategy (2020) and targets including the resilience of the highway network.	Support noted and welcomed.
katarzyna bond.		Rethink Climate Change Emergency Strategy and have a better climate change policy.	Noted. The Council is producing its own Carbon Reduction Plan
Lesley Goddard.		Suggestion to remove "supporting energy efficiency" within policy and replace with "requiring energy efficiency" - and state what this means in terms of heat loss. No new development to be allowed that is not carbon neutral.	Building Regulations already require new development to attain a certain prescribed standard of energy efficiency and reduction in carbon emissions. This is set to be increased under emerging government plans with an uplift to part L of the current Building Regulations and the Future Homes and Building Standards. The Plan is supportive of new development that wishes to go above and beyond the new proposed standards and achieve net zero carbon.
Natural England.		Welcomes and supports policy, Consideration should be given to include reducing consumption of raw natural resources, sourcing more renewable or 'green' energy, and reducing waste within policy. Consideration should also be given to an approach that maximises climate change adaptation and mitigation through the establishment of a Nature Recovery Network (NRN), and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. Such an approach could potentially benefit from carbon offsetting contributions from development over the local plan period.	Support noted and welcomed. The Council contends that Policy D1 High Quality Design and Place Making covers aspects such as reducing natural resources and minimising waste whilst Policy CC4 covers renewable and low carbon energy generation. The Council will continue to work with relevant partners and organisations to develop a Local Nature Recovery Strategy which would include a Nature Recovery

			Network for Hampshire; delivering wider environmental benefits.
Persimmon Homes.		It is unclear whether the criteria in the policy will be sought as part of development proposals, or whether the criteria relate to development delivered by the Council. If it is the former, the Policy should make clear that the criteria are not requirements but should only be met where it is possible to do so.	The Policies in the Local Plan relate to all development within the Borough. The NPPF requires Plans to take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change. Policy CC1 is a strategic policy which demonstrates how the plan is going to achieve this.
Wendy Ball.		Strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change must be adopted	Noted.
Woodland Trust.		Policy fails to set any specific policy requirements or targets that will deliver this policy and so risks being unsound in practice. Recommend including policy wording setting a target for tree canopy cover on individual development sites, "a minimum of 30% tree canopy cover". This is to help achieve national net zero carbon.	Disagree. Current national policy and legislation do not mandate the setting of specific carbon reduction targets in Local Plans which tracks national and international obligations. The NPPF requires Plans to take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change. Policy CC1 demonstrates how the plan is going to achieve this. Whilst it is recognised the valuable contribution trees will make to achieving carbon reduction, many other habitats also play an important role. It is for this reason the Council has opted to use the words 'green and blue infrastructure' which encompasses all forms of carbon reducing habitat.
Anne Stephenson.	8.6	Plan should seek to increase tree cover, attaining 40% tree canopy cover on streets to mitigate temperature rise (the urban heat island).	Disagree. The Council promotes the inclusion of Green Infrastructure such as trees, woodland and hedgerows within development to promote climate change mitigation and adaptation in

			line with the NPPF. It is felt not appropriate to specify a percentage cover.
<b>Representations on policy CC2 – Managing Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 5</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
The Environment Agency		Support for the Policy	Support noted and welcomed.
Natural England		Support for Policy. However it is advised that the policy makes clear that where a development drains to a protected site(s), an additional treatment component (i.e. over and above that required for standard discharges), or other equivalent protection may be required to ensure water quality impacts are avoided. Where SuDS are proposed serving as mitigation for protected sites, long-term (in perpetuity) monitoring, maintenance/replacement, and funding should be ensured.	<p>Support noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Additional policy wording and supporting text proposed.</p> <p>New paragraph for policy after last bullet point in Policy CC2</p> <p><b>“Where SuDS are proposed to ensure water quality impacts on designated sites are avoided, additional treatment over and above that required for standard discharges may be required. A framework for the in-perpetuity Monitoring, maintenance and replacement of such SuDS will be required.”</b></p> <p>New additional paragraph in the supporting text commentary after</p>

			paragraph 8.27 to explain the additional policy wording proposed.
Persimmon Homes		SuDS first bullet point in Policy, it is recommended that the wording is prefixed with 'Where possible,' to provide the necessary flexibility. Strict adherence to the guidance can be problematic as the design of a SuDS system also need to consider design, aesthetics, engineering etc.	The policy wording refers to the CIRIA C753 Manual or equivalent national or local guidance providing necessary flexibility for applicants to utilise the relevant guidance that suits their scheme. Designing SuDS in accordance with appropriate guidance ensures they are functional and fit for purpose. Proposed additional wording "or equivalent national or local guidance" within paragraph 8.26 to reflect policy wording.
Unknown Resident		The Plan does not consider the risk of Groundwater Flooding.	A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment accompanies the Plan which considers flood risk to development from all major sources of flooding including groundwater.
Neil Spurgeon	8.13	Support for wording in paragraph	Support noted and welcomed.
<b>Representations on policy CC3 – Coastal Change Management Areas</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 1</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Natural England		It is advised that the Policy should help facilitate the relocation of valued environmental assets away from areas of risk.	Noted. Relocating valued environmental assets away from areas of risk can be explored through partnership working to develop a Nature Recovery Network and Strategy across Hampshire.

Representations on policy CC4 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy			
Number of representations on policy: 7			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Charlotte Varney	8.60	Policy fails to state any carbon emission reductions targets for development.	Current national policy and legislation do not require the setting of specific carbon reduction targets in Local Plans.
June Ward		Policy does not state any carbon emission reduction targets	Current national policy and legislation do not require the setting of specific carbon reduction targets in Local Plans.
Anne Stephenson		Developments should be orientated to allow maximum potential for solar power use. It could be a stipulation of policy that all new builds have solar panels.	Noted. Covered in Policy D1 Design and CC4.
Turley for Graham Moyse		The Policy should be amended to include reference to other forms of infrastructure that promote net zero related technologies, such as electric vehicle charging facilities. There should be a general presumption in favour of such development in the policy, rather than the overly restrictive approach that is currently cast within the policy. The policy text should be recast to recognise that electric vehicle charging technologies are different to those energy generating uses that are perceived to have significant visual impacts.	Disagree. The plan, to the degree applicable for a land use plan, is supportive of a shift towards a net zero highway network such as requiring active travel and sustainable transport modes and EV charging points within residential and commercial developments.
Peter Davidson		The plan only passively considers net zero carbon new developments instead of actually requiring	The plan is supportive of new development that wishes to exceed

		them in accordance with national policy and climate science.	Building Regulations and the Future Homes and Building Standard.
Samantha Pope		Include CO2 emission reduction targets for the next five, ten- and fifteen-year periods to ensure the developers have each follow the same targets and guidelines. Targets should follow national standards to meet the climate change protocols	Noted. Current national policy and legislation do not require the setting of specific carbon reduction targets which tracks national and international obligations. However, the Plan contains policies and measures designed to secure the mitigation and adaption of climate change in in accordance with the relevant policy and legislative framework.
Unknown		The plan should set carbon reduction and sustainability standard/targets to ensure developers are designing for sustainability and carbon reduction.	Disagree. Current national policy and legislation do not require the setting of specific carbon reduction targets which tracks national and international obligations. However, the Plan contains policies and measures designed to secure the mitigation and adaption of climate change in in accordance with the relevant policy and legislative framework.
<b>Representations on Strategic Policy NE1 – Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 9</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Amy Robjohns		SINCs should be incorporated into the local plan	Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) are included in the Local Plan and covered under Policy NE1.



CPRE		Support for policy and the Local Ecological Network approach within the Plan.	Support noted and welcomed.
Natural England		Supports policy and the Local Ecological Network approach within the Plan	Support noted and welcomed.
Portsmouth City Council		Support for policy.	Support noted and welcomed.
Warsash Inshore Fishermen		The Policy fails to protect sandbanks within SEMS and Ostrea edulis and priority species from excessive nutrients in the Solent.	Disagree. Policy NE1 is worded so that new development is only permitted where internationally designated sites (which include those within SEMS) and priority species are protected. Furthermore, Policy NE4 also ensures development is only permitted where there are no effects on the integrity of designated sites through increased wastewater production/ Nutrient loading.
Wendy Ball		Support for policy.	Support noted and welcomed.
Clive Whittaker		Area of land around Wicor in Portchester should fall under the protection of this policy.	Noted.
The Woodland Trust		Suggests Policy is strengthened with proposed additional wording regarding the loss of irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland, ancient or veteran trees; including ancient woodland pasture and historic parkland.	NPPF Paragraph 175c states the policy protection for irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees. It is therefore not necessary to replicate the wording within the Local Plan Policy.
Lesley Goddard	9.11	The wording of the paragraph is too weak and does not give examples of when and what sort of development "cannot be avoided" and what "as a last resort" means.	The particular wording relates to the use of the mitigation hierarchy when considering the likely impacts of development and not of development itself. When determining planning applications, the Local Planning authority should apply the mitigation hierarchy principle contained in paragraph 175a of the NPPF.

			Paragraph 9.11 of the Local Plan provides additional context for this.
Woodland Trust	9.15	Support for wording in paragraph.	Support noted and welcomed.
<b>Representations on Policy NE2 – Biodiversity Net Gain</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 13</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
David Lock Associates on behalf of Buckland Development Limited.	9.30	Support for wording in paragraph	Support noted and welcomed.
CPRE		Support for 10% requirement in the policy	Support noted and welcomed.
David Lock Associates on behalf of Buckland Development Limited.		Questions whether Policy NE2 is in fact premature.	Disagree. Paragraph 174b of the NPPF states that “plans should: identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity”. Policy NE2 provides the mechanism to secure and achieve such measurable gains and is consistent with the emerging Environment Bill.
Foreman Homes.		A percentage requirement should not be set as it is contrary to paragraph 170 of the NPPF which does not set out a specific percentage. A policy without a specific percentage requirement would be consistent with current policy and should the relevant legislation be enacted as currently proposed, it would be sufficiently flexible to support a 10% requirement and any transition period.	Disagree. Paragraph 174b of the NPPF states that “plans should: identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity”. Policy NE2 provides the mechanism and means to secure and achieve such measurable net gains. The policy approach is consistent with

			emerging legislation, supports the wider objectives contained within the 25 Year Environment Plan and is being successfully administered in Local Authorities across the country.
Gladman.		It is considered that the policy is not positively prepared as it goes above and beyond that which is required by the NPPF. The percentage requirement should be deleted and reference to 'biodiversity net gains' included in the policy wording to ensure compliance with national policy.	Disagree. Paragraph 174b of the NPPF states that "plans should: identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity". Policy NE2 provides the mechanism and means to secure and achieve such measurable net gains. The policy approach is consistent with emerging legislation, supports the wider objectives contained within the 25 Year Environment Plan and is being successfully administered in Local Authorities across the country.
Home Builders Federation.		A percentage requirement should not be set as it is contrary to paragraph 170 of the NPPF which does not set out a specific percentage. A policy without a specific percentage requirement would be consistent with current policy and should the relevant legislation be enacted as currently proposed, it would be sufficiently flexible to support a 10% requirement and any transition period.	Disagree. Paragraph 174b of the NPPF states that "plans should: identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity". Policy NE2 provides the mechanism and means to secure and achieve such measurable net gains. The policy approach is consistent with emerging legislation, supports the wider objectives contained within the 25 Year Environment and is being successfully administered in Local Authorities across the country.
Lesley Goddard.		Biodiversity net gains should be clearly demonstrated by development. Net gains should be continually monitored, and appropriate action taken	Noted.

		if sufficient net gain has not been achieved or is not maintained.	
Natural England.		Fully supportive of Policy. It is recommended that consideration is given to developing a suite of projects across the LEN that development within the Borough can contribute to.	Support welcomed and comments noted.
Persimmon Homes.		The requirement to achieve BNG is likely to negatively impact on the developable area, resulting in a loss of revenue that negatively impacts on viability. The viability evidence to support the introduction of this Policy is inadequate.	Disagree. The viability study adequately accounts for BNG requirements.  In addition, an addendum to the Council's Viability Study includes a breakdown on costs for biodiversity net gain.
Portsmouth City Council.		There is the potential for a shortfall in net gain provisions (subject to the final provisions of the Environment Act) within the City Council's plan period. PCC is committed to ongoing discussions with Fareham BC and the other PfSH authorities on this matter and to consider the potential for environmental off-setting on both a sub-regional and a site by site basis.	Noted.
Terence O'Rourke on behalf of Miller Homes.		Delete the policy and rely on the Environment Bill to ensure schemes deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.	Disagree. Paragraph 174b of the NPPF states that "plans should: identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity". Policy NE2 provides the mechanism and means to secure and achieve such measurable net gains. The policy approach is consistent with emerging legislation, supports the wider objectives contained within the 25 Year Environment and is being

			successfully administered in Local Authorities across the country.
Turley on behalf of Reside Developments.		A percentage requirement should not be set as it is contrary to paragraph 170 of the NPPF which does not set out a specific percentage. A policy without a specific percentage requirement would be consistent with current policy and should the relevant legislation be enacted, as currently proposed, such a policy would be sufficiently flexible to support a 10% requirement and any transition period.	Disagree. Paragraph 174b of the NPPF states that “plans should: identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity”. Policy NE2 provides the mechanism and means to secure and achieve such measurable net gains. The policy approach is consistent with emerging legislation, supports the wider objectives contained within the 25 Year Environment and is being successfully administered in Local Authorities across the country.
WYG on behalf of Vistry Group		No assessment of how the requirement to provide BNG might affect site capacity. A blanket £500 per dwelling assumption in testing the viability of the policy is too blunt a measure of its effect on viability.	Paragraph 9.39 explains how BNG is expected to be provided onsite in the first instance however, where BNG cannot be adequately accommodated onsite, offsite contributions are permissible. The viability study adequately accounts for BNG requirements.  In addition, an addendum to the Council's Viability Study includes a breakdown on costs for biodiversity net gain.
WYG for Hammond, Miller and Bargate		Policy is in line with forthcoming government requirements.	Noted.
Persimmon Homes.	9.32	It is noted that BNG should be achieved across a site, it is not a requirement to be met at the individual plot level. As such, supporting text in	Proposed rewording of paragraph 9.32 to clarify that BNG is required for applications for development of 1 or more new dwelling or commercial

		Paragraph 9.32 is misleading and should be deleted.	floorspace and not that it should necessarily be accommodated at the individual plot level of major developments as the representation suggests.
Natural England.	9.32	References to features such as bat boxes and swift bricks etc. should be classed as general biodiversity enhancements that should be included as part of a wider biodiversity enhancement and mitigation plan. Net gain specifically should derive strictly from habitat enhancement and creation, required as calculated using the metric.	Proposed amended wording to paragraph 9.32 to clarify that features such as bat boxes and swift bricks should be included as part of a wider biodiversity enhancement and mitigation plan, separate to biodiversity net gain commitments.
Natural England.	9.35	Amend footnote 85 with link to new Defra Metric 3.0 which will be published early 2021.	Noted. At the time of writing no new Defra Metric has been published.
WYG on behalf of Vistry Group	9.41	Recognition should be given to the potential use of 'credits' to achieve BNG where net gains are not achievable on site.	Noted. Paragraph 9.41 references the use of habitat banks to secure off-site gains which uses the principle of 'credits'.
Natural England.	9.42	Support for wording within paragraph. Natural England and Defra are developing an Environmental Net Gain/metric for Natural Capital Net Gain that can be used in conjunction with the Biodiversity Metric	Support noted and welcomed.
Natural England.	9.43	The Plan should include requirements to monitor biodiversity net gain	Noted.
Natural England.	9.44	Support for wording within paragraph.	Support noted and welcomed.

## Representations on Policy NE3 –Recreational Disturbance on the Solent Special Protection Areas (SPAs).

Number of representations on policy: 3

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Amy Robjohns		Policy ineffective due to the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy not being successful enough at reducing bird disturbance. Suggestion of more forceful measures required.	The Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy is continually monitored and regularly reviewed by the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership to ensure it is effective.
Natural England		Welcomes policy. It is recommended that other types of development (such as new hotels, student accommodation, care homes etc.) are outline in the policy as they may also need to address recreational disturbance impacts, both alone and in-combination. Such development should be assessed on a case by case basis.	Support welcomed. Proposed additional wording to paragraph 9.46 referencing the potential need for mitigation for other types of development mentioned in the response.
WYG on behalf of Hammond, Miller and Bargate.		The policy requires a financial contribution to mitigate recreational disturbance and is consistent with previous local plan policy.	Noted.

**Representations on Policy NE4 – Water Quality Effects on the Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Special Conservation Areas (SACs) and Ramsar Sites of the Solent.**

**Number of representations on policy: 13**

<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Warsash Inshore Fishermen.	9.50	The Plan fails to take into account the likely increase in bacterial and viral contamination of shellfish, red floating seaweed and intertidal algal matts from greater nutrient loading to designated sites as a result of new development.	The Local Plan is accompanied by a Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) which assesses the Plan's effects on designated sites with respect to water quality issues. The Appropriate Assessment concludes that with the proposed mitigation approach and policy position of NE4, there will be no adverse impacts on the integrity of designated sites.
CPRE.		Unable to endorse the policy until the legal issues around the effectiveness of mitigation proposals have been resolved.	Noted.
Hampshire County Council (Property).		Support for policy.	Support noted and welcomed.
Richard Jarman;  Pat Rook;  Charlotte Varney.		The Plan's development strategy is contrary to this policy.	Disagree. Policy NE4 ensures new residential development proposed within the plan does not result in a significant effect on the designated sites in the Solent with regards to deteriorating water quality.
Natural England.		Support for policy.	Support noted and welcomed.
Persimmon Homes.		The Natural England methodology for achieving nutrient neutrality should be examined in detailed alongside the Local Plan because there are several	Disagree. The use of the Natural England Methodology is a



		onerous stages that result in significantly more mitigation being required than is necessary.	recommendation in the Plan and not a mandatory requirement.
Portsmouth City Council.		The City Council is committed to continuing to work with FBC and the other members of the PfSH Water Quality Working Group as necessary on short, medium and long term 'nutrient neutral' mitigation solutions for housing development within the Solent catchment.	Noted and welcomed.
RSPB		Support for Policy. It would be useful include some further policy wording around the need for developments to demonstrate nutrient neutrality or provide nutrient mitigation.	Support noted and welcomed. The Council considers it sufficient that extra detail is contained within the supporting text to the policy.
Steve Godwin; Warsash Inshore Fishermen		Policy insufficient at preventing excessive levels of nutrients in the Solent.	Disagree. Policy wording ensures development is only permitted where there are no effects on the integrity of designated sites through increased wastewater production.
WYG on behalf of Hammond, Miller and Bargate.		Policy requires a production of nutrient budgets and delivery of suitable mitigation to make sure that developments result in a net reduction in nitrogen outputs.	Noted.
June Ward	9.51	Opposed to the nitrates budget calculations	Noted. Development applications need to provide their own individual nutrient budgets in order to determine if mitigation is required.
RSPB	9.54	Support for wording in paragraph	Support noted and welcomed.

Representations on Policy NE5 – Solent Wader and Brent Goose Sites.			
Number of representations on policy: 9			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Hill Head Residents Association.		Lack of a coherent policy in respect of mitigation. Consider fields west of Old Street Stubbington as possible Solent Wader and Brent Goose mitigation site.	Noted. Policy provides the tests for when mitigation is required and is consistent with the Solent Wader and Brent Goose (SWBG) Strategy.
James Morgan		Support for policy.	Support noted and welcomed.
LRM Planning for Hallam Land		Delete references to “as shown on the Policies Map” in the policy. The Policies Map should show only a generic designation such as ‘Areas of Waders and Brent Geese Sensitivity’, which does not classify individual land parcels.	Disagree. Paragraph 23 of the NPPF states that land use designations such as the SWBG designations should be identified on a policies map. Any amendments to the SWBG network would be a material consideration at the planning application stage.
Natural England.		Recommended wording change to policy. Deletion of “as shown on the Policies Map” and replace with “ <i>as identified within the most up to date version of the Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy</i> ”.	Disagree. Paragraph 23 of the NPPF states that land use designations such as the SWBG designations should be identified on a policies map. Any amendments to the SWBG network would be a material consideration at the planning application stage.
Natural England.		It is advised that Core Areas are identified for protection by the Policy.	Noted. Policy NE5 states that “Sites which are used by Solent Waders and/or Brent Geese (as shown on the Policies map) will be protected from adverse impacts commensurate to their status in the hierarchy of the

			Solent Wader and Brent Geese Network.”
Natural England.		Suggestion that the Council works with relevant partners/stakeholders, including cross-boundary partnerships, to develop strategic projects to enhance, manage and monitor the wider Solent wader and Brent goose ecological network, to which contributions can be directed.	Noted.
Pegasus on behalf of Hammond, Miller and Bargate.		Amend policy to permit offsite mitigation solutions for development impacts on Low Use Sites.	Noted. Proposed additional wording to policy under Low Use sites to reflect mitigation guidance in SWBG Strategy.
Persimmon Homes.		Concern that the mapping evidence base underpinning Policy is flawed.	Disagree. The SWBG Strategy details a robust method for data collection and analysis which informed the designations within the Borough and wider region.
Persimmon Homes.		Policy does not set provision with regards to bird surveys.	Bird surveys are only required for Candidates Sites as set out in Policy NE5 and supporting text and also stated in the SWBG Strategy.
Persimmon Homes.		Delete references to “as shown on the Policies Map” in the policy.	Disagree. Paragraph 23 of the NPPF states that land use designations such as the SWBG designations should be identified on a policies map. Any amendments to the SWBG network would be a material consideration at the planning application stage.
Persimmon Homes.		Not clear why there is a requirement for net gain in the SW&BG network as required under policy bullet point a.	Noted. Propose deletion of wording to be consistent with the SWBG Strategy.
RSPB		Policy should make specific reference to the SWBG Guidance on Mitigation and Off-setting Requirements (2018 and subsequent updates).	Disagree. Policy refers to ensuring mitigation is consistent with the approach taken to mitigating and off-setting impacts on the SWBG network.

		Also suggested that any mitigation is agreed with the SWBG Steering Group as well as the Council.	This 'future proofs' the policy against any amendments to the mitigation guidance. The last point is covered within the supporting text.
Southern Water		Policy Map associated with the Local Plan does not provide sufficiently fine-grained detail to identify that part of the SW&BG designation at Peel Common WwTW overlays some operational areas. These should be excluded from designation.	Noted. Mapping discrepancy reported to SWBG Steering group to investigate.
WYG on behalf of Hammond, Miller and Bargate.		Policy wording should make it clearer that bespoke mitigation solutions which do not result in such payments are also acceptable.	Noted. Proposed additional wording to policy under Low Use sites to reflect mitigation guidance in SWBG Strategy.
Hill Head Residents Association.	9.78	Paragraph refers to candidate sites but gives little detail.	Paragraphs 9.75-9.78 provide detail on candidate sites.

### Representations on Policy NE6 – Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

**Number of representations on policy: 7**

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Anne Stephenson		Amend policy wording to state that replacement trees will be 5/3 times that of those felled and there will be maintenance required for at least 3 years afterwards to ensure the trees are established.	Disagree. The Policy requires the replacement of any trees lost to development. However, there also needs to be a careful balance to ensure a variety of habitats are created on site, enabling net gains for biodiversity. Paragraph 9.89 provides wording around the costed long-term maintenance of any replacement trees.

CPRE.		Support for Policy.	Support noted and welcomed.
Natural England.		Support for Policy. It is also recommended that development proposals that affect ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees, are in line with standing advice published by Natural England and the Forestry Commission	Support welcomed and response noted.
Persimmon Homes.		Unclear what 'unnecessary loss' and 'avoidable' means in the policy	There is a presumption against the loss of any non-protected trees, woodland and hedgerows of high amenity value. Any such loss would be deemed unnecessary unless for clearly justified reasons. Where justified reasons are stated (unavoidable), there is an expectation that the losses are replaced.
Persimmon Homes.		Point b) of the Policy should be a new sentence	Noted. Amended.
Portsmouth City Council		Support for Policy.	Support noted and welcomed.
Wendy Ball		Support for Policy.	Support noted and welcomed.
Woodland Trust		Policy risks being unsound by failing to afford adequate protection to ancient woodland and veteran trees. Policy is also insufficiently robust in specifying the level of replacement where ancient woodland and trees are removed and the appropriate number of new plantation in order to deliver net gain tree canopy cover.	Disagree. The NPPF paragraph 175 c) provides the primary basis for protection of ancient woodland and veteran trees. It is considered that the Policy in the Plan is suitably robust but also flexible with regards to the extent, type and location of any required replacement of protected trees, woodland and hedgerows.

Representations on Policy NE7 New Moorings			
Number of representations on policy: 0			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
No comments			

Representations on Policy NE8 – Air Quality			
Number of representations on policy: 11			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
CPRE.		Supports policy but considers more could be achieved if development were only to be permitted in locations around mass public transport hubs.	Noted.
Turley on behalf of Graham Moyse.		Unless addressed elsewhere in the plan, this policy should include provisions that support the delivery of electric vehicle charging infrastructure to serve the wider strategic road network.	Disagree. The plan, to the degree applicable for a land use plan, is supportive of a shift towards a net zero highway network such as requiring active travel and sustainable transport modes and EV charging points within residential and commercial developments.
Hampshire County Council		Policy needs to be more specific and should be amended to include the wording 'development should deliver sustainable transport (public	Disagree. Bullet point b) within Policy states that development will only be permitted where it contributes to the

		transport, walking and cycling) as part of improving air quality'.	reduction of transport impacts on local air quality whilst Policy TIN1 relates specifically to the delivery of sustainable transport.
The Home Builders Federation.		The costs of installing the cables and the charge point hardware will vary considerably based on site-specific conditions in relation to the local grid. The Government's recent consultation proposed introducing exemptions for such developments. The requirement for EVCPs should be deleted. Government proposed changes to Building Regulations will provide a more effective framework for the delivery of charging points for electric vehicles.	Disagree. EV charging points are considered within Viability study accompanying the Plan.  In addition, an addendum to the Council's Viability Study includes a breakdown on costs for EV charging points.  Furthermore, the NPPF states that the Planning system 'should help to shape places in ways that contribute to the radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions'. Requiring the provision of EV charging facilities within development will help promote the shift away from the use of fossil fuels and help fulfil the objective of 'radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions'
Fareham Society.		Policy does not make it clear that explanatory text paragraphs 9.108 – 9.110 set out what may be required to meet the Policy requirement. Policy should be amended to refer to this supporting text.	Disagree. The policy and supporting text should be read together as a whole therefore, there is no need to include supporting text wording within the policy.
David Mugford.		Recommended that the Policy includes the Fareham/Stubbington Strategic Gap to be planted with trees to tackle pollution.	Noted.
Persimmon Homes		Unclear why part of the Policy is not to be applied to Welborne. The element of the policy relating to EV charging points is also not justified. The Viability	The particular part of the policy referred to in the response is not a requirement of the Welborne Plan. As

		<p>Study should consider this issue in greater detail and not combine this policy requirement with other unknown cost demands on development.</p>	<p>such, it had not been tested by that plan's associated viability study unlike this Local Plan.</p> <p>The NPPF states that the Planning system 'should help to shape places in ways that contribute to the radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions'. Requiring the provision of EV charging facilities within development will help promote the shift away from the use of fossil fuels and helps fulfil the objective of 'radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions'. The Viability Study provides an appropriate costing of EV charging point requirements for development.</p> <p>In addition, an addendum to the Council's Viability Study includes a breakdown on costs for EV charging points.</p>
Terence O'Rourke on behalf of Miller Homes		<p>Policy needs to retain more flexibility. Suggestion Policy is amended to enable the future installation of EV charging points rather than requiring them.</p> <p>Rapid charge facilities in shared residential parking areas is wholly unnecessary and onerous. A 'Fast' charge facility is more appropriate.</p>	<p>Disagree. The NPPF states that the Planning system 'should help to shape places in ways that contribute to the radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions'. Requiring the provision of EV charging facilities within new development will help promote the shift away from the use of fossil fuels and helps fulfil the objective of 'radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions'.</p>



			Disagree. Choice of wording is deliberate to reflect the fact that in a shared parking environment, it is necessary to have EV charging facilities that provide 'rapid' charging. i.e. as quick as possible in order to service the number of vehicles in the shared car park.
Turley on behalf of Reside Developments		Given that there is currently not the demand, it is considered that the policy provides a phased introduction of the EV Charge Point requirement, gradually ramping up to 100% provision in the later point of the plan period. This would be in line with the commitment made by government to end the sale of new petrol and diesel cars in the UK by 2030.	Disagree. The NPPF states that the Planning system 'should help to shape places in ways that contribute to the radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions'. Requiring the provision of EV charging facilities within new development will help promote the shift away from the use of fossil fuels and helps fulfil the objective of 'radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions'.
WYG on behalf of Vistry Group		Support for the Policy. However, within the first paragraph of the policy, it should be made abundantly clear that the policy does not require major developments to demonstrate they are 'air quality neutral'. There should be measures to ensure security of supply and sufficient capacity to support the promotion of, and increased reliance on, electric vehicles.	Support welcomed. The Policy is positively worded stating what is required of development which is to minimise emissions.
Natural England	9.118	Amend last sentence of paragraph to reflect the correct terminology under the Habitats Regulations, i.e. the HRA concludes the Plan will not result in an 'adverse effect on integrity'	Noted. Wording amended.

Representations on Policy NE9 – Green Infrastructure			
Number of representations on policy: 5			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
CPRE.		Suggestion that Green Infrastructure would be better protected in perpetuity were it to be formalised as part of a new Green Belt.	Noted.
Gosport Borough Council.		Policy should reference strategic green infrastructure opportunities in particular, working with Gosport Borough Council to develop a joint strategy for the strategic gap between Gosport, Fareham, Lee-on-the-Solent and Stubbington.	Disagree. However, the policy requires development where possible to provide GI which connects to the wider GI Network. The policy also ensures that development does not impact upon the delivery of any identified local and strategic GI projects across the subregion.
Fareham Society.		A compendium, capable of being updated, should be provided of Green Infrastructure in the Borough. The Policy should then be amended to make reference to this.	The PfSH and FBC Green Infrastructure Strategies provide comprehensive pictures of GI in the Borough and wider subregion. The Ecological Network Map for Hampshire is also closely linked to the GI network. These are referred to within the Plan.
Natural England.		Support for Policy.	Support noted and welcomed.
Portsmouth City Council.		Support for Policy. Integrating cross-boundary Green Infrastructure features and networks would be welcomed.	Support noted and welcomed.

Gosport Borough Council.	9.125	Supporting text should reference strategic green infrastructure opportunities in particular, working with Gosport Borough Council to develop a joint strategy for the strategic gap between Gosport, Fareham, Lee-on-the-Solent and Stubbington.	Disagree. However, the policy requires development where possible to provide GI which connects to the wider GI Network. The policy also ensures that development does not impact upon the delivery of any identified local and strategic GI projects across the subregion.
--------------------------	-------	--	--

### Representations on Policy NE10 – Protection and Provision of Open Space

Number of representations on policy: 5

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
John Stubbs.		The Plan fails to protect public open space (particularly privately owned) from development. The Plan should object to any development proposed on such Designated Public Open Space where applicants propose to override S52 or S106 Agreements using legislative powers and Development Consent Orders (DCOs) associated with S120(4) of the Planning Act 2008.	Disagree. Policy NE10 is consistent with the approach taken to protect open space in the NPPF and National Planning Practice Guidance.
The Fareham Society.		The policy fails under paragraph 91 of the NPPF which states that planning policies should enable and support healthy lifestyles through the provision of safe and accessible greenspace. The Policy should include the minimum open space and play space requirements for new development which is set out in explanatory text paragraph 9.134 and table 9.1.	Disagree. Policy NE10 States that “residential development will be required to provide open and play space to meet the needs of new residence” this accords with objectives stated in paragraph 91 c) of the NPPF. The NPPF does not require specific standards for open space provision to be detailed in a policy. The standards referred to in paragraph 9.134 and

			table 9.1 are a minimum guide for new development.
Natural England.		Policy should seek to secure enhancement of public rights of way and National Trails, as outlined in paragraph 98 of the NPPF. Recognition should also be given to the value of rights of way and access to the natural environment in relation to health and wellbeing and links to the wider green infrastructure network.	Noted. There are a range of improvements to Public Rights of Way which are contained within the IDP which is tied to policy TIN4. Furthermore, policy NE9 ensures that new development provides GI (which includes PRow) where possible and/or ensures the delivery of existing GI projects is not compromised.
Sport England.		Broad support for policy, however it could be improved to ensure consistency with national planning policy para 97.	Additional wording proposed to ensure consistency with NPPF para 97.
Woodland Trust		Recommend Policy includes standards for access to natural green space and woodland for existing and new developments.	Disagree. The NPPF does not require specific standards for open space provision to be detailed in a policy. The standards for access are contained within the supporting text.
Sport England.	9.129	Paragraph should be removed or at least made clear that any loss of school playing fields is compliant with para 97 of the NPPF and Sport England's playing fields policy.	Noted. However, regardless of the wording in 9.129 of the Plan, if the Secretary of State approves the disposal of surplus school playing fields then an exception would still be made to the policy.
Natural England.	9.134	Support wording in paragraph.	Support noted and welcomed.

Representations on Policy NE11 –Local Green Space			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Robert Tutton Town Planning Consultants on behalf of Chambers Properties Ltd	9.138	Remove the land owned by Chambers Properties Ltd from the 'Mulberry Avenue Open Space.'	Noted. The whole site area is valuable open space to the local community and is supported by the assessment within the Local Greenspace Background paper. It is also understood that the owners of the private segment in question are looking to dispose of the site. The Council is considering its options in this regard.
Representations on Strategic Policy TIN1: Sustainable Transport			
Number of representations on policy: 15			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Barrie Webb	10.1, 10.3, 10.5, TIN1	The ambitions of a convenient, efficient, resilient and safe transport network as well as ensuring convenient cycling and walking networks that contribute towards a modal shift and provide alternative options to the motor car will not be met by the LCWIP (as yet unpublished so unable to comment on detail).	Disagree. The LCWIP will provide the framework for a coordinated approach to funding and facilitating a more convenient and efficient active travel network. Noted that the LCWIP has not been published so cannot be interrogated, but the Council

			anticipates consultation and adoption by the highway authority before the Local Plan is submitted.
LRM Planning Limited (Hallam Land Management)	10.2	Transport Assessment demonstrates that the SGA is consistent with the NPPF requirement that the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth to support sustainable travel and that significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable.	Noted. Omission site justification.
Lesley Goddard	10.3	No indication of how these networks identified in the LTP will come about. Give examples.	The Local Transport Plan is produced by the Highway Authority. The Highway Authority is developing an A27 strategy which will deliver on the aspirations of the LTP and the LCWIP will be a main stay of the sustainable transport facilitation.
Portsmouth City Council	10.3	Supports reference for proposals that promote sustainable transport links through Fareham Borough to Portsmouth and Southampton.	Noted.
Roy Roberts	10.3	Alternative methods of transport for day to day living quoted such as cycling and walking are fanciful and remain largely recreational only in suitable weather. Available Public transport capability comes way down the list for the means to transport large numbers of people around.	Disagree. Sustainable transport is about behavioural/attitude change, but also putting in place the means to facilitate it. The LCWIP will help to deliver a focused and coordinated sustainable transport system which focuses on the links between other alternative means like bus stops and train stations.
Robin Webb	10.3	The plan gives insufficient attention to 'accessibility improvement' or 'management of network congestion', particularly in respect of the Warsash peninsular and connection to the A27 and M27.	Disagree. The Plan is supported by a strategic transport assessment which considers traffic growth over the life of the Plan. This allows for natural variations and rerouting as a result of likely future congestion. The results of this are highlighted in the supporting

			text. Planning applications will be supported by localised transport assessments which will consider the traffic implications of the here and now on local junctions and routes.
Lesley Goddard	10.8	'Reasonable choice' must include 'reasonable expected duration' when considering the suitability of a site with developments needing to show how they will decrease time to take public transport/cycle/walk relative to car travel.	Disagree. Applications are required to demonstrate, through suitable mitigation, that they do not exacerbate the current situation at any given point. They cannot be required to improve the existing conditions as this is the responsibility of the highway authority. They will however be expected to contribute to and provide for active travel routes and connections as identified through the LCWIP.
Lesley Goddard	10.10	Exclude 'road junctions' from options available. Suggest <i>'developments which don't allow car parking/encourage car share and cycle/walking are to be encouraged but those which make journeys by car the most likely outcome are not to be allowed?'</i>	Disagree. It isn't possible to reject applications on the basis of car use unless they will have a severe impact, but the Plan is based on principles of good growth which include accessibility, and good design to support as much as possible the alternatives to private car use.
CPRE	TIN1	Policy does not go far enough, and Council should feel empowered to reject development which is not already located around, or can provide, public mass transit hubs, in particular the rail network.	Noted. The development strategy is based on concept of good growth and allocations have been identified partly on the basis of their accessibility and linkages as far as possible to existing routes.
Turley (Graham Moyes)	TIN1	Amend to include reference to the role of electric vehicles as a sustainable mode of transport and to provide support for appropriate infrastructure to facilitate their delivery.	Noted. Policy and supporting text in NE8 set out the requirements for electric vehicle charging infrastructure.

Hampshire County Council	TIN1	Chapter and Policy needs more cross reference to air quality management such as how policies contribute to both climate change objectives and air quality objectives and impact from M27, A32 and A27. Policy should make direct reference to role of sustainable transport in air quality improvement and supporting text should refer to AQMA/CAZ designations	Noted. Air Quality is covered in Natural Environment chapter.
Hampshire County Council	TIN1	Strengthen the commitment to deliver high quality walking and cycling facilities with reference to the Government's new cycle infrastructure design guidance in Local Transport Note 1/20.	Noted.
Hampshire County Council	TIN1	Opportunities for enhancing and encouraging active travel to and from school should be encouraged and implemented working closely with Hampshire County Council Children's Services and Highways Departments. The County Council will require the provision of safe walking and cycle routes to schools and existing routes to be enhanced where necessary to improve walking and cycling numbers. Contributions from developers will be sought where necessary including for the production and monitoring of school travel plans (STP's).	Noted. The Policy incorporates the emerging LCWIP as part of its delivery strategy. The Council will also continue to engage with the education authority on individual planning applications and developer contribution requests.
Wendy Ball	TIN1	Improvement is needed with respect to local public transport networks, cycling and walking routes. There should be a reduced need to travel.	Noted. The Policy incorporates the emerging LCWIP as part of its delivery strategy.
British Horse Society	TIN1	Local Plan should include equestrians as vulnerable road users and that cycling, and walking strategy should include horse riding. Planning policy should support the automatic inclusion of horse riders on shared off-road routes. Equestrians should be considered and consulted with at an early stage within the planning of any major housing or infrastructure development.	Agreed. Alteration to the wording of Policy TIN1 a) to non motorised road users'.



Representations on Policy TIN2 Highway Safety and Road Network			
Number of representations on policy: 14			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Fareham Labour Party	10.12	The Local Plan should include a new railway station on the western edge of the Welborne development as this would be relevant for the whole of Fareham.	Noted. The potential for a halt at this location is being considered as part of the Welborne development which is not covered by this Plan. The LCWIP also considers links to railway stations to improve access across the borough.
Gosport Borough Council	TIN2	Support as it aims to ensure development does not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and the residual cumulative impact on the road network is not severe.	Noted.
Highways England	TIN2	The difference between the modelled scenario and the Publication Local Plan in terms of dwelling numbers is substantial and may result in the modelling reporting more excessive delays and queueing than are likely, and potentially presenting an unrealistic prediction of the future operation of the highway network.	Noted. Approach agreed with highway authority on this matter. Modelling presents a worst case scenario and new housing requirement is much closer to the modelled scenario.
Hampshire County Council	TIN2	LHA is undertaking a transport study for the A27 corridor which will seek to incorporate a multi modal approach that facilitates a modal shift away from private car use. Future transport assessments of development sites along the A27 corridor should take this into account and have regard to the emerging transport strategy.	Noted. Para 10.12 contains approach to A27. Further reference to the A27 study would be made through individual Transport Assessments in consultation with HA.

Hampshire County Council	TIN2	Policy should consider alternative mitigation options which would generally follow a sequential approach to assess their impact on the local road network and the role they can play in traffic reduction and reducing transport emissions starting with measures to avoid the need to travel, active travel measures, public transport (SE Hampshire rapid transit) and finally localised junction improvements.	Noted. Alteration to policy TIN2 b) <b>a sequential approach consisting of measures that would avoid/reduce the need to travel, active travel, public transport, and</b>
Stuart Young	10.15	Roads around the area are already far too busy. This will get worse with the proposal to build so many houses.	Disagree. The Plan is supported by a industry standard transport assessment which considers increase in traffic as a result of local plan development.
Jane Wright	10.15	Transport plan does not include an analysis of streets where the majority of the houses are proposed. Why hasn't more consideration been given to HA1 in the transport assessment?	Disagree. The Transport Assessment considers additional houses by zoned area. Individual applications will be supported by localised transport assessments.
Samantha Pope	10.15	Transport plan does not include an analysis of streets where the majority of the houses are proposed. Why hasn't more consideration been given to HA1 in the transport assessment?	Disagree. The Transport Assessment considers additional houses by zoned area. Individual applications will be supported by localised transport assessments.
June Ward	10.15	Transport plan does not include an analysis of streets where the majority of the houses are proposed. Why hasn't more consideration been given to HA1 in the transport assessment?	Disagree. The Transport Assessment considers additional houses by zoned area. Individual applications will be supported by localised transport assessments.
Unknown	10.15	Transport plan does not include an analysis of streets where the majority of the houses are proposed. Why hasn't more consideration been given to HA1 in the transport assessment?	Disagree. The Transport Assessment considers additional houses by zoned area. Individual applications will be supported by localised transport assessments.

Valerie Wyatt	10.15	Transport Assessment does not take account of the volume of traffic now likely from the increased number of dwellings proposed in the Plan. It is out of date and therefore the plan is unsound.	Disagree. The Transport Assessment considers additional houses by zoned area. Individual applications will be supported by localised transport assessments.
Trevor Ling	10.15	With the major increase in planned infill at DOWNEND ROAD there is little hope that the increased traffic during this rush hour will be any better. The infrastructure plans for Delme roundabout are inadequate for future planned development off the A27.	Disagree. The Plan is supported by a industry standard transport assessment which considers increase in traffic as a result of local plan development. The Delme scheme has been modelled to show that a solution is possible.
Hampshire County Council	10.15	Recognise that the strategic modelling with the higher housing number represents a worst-case scenario and that the limitations of the SRTM do not allow for localised impacts at junctions to be attributed to specific development sites. Therefore, the LHA accepts the outputs from the strategic modelling report and has not requested an additional model run of the SRTM to reflect the removal of the two SGAs and subsequent lower housing number.	Noted.
Hampshire County Council	10.15	Parkway/Leafy Lane junction does not warrant a Do Something mitigation scheme for increased junction capacity because the Leafy Lane arm of the junction leads to a residential area with a 20mph zone reinforced by vertical speed reduction measures. An alternative highway scheme which strengthens the current situation of suppressing flows along Leafy Lane should be the mitigation scheme to be taken forward.	Noted. No specific mitigation is identified in the policy and so that will be down to the discretion of the highway authority.

Representations on Policy TIN3: Safeguarded Routes			
Number of representations on policy: 3			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Portsmouth City Council	10.20	Supports the reference to the development of the rapid transit networks between the two authorities and linking to others in the sub region.	Noted.
Gosport Borough Council	TIN3	Support safeguarding of land between Delme Roundabout and the Portsmouth Boundary and the Quay Street Roundabout to support the delivery of the South East Hampshire Rapid Transit scheme.	Noted.
Hampshire County Council	TIN3	Supports policy TIN3 but the supporting text should refer to the future extensions of the SEHRT network to the west of Fareham towards Segensworth, Swanwick Station, Whiteley and the North Whiteley major development area and to serve the Solent Enterprise Zone at Daedalus and adjacent coastal settlements.	Noted. Include addition to supporting text to reference future extensions: <i>....including future extensions of the SEHRT network to the west of Fareham towards Segensworth, Swanwick Station, Whiteley and the North Whiteley major development area and to serve the Solent Enterprise Zone at Daedalus and adjacent coastal settlements.</i>

Representations on Policy TIN4: Infrastructure Delivery			
Number of representations on policy: 16			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Portsmouth City Council	10.25	Development in close proximity to the FBC and PCC authority borders can impact the availability of school places across authorities. The timing and size of development should therefore be closely monitored to ensure the continued availability of school places during the life of both Local Plans.	Noted. The education authority has raised this in relation to school places planning incorporated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).
Highways England	10.26	Confirm that approach to assessing impacts on the SRN as set out in the IDP is consistent with national policy requirements. Infrastructure improvements on the SRN should only be considered as a last resort.	Noted.
Rosemary Hutton	10.26	Current infrastructure cannot cope in Western Wards, let alone with influx of new residents. Need reassurance that local essential services will be improved not just for existing residents but to provide for the influx of new residents.	Disagree. The IDP process involves consultation with a range of service providers who advise the council on infrastructure requirements associated with Local Plan development.
Jane Wright	10.26	IDP seeks expansion of health care facilities through further GP locations but table within document only provides an historic timeline pre-dating the Local Plan. Unsound approach. Current analysis of health care requirements required.	Disagree. IDP provides current assessment of health provision and identifies potential new requirement and delivery strategy.
June Ward	10.26	Infrastructure Delivery Plan calls for the expansion of health care provision through the addition of further GP locations, however the table provided within the document only provides an historic timeline pre-dating the Local Plan. Education is	Disagree. IDP provides current assessment of health provision and identifies potential new requirement and delivery strategy. Likewise, with education, though education authority

		planned with HCC but the period of any proposed extensions for child placements is only up to 2021 whereas the Plan covers up to 2037. This is not a sound approach.	has not committed to specific delivery strategy but have earmarked developer contributions.
Roy Roberts	10.26	Plan does not take into account cumulative impacts on infrastructural elements impacted by surrounding authorities.	Disagree. Service providers and modelling take surrounding authorities and committed schemes into the equation.
Richard Jarman	10.26	Infrastructure Delivery Plan calls for the expansion of health care provision through the addition of further GP locations, however the table provided within the document only provides an historic timeline pre-dating the Local Plan. Education is planned with HCC but the period of any proposed extensions for child placements is only up to 2021 whereas the Plan covers up to 2037. This is not a sound approach.	Disagree. IDP provides current assessment of health provision and identifies potential new requirement and delivery strategy. Likewise, with education, though education authority has not committed to specific delivery strategy but have earmarked developer contributions.
Pat Rook	10.26	Infrastructure Delivery Plan calls for the expansion of health care provision through the addition of further GP locations, however the table provided within the document only provides an historic timeline pre-dating the Local Plan. This is not a sound approach.	Disagree. IDP provides current assessment of health provision and identifies potential new requirement and delivery strategy.
Charlotte Varney	10.26	Infrastructure Delivery Plan calls for the expansion of health care provision through the addition of further GP locations, however the table provided within the document only provides an historic timeline pre-dating the Local Plan. Education is planned with HCC but the period of any proposed extensions for child placements is only up to 2021 whereas the Plan covers up to 2037. This is not a sound approach. IDP requests contributions towards infrastructure but doesn't specific where or how will be spent.	Disagree. IDP provides current assessment of health provision and identifies potential new requirement and delivery strategy. Likewise, with education, though education authority has not committed to specific delivery strategy but have earmarked developer contributions.

Samantha Pope	10.26	Infrastructure Delivery Plan calls for the expansion of health care provision through the addition of further GP locations, however the table provided within the document only provides an historic timeline pre-dating the Local Plan. Education is planned with HCC but the period of any proposed extensions for child placements is only up to 2021 whereas the Plan covers up to 2037. This is not a sound approach.	Disagree. IDP provides current assessment of health provision and identifies potential new requirement and delivery strategy. Likewise, with education, though education authority has not committed to specific delivery strategy but have earmarked developer contributions.
Fiona Gray (Buckland)	10.27	Support the viability work which has been undertaken by the Council to underpin this Local Plan, particularly the recommendation that a zero CIL rate should be applied to Welborne.	Noted.
Turley (Graham Moyse)	TIN4	Support policy but it fails to address the need for the delivery of wider infrastructure, particularly that which stems from the objectives set out within the Climate Change chapter to ensure that core climate change objectives are capable of being met.	Noted. Links to comments and response made to TIN1.
Katarzyna Bond	TIN4	Policy should propose on site facilities, avoiding using local infrastructure for bigger developments.	Noted. Where sites are of sufficient size to warrant it, on site provision of facilities is requested. But in most cases financial contributions will be sought to secure off site delivery.
Persimmon Homes	TIN4	It is considered the funding for such infrastructure may, in many instances, be a matter for CIL. Notwithstanding, the above, if such Infrastructure is a requirement to make the development acceptable in planning terms, then such contribution need to meet the relevant tests set out in the CIL Regulations. It is no longer appropriate for blanket contribution to be sought by planning authorities. The Policy should be clear on this matter.	Noted. The Policy and supporting text include a breakdown of approach to developer contributions. Developer contributions will only be sought where they meet the necessary tests in legislation and the Council's approach to CIL is clearly set out.
Unknown	TIN4	Infrastructure Delivery Plan calls for the expansion of health care provision through the addition of further GP locations, however the table provided	Disagree. IDP provides current assessment of health provision and identifies potential new requirement

		within the document only provides an historic timeline pre-dating the Local Plan. Education is planned with HCC but the period of any proposed extensions for child placements is only up to 2021 whereas the Plan covers up to 2037. This is not a sound approach.	and delivery strategy. Likewise, with education, though education authority has not committed to specific delivery strategy but have earmarked developer contributions.
Gordon Deadman	TIN4	There is nothing in the plan for the additional infrastructure required to support the increase in traffic that can be expected at the junction of Downend Road and the A27.	Noted. This will be part of any application for the site as this is not identified through the strategic model.
<b>Representations on Policy D1: High Quality Design and Placemaking</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 13</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
CPRE	11.27 (policy D1)	Reference to importance of overall masterplanning and landscape context and specific building details to quality. Poor car dependant nondescript developments over recent years highlighted	Noted. Policy includes reference to use of contextual masterplans and design codes. Policy seeks creation of sustainable places as part of reducing need to travel, particularly by car.
HCC Property	11.27 (policy D1)	Supports Policy without modification	Noted.
Hampshire Police	11.4 and 11.27 (policy D1)	Seeks additional requirement for development to meet Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles and Secured By Design (SBD) accreditation	Noted. Policy D1 vi requires development to be 'safe'. Further detailed criteria is set out in para 11.18, including natural surveillance, which accords with CPTED principles. <b>(not a soundness issue)</b>
Historic England	11.27 (policy D1)	Supports contextual design approach	Noted



Natural England	11.27 (policy D1)	Supports design approach to integrate existing and new habitats and biodiversity Appropriate native and locally sourced species advised for landscaping as far as possible to cater for local wildlife.	Noted.  Additional sentence included at the end of the paragraph 11.15 ' <b>Native species should be used to generate optimal biodiversity net gain, particularly with regard to trees, hedgerows and natural greenspace.</b> '
Pegasus Group for Bargate Homes (various sites) and King Norris	11.27 (policy D1)	"Quality Place" should be defined. The ten criteria push the "bar" too high.	Noted. Quality place is defined by the amalgam of the 10 criteria. Ten criteria are national criteria as set out in National Urban Design Guidance and linked to NPPF and NPPG advice.
Persimmon Homes	11.27 (policy D1)	Cross reference to the supporting text contained in the policy wording should be deleted to avoid confusion.  The Council should also review the policy to remove any duplication with other policies. Consideration should also be given as whether the policy needs to be so detailed given that the Council has comprehensive guidance on design set out in its adopted Design SPD.	Disagree. Supporting text provides detail and interpretation to the policy wording.  It is important that components of quality places are not disaggregated. The current SPD is limited in its coverage.
Wendy Ball	11.27 (policy D1)	Supports D1	Noted
Mrs Katarzyna Bond	Unclear. D4 referenced	Quality of housing should be reviewed	Quality is considered through policy D1 criteria as well as D5 space standards and D4 water quality
Mr Robin Webb	11.24	Suggests FBC should lead energy conservation and carbon neutrality in building design and whole-life energy.	Noted, however there is no evidence locally that would support policies that go beyond the requirements of national building standards, which are

			due to be updated in 2021 and again in 2025 that will move design to zero carbon compatibility.
Mr Richard Jarman	11.34	Suggests targets that exceed current building regulations	Noted. However however there is no evidence locally that would support policies that go beyond the requirements of national building standards, which are due to be updated in 2021 and again in 2025 that will move design to zero carbon compatibility.
Mrs Samantha Pope	11.34 11.36	Suggests targets that exceed current building regulations as is required by London boroughs. Standards should be set for natural ventilation and green infrastructure	Noted, however there is no evidence locally that would support policies that go beyond the requirements of national building standards, which are due to be updated in 2021 and again in 2025 that will move design to zero carbon compatibility. FBC will consider standards and design for GI in the future
Mrs Charlotte Varney	11.34 11.36	Suggests targets that exceed current building regulations as is required by London boroughs Standards should be set for natural ventilation and green infrastructure	Noted, however there is no evidence locally that would support policies that go beyond the requirements of national building standards, which are due to be updated in 2021 and again in 2025 that will move design to zero carbon compatibility. FBC will consider standards and design for GI in the future

Representations on Policy D2: Ensuring Good Environmental Conditions			
Number of representations on policy: 0			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
No Comments			

Representations on Policy D3: Coordination and Piecemeal Development			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Persimmon Homes	11.44 Policy D3	Policy should not interfere on private property rights with regard to depressing or prevent returns to a landowners.	Noted. The policy is not intended to prevent reasonable landowner returns, but ensure viability of development that delivers sustainable, connected places and infrastructure.

Representations on Policy D4: Water Quality and Resources			
Number of representations on policy: 10			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Persimmon Homes	Para 11.52 Policy D4	Meeting Standards should be optional, not required as a means of addressing nitrate loading. Nutrient neutrality can be achieved without doing so.	Noted. It is acknowledged that nitrate neutrality can be delivered through other mechanisms. However, the policy also applies to the consumption of water resources in general. Paragraph 149 of the NPPF states "Plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change taking into account the long-term implications for water supply." Furthermore, paragraph 150a states that "New development should be planned for in ways that avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change." Parts of the Borough are already in water stressed areas and with climate change, there is a need to safeguard future water resource across the Borough and South Hampshire. This is to ensure sustainable development and protect the environment. The policy approach is supported by the main water companies, Natural England and the Environment Agency.
Portsmouth Water	Para 11.52	Very supportive of this policy.	Welcomed.

	Policy D4	This is in line with water industry's aspirations of 100 litres/head/day by 2050 to improve environmental protection, reduce wastewater discharge.	
Ms Pamela Charlwood c/o Hill Head Residents Assoc	Para 11.52 Policy D4	Policy does not address sufficiently the seriousness of the need to improve water quality. More detailed actions and clear targets should be set out, with for improvement of water quality.	The policy states that the Council will work with water suppliers to improve quality and efficiency. Water quality (drinking) is governed nationally under The Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations 2018, which set the standards required to produce quality drinking water. They explain, in detail, the levels of certain characteristics, elements and substances that are allowed in drinking water to protect public health, and how much of each substance should be in the water supply. Policy NE4 ensures new development does not deteriorate the wider water environment and impact designated sites in the Solent.
Environment Agency	Para 11.52 Policy D4	We are very supportive of this policy. higher water efficiency standard acknowledges the water resource sensitivity of South Hampshire and is also a key way of helping mitigate issues around the capacity of waste water treatment works	Welcomed
Hampshire County Council property	Para 11.52 Policy D4	Supports principle, but greater flexibility required to respond to unexpected changes during the plan period.	Welcome support and note need for flexibility. Unexpected changes in circumstances or to targets or other requirements during the plan period will be a material consideration and will be given due weight in considering development proposals.

Hampshire County Council property	paras 11.55/56	Alternative methods to achieve energy efficiency for non residential buildings should be allowed. Eg RIBA 2030 Climate Challenge	Noted. Applicants for development can set out how alternative energy efficiency assessments achieve the equivalent sustainability outcome and these will be a material consideration in the determination of a planning application.
Mrs Helen Laws	Para 11.52 Policy D4	Insufficient control over sewerage discharges by water companies. Sewerage system capacity for new housing must be adequate	Noted. sewerage discharges are regulated and policed at a national level by the Environment Agency through the issue of Discharge Consents. However, new housing development capacity is planned for and taken into account by the statutory wastewater companies to ensure that any additional capacity required in the network is provided. Financial contributions from developers to water companies is procured to ensure adequate and timely delivery.
Home Builders Federation	Para 11.52 Policy D4	The final sentence of policy D4 should be deleted as its inconsistent with NPPF which requires policies to be unambiguous and evidenced. Standard is higher than the maximum requirement that can be applied through the adoption of the optional technical standards.	Disagree. Policy only requires 110l as per optional standard. 100l will be supported but is not a mandatory requirement.
Natural England	Para 11.52 Policy D4	Welcomes policy to help reduce water consumption and improve water quality. However, strongly recommends all new development within the Southern Water supply area adopt a higher standard of water efficiency of 100 litres to be in line with Southern Water's Target reduction programme.	Support Welcome.  The current standard is the maximum requirement that can be applied through the adoption of the optional technical standards. However, the 100L is supported by the Council

		Natural England also recommends encouraging wise use of water eg incorporating grey water recycling systems and efficient appliances.	Grey water recycling is not part of current building regulations nor the future homes standard . However it has been added to policy as part of part of non-mandatory 'support'
Hampshire Police	paras 11.55/56	Note that the paras are the same	Noted. Delete repeat paragraph
<b>Representations on Policy D5: Internal Space Standards</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 4</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Gladman	Para 11.62 Policy D5	Policy should be optional and not mandatory. Robust evidence regarding need, viability and impact upon affordability must be demonstrated	Noted. The council has undertaken robust evidence to demonstrate mandatory requirement. The standard has been subject to viability test. Further survey work of recently submitted applications support this.
Home Builders federation	Para 11.62 Policy D5	Policy should be deleted. Robust evidence regarding need, viability and impact upon affordability must be demonstrated. Evidence set out in supporting text does not demonstrate pressing need. Additional space can affect affordability at entry level units.	Noted. The council has undertaken robust evidence to demonstrate mandatory requirement. The standard has been subject to viability test. Further survey work of recently submitted applications support this.
Persimmon Homes	Para 11.62 Policy D5	Policy should be deleted. Robust evidence regarding need, viability and impact upon affordability has not been demonstrated. Evidence set out in the background Paper is not sufficient and does not address affordability.	Noted. The council has undertaken robust evidence to demonstrate mandatory requirement. The standard has been subject to viability test. Further survey work of recently submitted applications support this.

Turley on behalf of Southampton Solent University	Para 11.62 Policy D5	Policy unsound as not justified. Specific reference to need for flexibility in relation to listed buildings.	Agree that some flexibility is needed to take account of the need to respect the fabric and character of listed buildings. Modify supporting text. Add sentence to para 11.61: 'For example, The Council will consider minor reductions in the internal space standards where it can be demonstrated that this is necessary to ensure the repair and re-use of a heritage asset without undermining its character and fabric integrity'
---	-------------------------	--	--

### Representations on policy HE1 – Historic Environment and Heritage Assets

**Number of representations on policy: 2**

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Historic England		Sound – complies with NPPF. Support the inclusion of a strategic policy for the historic environment.	Welcomed and noted.
Wendy Ball		Legally compliant, sound and complies with duty to cooperate. Important to conserve and enhance the historic environment. Design of developments should be compatible with surrounding historic environment.	Welcomed and noted.



Representations on policy HE2 – Conservation Areas			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Jane Thackker	12.16	Not legally compliant, not sound, does not comply with the duty to cooperate. Warsash is a conservation area. Allocation of housing does not preserve or enhance.	Noted. The housing allocations proposed in the local plan within Warsash are not located in or adjacent to the Warsash Conservation Area.
Representations on policy HE3 – Listed Buildings and Structures and/or their settings			
Number of representations on policy: 0			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
No Comments			
Representations on policy HE4 – Archaeology			
Number of representations on policy: 0			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
No Comments			

Representations on policy HE5 – Locally Listed Buildings and Non-designated Heritage Assets			
Number of representations on policy: 0			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
No Comments			

Representations on policy HE6 –Heritage at Risk			
Number of representations on policy: 0			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
No Comments			

Representations on Implementation and Monitoring			
Number of representations on Implementation and Monitoring chapter: 0			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
No Comments			

Representations on Glossary			
Number of representations on Glossary chapter: 0			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
No Comments			

Representations on Appendices			
Number of representations on policy: 10			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Home Builders Federation	Appendix B	The respondent suggests that the Council should set out evidence base trajectories for each of the sites that make up supply across the plan period.	Disagree. There is no requirement in national policy guidance to provide a housing trajectory for individual sites.
Hammond Miller and Bargate (from Pegasus)	Appendix B	Suggests the appendix should be updated to reflect the quantum of housing required to meet local needs. The trajectory for 2023/24 and 2024/25 is at risk from delays to Welborne. Welborne completions should also be shown in the trajectory.	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.  There is no requirement in national policy guidance to provide a housing trajectory for individual sites.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) 75 Holly Hill	Appendix B	Suggests the appendix should be updated to reflect the quantum of housing required to meet local needs. The trajectory for 2023/24 and 2024/25 is at	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.

		risk from delays to Welborne. Welborne completions should also be shown in the trajectory.	There is no requirement in national policy guidance to provide a housing trajectory for individual sites.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) Old Street	Appendix B	Suggests the appendix should be updated to reflect the quantum of housing required to meet local needs. The trajectory for 2023/24 and 2024/25 is at risk from delays to Welborne. Welborne completions should also be shown in the trajectory.	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.  There is no requirement in national policy guidance to provide a housing trajectory for individual sites.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) HA1	Appendix B	Suggests the appendix should be updated to reflect the quantum of housing required to meet local needs. The trajectory for 2023/24 and 2024/25 is at risk from delays to Welborne. Welborne completions should also be shown in the trajectory.	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.  There is no requirement in national policy guidance to provide a housing trajectory for individual sites.
King Norris (from Pegasus) Brook Avenue	Appendix B	Suggests the appendix should be updated to reflect the quantum of housing required to meet local needs. The trajectory for 2023/24 and 2024/25 is at risk from delays to Welborne. Welborne completions should also be shown in the trajectory.	An addendum consultation will be undertaken to address the re-confirmed housing need for Fareham.  There is no requirement in national policy guidance to provide a housing trajectory for individual sites.
Persimmon Homes	Appendix B	Concern that the trajectory is inadequate to properly assess the delivery expectations made by the Council with respect to individual sites. Suggest the trajectory is broken down by individual sites as there is concern around the delivery estimated for key sites.	Disagree. There is no requirement in national policy guidance to provide a housing trajectory for individual sites.

Miller Homes (From Terence O'Rourke)	Appendix B	Concern that the trajectory provides insufficient information as to how the Council can maintain a 5-year housing land supply and that there is significant reliance on the delivery of Welborne. Appendix B as drafted anticipates a delivery deficit of 152 new homes between 2021/22 and 2022/23, which is inconsistent with the NPPF. Suggests that the trajectory sets out the anticipated rates of development for all the housing sites.	Disagree. There is no requirement in national policy guidance to provide a housing trajectory for individual sites.  The plan allocates sites to maintain a 5-year housing land supply across the plan period.
Hammond Miller and Bargate (from Pegasus)	Appendix C	The Local Ecological network map does not appear to have a basis in the policies of the LP. Former HA2 site is identified as a network opportunity on the plan but is not explained. This appendix should be deleted.	It is the requirement of National Policy to identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks (NPPF para 174). Whilst Appendix C shows an extract of the LEN for Fareham, it is part of the wider LEN for Hampshire. The Plan is taking a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats in accordance with NPPF para 171.
King Norris (from Pegasus) Brook Avenue	Appendix C	The Local Ecological network map does not appear to have a basis in the policies of the LP. Former HA2 site is identified as a network opportunity on the plan but is not explained. This appendix should be deleted.	It is the requirement of National Policy to identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks (NPPF para 174). Whilst Appendix C shows an extract of the LEN for Fareham, it is part of the wider LEN for Hampshire. The Plan is taking a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats in accordance with NPPF para 171.

Representations on Evidence Base			
Number of representations on Evidence Base: 24			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Historic England	Historic Environment Background Paper	Welcomed the paper as a useful tool, demonstrates suitable evidence base in respect of the historic environment.	Noted and comment welcomed.
Rob Stickler	Statement of Community Involvement	FBC have not complied fully with commitments to record and publish representations throughout the plan making process.	Noted, however the Council disagrees, the Council recorded and published all comments received in full in relation to the Regulation 18 consultation which took place in 2017. As part of the Regulation 19 Consultation in 2020, the Council published summaries of all representations received in the initial 2017 Regulation 18 as well as the subsequent Regulation 18 Issues and Options Consultation and the Regulation 18 Supplement Consultation and provided responses to these in the Statement of Consultation. The Council continues to follow this method and will provide this as part of the Regulation 22 for submission to the inspector.
Apsbury Planning for Hamilton Russell	SHELAA	Site ID 3222 – Upper Wharf, agent's minerals and waste assessment and flood risk assessment are	Noted, however the Council disagrees. The evidence used in assessing the site for the SHELAA is

		contrary to the evidence used for the SHELAA, making the site suitable, available and achievable.	sourced from Hampshire County Council as the authority responsible for the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan and the latest flood risk information is gathered from the Environment Agency, providing accurate evidence upon which to base the assessment.
WYG for Bargate & Miller Homes	SHELAA	Inconsistency of assessment of Faraday (Site ID 3113) and Swordfish (Site ID 3114) Business Parks in comparison to other sites in SHELAA.	Noted. Additional text has been added to sites 3113 and 3114 to reflect the need for a BG&SW mitigation strategy to ensure consistency with other sites.
Pat Rook	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	IDP calls for the expansion of health care provision through the addition of further GP locations in Western Wards. However, the table provided only provides an historic timeline pre-dating the Local Plan	Noted, however the Council disagrees. The IDP is produced with input from service providers. The CCG has set out the current pressures on the healthcare estate, which is the table referred to, but then also the strategy for meeting increasing needs, which also includes efficiency and modernisation of the current estate. The new built facilities required are represented in Table 7 of the IDP.
Richard Jarman	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Infrastructure Delivery Plan calls for the expansion of health care provision through the addition of further GP locations in the Western Wards, However the table provided within the document only provides an historic timeline pre-dating the Local Plan. This is not a Sound approach taking into consideration that HA1 alone will bring an additional 830 dwellings.	Noted, however the Council disagrees. The IDP is produced with input from service providers. The CCG has set out the current pressures on the healthcare estate, which is the table referred to, but then also the strategy for meeting increasing needs, which also includes efficiency and modernisation of the current estate. The new built facilities required are represented in Table 7 of the IDP.

Samantha Pope	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	The IDP calls for the expansion for health care in the Western Wards with additional of GP locations in the Western Wards, however within the table provided within the document the timeline of this project and its review is in the past (prior to adoption of the local plan). How is this a sound approach for the borough when addition of 830 dwellings in HA1 alone. Complete the review inline with the timeframe set out in this local plan.	Noted, however the Council disagrees. The IDP is produced with input from service providers. The CCG has set out the current pressures on the healthcare estate, which is the table referred to, but then also the strategy for meeting increasing needs, which also includes efficiency and modernisation of the current estate. The new built facilities required are represented in Table 7 of the IDP.
Samantha Pope	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Has the council fully engaged with HCC over the houses planned for Warsash and the Western Wards as they will be built over the next five years and the local plan extends up to 2036. Is this a sound approach for the borough and our children's education?	Noted, however the Council disagrees. Yes, the Council has consulted with the Education Authority and will continue to do so throughout the Plan making process, as well as through consultation on planning applications. The Education Authority has requested that financial contributions are sought from all development sites which will be used to fund new school places to be identified through future School Places Plan.
Tamsin Dickinson	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Infrastructure Delivery Plan Section 5.4 Education is planned with HCC but the period of any proposed extensions for child placements is only up to 2021 whereas the Plan covers up to 2037. This is not a sound approach for the education of our children.	Noted, however the Council disagrees. The Hampshire School Places Planning process is an ongoing process which is regularly updated. The existing plan looks to 2023. The Education Authority has requested that financial contributions are sought from all development sites which will be used to fund new school places to be identified through future School Places Plan.



Unknown Response	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Infrastructure Delivery Plan Section 5.4 Education is planned with HCC but the period of any proposed extensions for child placements is only up to 2021 whereas the Plan covers up to 2037. This is not a sound approach for the education of our children.	Noted, however the Council disagrees. The Hampshire School Places Planning process is an ongoing process which is regularly updated. The existing plan looks to 2023. The Education Authority has requested that financial contributions are sought from all development sites which will be used to fund new school places to be identified through future School Places Plan.
Unknown Response	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Infrastructure Delivery Plan calls for the expansion of health care provision through the addition of further GP locations in the Western Wards, However the table provided within the document only provides an historic timeline pre-dating the Local Plan.	Noted, however the Council disagrees. The IDP is produced with input from service providers. The CCG has set out the current pressures on the healthcare estate, which is the table referred to, but then also the strategy for meeting increasing needs, which also includes efficiency and modernisation of the current estate. The new built facilities required are represented in Table 7 of the IDP.
Charlotte Varney	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Infrastructure Delivery Plan calls for the expansion of health care provision through the addition of further GP locations in the Western Wards, However the table provided within the document only provides an historic timeline pre-dating the Local Plan. This is not a Sound approach taking into consideration that HA1 alone will bring an additional 830 dwellings.	Noted, however the Council disagrees. The IDP is produced with input from service providers. The CCG has set out the current pressures on the healthcare estate, which is the table referred to, but then also the strategy for meeting increasing needs, which also includes efficiency and modernisation of the current estate. The new built facilities required are represented in Table 7 of the IDP.

Hampshire County Council	Strategic Transport Assessment	The TA has now been finalised and forms part of the Publication Plan evidence base. The LHA supports the methodology used by FBC in preparing a borough-wide TA and the use of the strategic model known as the Sub Regional Transport Model (SRTM) to assess the wider transport impacts of the strategic disposition of proposed development across the Borough.	Noted and welcomed.
Hampshire County Council	Strategic Transport Assessment	The LHA accepts the outputs from the strategic modelling report and has not requested an additional model run of the SRTM to reflect the removal of the two SGAs and subsequent lower housing number.	Noted and welcomed.
Hampshire County Council	Strategic Transport Assessment	The Do Something modelling proposed mitigation schemes for increased junction capacity and modelled only the highway impacts of increased motorised vehicle traffic. There are other solutions for mitigating the transport impacts from local plan development which are more in line with the emerging policy agenda on decarbonising transport from Government and Hampshire County Council.	Noted. Proposed amendment to Policy TIN2 to reflect a sequential approach to mitigation in terms of measures to avoid the need to travel, active travel measures, public transport and finally localised junction improvements.
Tamsin Dickinson	Strategic Transport Assessment	Why, when there are 830 new dwellings proposed, hasn't more consideration been given to HA1 in the transport assessment. With an average of 2 cars per dwelling, an additional 1660 vehicles will be on local roads and there is no reference for the mitigation required to reduce congestion by 2037.	Noted, however the Council disagrees. The Strategic Transport Assessment does consider proposed sites in Warsash as shown in Figure 7-2. In a strategic model, numbers are distributed by modelling zones. The Strategic Model shows that cumulative impacts on the network can be mitigated, with detailed junction assessments considered as part of planning applications.

Tamsin Dickinson	Strategic Transport Assessment	The Local Plan Strategic Transport Assessment at Para 14.16 reads; "In conclusion, based on the work of this Strategic Transport Assessment, it is considered that the quantum and distribution of the development proposed in the Fareham Local Plan, and the resulting transport impacts, are capable of mitigation at the strategic level, and that the plan is therefore deliverable and sound from a transport perspective." This statement doesn't include the area HA1, of the local plan with 830 homes and isn't assessed within the Local Plan Strategic Transport Assessment document.	Noted, however the Council disagrees. The Strategic Transport Assessment does consider proposed sites in Warsash as shown in Figure 7-2. In a strategic model, numbers are distributed by modelling zones. The Strategic Model shows that cumulative impacts on the network can be mitigated, with detailed junction assessments considered as part of planning applications.
East Hampshire District Council	GTAA	Concern that the response rate to the interviews conducted is low and the Council is meeting only the minimum number of pitches required and the need is much higher. Suggest the GTAA is updated to support the submission Local Plan.	Noted. The Council is content that the evidence to support the policy is robust. Paragraph 5.89 states that it is anticipated that an updated GTAA will be undertaken during the plan period. The Council consider this an appropriate approach.
Vistry Group (White Young Green)	Viability Study	Note that a £500 per dwelling has been assumed at the cost of implanting biodiversity net gain and the justification for this cost is not apparent in the evidence base. There is no assessment of how the requirement to provide biodiversity net gain might affect site capacity.	Paragraph 9.39 explains how BNG is expected to be provided onsite in the first instance however, where BNG cannot be adequately accommodated onsite, offsite contributions are permissible. The viability study adequately accounts for BNG requirements.  In addition, an addendum to the Council's Viability Study includes a breakdown on costs for biodiversity net gain.

David Lock Associates on behalf of Buckland Development Limited.	Viability Study	Supports the viability work which underpins the Local Plan, particularly the recommendation that a zero CIL rate should be applied to Welborne.	Support noted.
Persimmon Homes	Viability Study	Concern that no assessment has been carried out by the Council to demonstrate that the requirement for new development to include space standards will not negatively impact affordability within the market.	The Council's Viability Study incorporates the costs of internal space standards within the viability testing.
Hammond Miller and Bargate (from Pegasus)	SA/SEA	Concern that lower housing requirement has not been tested through the SA.	The lower housing was subject to SA in the SA Report for the Publication Plan which contained the lower requirement. That SA report also considered all available reasonable alternatives including the higher housing requirement contained in earlier consultation stages of the Plan. Since then, the housing requirement has in any event been increased again.
Gladman Developments	SA/SEA	Respondent suggests that the future results of the SA must clearly justify policy choices. Further clarification should be provided on the SA results as to why some policy options have been progressed and others rejected through an assessment of all reasonable alternatives.	Noted.
Natural England	SA/SEA	<p>Suggests that SA5 includes a further monitoring parameter to monitor the implementation of new GI/habitat that can alleviate pressures of climate change on species/ecological network.</p> <p>Suggest that SA7 also seeks to conserve and enhance geodiversity.</p> <p>Also advises that:</p>	<p>This is being considered and may be added to the Post Adoption Statement.</p> <p>Amended</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan policy requires development to carry out site level HRA to ensure impacts on European sites are suitably addressed.</li> <li>Further monitoring parameters are incorporated to ensure impacts on sites are monitored through the plan period.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This is being considered and may be added to the Post Adoption Statement.</p>
--	--	--	--

## **2.0     *Regulation 19 Revised Publication Local Plan Consultation***

Almost 300 individuals and organisations submitted comments in response to the Regulation 19 Revised Publication Local Plan Consultation in 2021.

The consultation focussed on the revisions made to the publication plan and as such, for the avoidance of doubt, no consultation responses were received in respect of policies FTC6, HA12, HA15, HA23, HA26, HA29, HA30, HA32, HA33, HA34, HA35, HA36, HA37, HA41, HP3, HP10, HP12, R3, NE6, NE7, NE11, D2, D3, HE1, HE2, HE3, HE4, HE5, HE6.

The following tables provide a summary of the consultation responses received by chapter, policy and evidence base document together with the Council's response:

Representations on Introduction			
Number of representations on chapter: 11			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Miss Boyce	1.7	Wishes to speak at examination.	Noted. This will be passed to the Programme Officer.
Russell Prince-Wright	1.14.1	No justification provided for increase in the OAHN. No evidence that FBC has been able to deliver more than 350 dpa. Increasing target to 541 will result in failure. New homes will be unoccupied as Brexit has reduced immigration and more people work from home. Emphasis should be on levelling up rather than focusing on the south east. Building will result in loss of agriculture and increased CO <sub>2</sub> .	Noted. Fareham's housing need is set using the Standard Methodology as set out in the NPPF. Housing delivery will be achieved by working with developers and communities to meet the target including delivery of Welborne.
Jacky Keys	1.15	Local plan period could be extended for additional 8 years to include all of the Welborne contribution so that less houses needed to be built in the Strategic Gap.	Noted. By extending the plan period, an additional 541 dwellings per annum would be required, resulting in 4,328 homes, more than the remaining Welborne contribution.
Andrew Jackson	1.16	No reference to unadopted draft plan from 2017 in this publication plan	Noted. The local plan has been through draft stages (as in 2017) and has now reached the publication stage and therefore it is part of the same plan that the Council has been working on since 2015. The next stages are submission, then examination and adoption.
Hazel Russell	1.16	No reference to unadopted draft plan from 2017 in this publication plan	Noted. The local plan has been through draft stages (as in 2017) and has now reached the publication stage

			and therefore it is part of the same plan that the Council has been working on since 2015. The next stages are submission, then examination and adoption.
Pegasus for Bargate	1.18	The Welborne plan should be reviewed, as previously responded in the earlier Reg 19 consultation.	Noted.
David Lock Associates for Buckland Developments	1.18	Supports the Council's position to not revisit the detailed policies of the Welborne plan. Supports the trajectories for Welborne	Noted. Support welcomed.
Funtley Village Society	1.18	No other housing options were properly and thoroughly explored as an alternative to Welborne. FBC leadership stated there would be no need for further development if Welborne were built – complete fallacy.	Noted. Fareham's housing need has increased as determined by the standard methodology calculation, set by Government. Welborne has been subject to some delays meaning housing need must be met elsewhere in the borough.
Robert Marshall, Fareham Society	1.28	In absence of Statement of Common Ground with PfSH, new allocations cannot be justified and therefore plan is not sound.	Noted. There has been continuing work with PfSH throughout the preparation of the plan. PfSH have now agreed a Statement of Common ground with the Council.
Metis Homes	1.35	Should include HP2, HP4 & HP6 in the list of strategic policies	Noted. The NPPF states that strategic policies should be limited to those necessary to address the strategic priorities of the area.
Russell Prince-wright	1.45	Para 1.45 does not mention the protected sites in and around the Solent	Noted.
Phillip Hawkins	1.45	Para 1.45 does not mention the protected sites in and around the Solent	Noted.



Representations on Chapter 2 Vision and Strategic Priorities			
Number of representations on policy: 5			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Mr Phillip Hawkins	Para 2.10	Para 2.10 states Fareham Borough will retain its identity, valued landscapes and settlement definition and will protect its natural, built and historic assets. The proposed allocation of Policy HA1 contradicts these aspirations and those of Para 2.12 "Strategic Priorities" which strive to maximise development within the urban area and away from the wider countryside and to create places which encourage healthier lifestyles.	Disagree. HA1 is a sustainable location for development adjacent to the current settlement boundary and proposed to be within the revised urban area boundary.
Gladman	Para 2.12	Support for the Council's vision and objectives, particularly to accommodate development to address housing and employment need. Suggests reference to meeting the unmet housing needs of the wider sub-region should be an aim.	Disagree. The aim of the plan is to meet local housing need and to have a plan found sound. A consequence of the latter is the need to meet the duty to cooperate and consider meeting unmet needs.
Historic England	Para 2.12	Welcome the change of text and no longer consider this part of the plan to be unsound.	Support welcomed.
Mr Russell Prince-Wright	Para 2.12	Queries the level of 'buffer' and recommends reducing to 5%	PINS have advised that, as a minimum, a 10% oversupply is deemed appropriate to manage under-delivery issues.
Mrs Iris Grist	Para 2.12	Suggests that the two sites east and west of Downend road are on Portsdown Hill and should be removed from the Plan.	HA4 and HA56 are currently within the countryside but are not within the proposed ASLQ but their presence on the lower slopes of Portsdown Hill,

			some of which is proposed as an ASLQ, is recognised.
<b>Representations on Chapter 3</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy:</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Raymond Brown (from Southern Planning Practice)	3.1-3.42 and Key diagram	<p>Considers the Plan to be unsound and failing the DtC.</p> <p>Rep (214 page report) objects to the development strategy, recommends the omission site Rookery Farm is included as an allocation.</p> <p>Para 2.51 of the rep suggests that we have not followed our own Development Strategy by not allocating Rookery Farm, which they contend is PDL.</p>	Disagree. The site is question is not considered developable in the SHELAA and so its status as PDL, as alleged, does not mean it warrants allocation. The Council has not deviated from its Development Strategy and has allocated suitable, available, achievable brownfield sites over greenfield sites.
Hazel Russell	3.4-3.5	Rep suggests an uneven distribution of housing sites across the Borough.	Disagree. Housing sites are distributed widely across the Borough in accordance with the Development Strategy. The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. It is accepted that this is not numerically even across the Borough.
Iris Grist	3.6	Comment suggests that HA4 and HA56 should be removed from the plan.	Disagree. I think the point that the representor is trying to make is that these sites are outside of the settlement boundary. This is true

			against the adopted plan but given the housing need, the Council has had to look wider than within existing urban areas.
Iris Grist	3.9	Comment suggests that HA4 and HA56 should be removed from the plan. Objects as they are on Portsdown Hill.	HA4 and HA56 are not within the proposed ASLQ but their presence on the lower slopes of Portsdown Hill, some of which is proposed as an ASLQ, is recognised.
Valerie Wyatt	3.9	Comment relates to the assertion that there are no allocations in the Hamble valley but respondent points out the HA32 Egmont Nursery is an allocation.	This is an unchanged paragraph and this representation was made to the first Reg 19.  As an extant permission, the designation of ASLQ cannot be retrospectively added to the site.
Fareham Society (Bob Marshall)	3.15	Recognises that this is not a new paragraph.  Suggests that the rationale for site selection between the SA/SEA and SHELAA is not clear, and that there is no reference to the SA/SEA in the SHELAA.	Disagree. Each site has undergone extensive assessment, including SA/SEA and SHELAA. Both are part of the evidence base and have been available to comment on throughout the consultation process.
Nicholas John	3.21	Concerns expressed about the spatial distribution of the additional sites in this Revised Publication Local Plan.	Disagree. Housing sites are distributed widely across the Borough in accordance with the Development Strategy. The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. It is accepted that this is not numerically even across the Borough, but the whole Local Plan supply needs to be considered, not just the additional allocations in this allocation.
Hilary Megginson	3.21	Concerns expressed at what is seen to be an 'unfair distribution' for Warsash.	Disagree. Housing sites are distributed widely across the Borough

			in accordance with the Development Strategy. The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. It is accepted that this is not numerically even across the Borough.
Hazel Russell	3.27	Comment suggests that the 8 potential growth areas are not shown on the map.	Figure 3.2 is historic demonstrating the eight potential growth areas that were considered in an earlier consultation (2019) and in the SA. Its inclusion is as part of the narrative for preparing the plan.
Andy Jackson	3.27	Comment suggests that the 8 potential growth areas are not shown on the map.	Figure 3.2 is historic demonstrating the eight potential growth areas that were considered in an earlier consultation (2019) and in the SA. Its inclusion is as part of the narrative for preparing the plan.
Linda Morgan	3.32	Respondents queries if 'the new houses get a lovely view' what about 'everyone else's view when walking in the field'?	Para 3.32 states that countryside locations for 'some forms of development' 'can provide important views from the built form into the open countryside beyond'. The Local Plan includes developments outside of settlements due to the housing need.
Gladman	Policy DS1	Gladman oppose the use of settlement boundaries as an arbitrary tool that prevent sustainable development. Suggest that development in the countryside is only permitted under a narrow set of circumstances. Suggest a criteria-based policy is required to assess the specific circumstances of each proposal rather than sites being discounted because of an artificial boundary.	This is an unchanged policy and Gladman made this representation to the first Reg 19.

Gosport Borough Council	Policy DS1	While supporting the intention of the policy, GBC are concerned about the effectiveness, particularly in relation to the links to policy HP4, HP5 and HP6, and the potential for unintended development in the countryside. Of particular concern is development affecting the transport corridor to Gosport Borough	This is an unchanged policy and GBC made representation to the first Reg 19.
Phil Hawkins	Policy DS1	Strategic Policy DS1 (Paras 5.6 and 3.36) deals with the need (in exceptional circumstances and where necessary and justified) for residential development in the countryside on previously developed land.	It seems this comment is being part as part of an objection to site HA1. This site is a sustainable site, much of it has outline planning permission or resolution to grant.
Miller Homes (from Terence oRourke)	Policy DS1	Concern that the policy is not consistent with national policy. Policy DS1 should not seek to prevent development on BMV agricultural land. Suggests it should be noted that other factors should be taken into consideration such as low-quality agricultural land may not be in accessible locations or suitable for development.  Criterion v) should be deleted as this is already covered by national policy.	This is an unchanged policy and this representation was made to the first Reg 19.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) 75 Holly Hill	Policy DS1	Not clear what landscapes are being referred to in point ii, nor how to measure how the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside has been recognised. Suggest that point v should include an exemption where land permitted under HP4 and loss of BMV is permitted. Paragraph 3.39 fails to explain how DS1 applies to housing policies.	This is an unchanged policy and this representation was made to the first Reg 19.
Bryan Jezeph Consultancy (BJC) Planning	Policy DS1	Comments relates to the lack of policy provision for new education sites within the countryside, with many within the urban areas at or near capacity. Additional wording to DS1d suggested.	This is an unchanged policy and this representation was made to the first Reg 19.

Linda Morgan	3.42	Comment suggests that the Council is contravening its intention to provide green infrastructure by taking away green infrastructure.	The Local Plan includes developments outside of settlements due to the housing need. Significant efforts have been made to secure green infrastructure on new developments through masterplanning.
Linda Morgan	3.45	Argues that the plan is not sound as it will not protect the countryside setting of Stubbington.	The Local Plan includes developments outside of settlements due to the housing need. Efforts have been made to reduce the impact on the countryside setting of Stubbington.
Titchfield Village Trust	3.45	Supports the preservation of the strategic gap in the Meon valley. Suggests the Council's position has been strengthened.	Support welcomed.
Tracey Viney	3.46	Points out that this paragraph states no changes are proposed to the Strategic Gap boundary but there are changes proposed. Objects to HA54 and 55 which would remove 'half the width' of the farmland gap.	Inaccuracy in para 3.46 is noted.  The need to look for sites outside of settlements is justified by the housing need. The proposed allocations are justified by the Technical Review.
Mr M Berridge	Policy DS2	Expresses concern about housing development in the strategic gap and the impacts on Gosport and traffic on the A32.	Concerns noted. Not sure which development the respondent is particularly concerned about but development in the Strategic Gap is justified by the Technical Review.
Gordon Ash	Policy DS2	Considers the policy and the plan unsound as the Council has gone against the views of residents. Suggests that there has not been enough consultation.	Disagree. The Council consulted on the idea of growth in the strategic gap in 2020 and is consulting again on two specific proposals to gather views to pass to the Inspector.
Gladman	Policy DS2	Concern that the policy as currently worded is negative, which may affect the consideration of development proposals. Suggest the policy is positively re-worded to allow an exercise to be undertaken to assess any harm to the visual and	This is an unchanged policy and this representation was made to the first Reg 19.

		functional separation of settlements against the benefits of a proposal.	
Gosport Borough Council	Policy DS2	Supports the strategic gap which excludes land east of Newgate Lane East and that the formerly identified strategic growth area in the Fareham-Stubbington gap.	This is an unchanged policy and this representation was made to the first Reg 19.
Nicholas John	Policy DS2	Concerned about the two housing allocations HA54 and HA55 and the encroachment from north and south with the new bypass in the middle.	The need to look for sites outside of settlements is justified by the housing need. The proposed allocations are justified by the Technical Review.
Bargate Homes (from Pegasus) Land West of Old Street	Policy DS2	Policy should only apply to land which provides a spatial function to maintain the separation of settlements and define settlement pattern. Policy DS2 should not apply to the land west of Old Street. This view is supported by the appeal Inspector (APP/A1720/W/18/3200409).	This is an unchanged policy and this representation was made to the first Reg 19.
Pegasus Group for Hammond Miller Bargate	Policy DS2	<p>Suggests there is a contradiction between policy DS2 and HA55 (and to a lesser extent HA54).</p> <p>Response also critiques the Technical Review in respect of omission site HA2 Newgate Lane South.</p>	<p>The omission of HA2 is unchanged and representations on this site were made to the first Reg 19.</p> <p>There is no conflict between DS2 and HA54 as the policy would not apply to this land. This is backed up by the Technical Review which provides justification for Oakcroft lane as a boundary. For HA55 the wording of the Technical Review is less conclusive, stating that development could be accommodated in the area but without providing a definitive new boundary. Therefore, keeping the land within the SG allows the policy to inform that development of the masterplan to ensure visual and</p>

			physical separation of settlements in line with the policy.
Persimmon Homes	Policy DS2	Pleased that the Local Plan includes some housing allocations in the Fareham-Stubbington gap area. Thinks more is needed in light of housing needs in the Borough and wider sub-region.	Support welcomed.
Reside (from Turley)	Policy DS2	Suggests that there is no justification for the extension of the Meon gap to the south of Funtley.	This is an unchanged policy and this representation was made to the first Reg 19.
T Ware Developments Ltd	Policy DS2	Suggests the clients land at Land south of Hope Lodge should be removed from the Meon gap and cites an Officer's report in respect of a refused planning application, now at appeal.	<p>This is an unchanged policy but this representation was not made to the first Reg 19.</p> <p>Disagree about the need for a change. The Technical Review justifies the boundary. Just because one application does not find harm to the integrity of the Strategic Gap, does not mean that another development on the same site would not.</p>
Vistry Group (from TetraTech)	Policy DS2	Suggests that allocations HA54 and HA55 are contradictions to policy DS2 and in their place, Pinks Hill should be delivered.	<p>Omission site Pinks Hill is covered by the SHELAA. It is a discounted site and is not comparable to either of the proposed allocations in between Fareham and Stubbington in terms of scale.</p> <p>Disagree that HA54 and HA55 contradict DS2. HA54 is outside of the gap on the policies map and HA55 is intentionally left in to influence the masterplan of the site.</p>
Bargate Homes from Pegasus (75 Holly Hill Lane)	Policy DS2	Suggests there is a contradiction between policy DS2 and HA55 (and to a lesser extent HA54).	There is no conflict between DS2 and HA54 as the policy would not apply to



			<p>this land. This is backed up by the Technical Review which provides justification for Oakcroft lane as a boundary. For HA55 the wording of the Technical Review is less conclusive, stating that development could be accommodated in the area but without providing a definitive new boundary. Therefore, keeping the land within the SG allows the policy to inform that development of the masterplan to ensure visual and physical separation of settlements in line with the policy.</p>
Bargate Homes from Pegasus (75 Holly Hill Lane)	Policy DS3	<p>Questions the Council's designation of ASLQ's. By designating the ASLQ's the Council is at risk of creating a policy that is irrelevant. Guidance states that non designated landscapes can be valued, and therefore site by site assessment would be required. Suggests policy is deleted.</p>	<p>This is an unchanged policy and this representation was made to the first Reg 19.</p>
T Ware Developments Ltd	Policy DS3	<p>Suggests the clients land at Land south of Hope Lodge should be removed from the Meon valley ASLQ and cites an Officer's report in respect of a refused planning application, now at appeal.</p>	<p>This is an unchanged policy but this representation was not made to the first Reg 19.</p> <p>Disagree about the need for a change. The Technical Review justifies the boundary.</p>
CPRE Hampshire	Policy DS3	<p>Reiterating their support for the landscape approach to the Local Plan. Disappointed that there is no reference to Green Belt.</p>	<p>This is an unchanged policy and this representation was made to the first Reg 19.</p> <p>Green Belt is being explored at a PfSH Level and there is no evidence, as yet, to support its introduction through a Fareham Local Plan.</p>

Reside (from Turley)	Policy DS3	Suggests that there is no justification for the extension of the Meon ASLQ to the south of Funtley.	This is an unchanged policy and this representation was made to the first Reg 19.
<b>Representations on Policy H1 and Paragraphs 4.1-4.20</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 66</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Raymond Brown	Paras 4.1-4.20 & Policy H1	<p>Welcome the Local Plan planning for the homes required by the standard method, however this is just a starting point. Contribution towards unmet need not sufficient given scale of unmet need in sub-region. Additional factors contributing to the shortfall. Over reliance on Welborne and town centre, a mix of sites need to be included. Plan not ambitious, with most sites already having permission. Contingency buffer inadequate. Inability to meet identified affordable housing provision particularly due to reliance on larger sites that will be delivering later in the plan period. Over reliance on windfall and no evidence that the figure can be realistically achieved. Lack of priority to brownfield sites.</p> <p>Rookery Farm should be included as an allocation in Policy H1.</p>	Disagree. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate. The plan is reliant on delivery at Welborne, however the site now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory. The proposed allocations include a mix of sites including various sizes, edge of settlement, town centre etc. There is a balance to be struck between certainty and ambition in the Local Plan. The NPPF allows for windfall to contribute towards the supply where there is evidence that that they will provide a reliable source of supply. The windfall paper provides justification for an

			<p>allowance to be included. A brownfield first approach to development enshrined in national policy, the development of previously developed land and under-utilised buildings will be supported particularly if this would help to meet housing or employment needs.</p> <p>Rookery Farm has been considered through the SHELAA.</p>
Downing, Andrew	Para 4.2	Folly to try to accommodate government new housing quotas. Government is continuing to allow mass immigration which is fuelling housing demand	Noted. Planning Practice Guidance is clear that there is an expectation that the standard method will be used to calculate the housing requirement and that any other method will be used only in exceptional circumstances.
Hawkins, Alan	Para 4.2	Housing requirement and Government methodology for calculating housing need flawed	Noted. Planning Practice Guidance is clear that there is an expectation that the standard method will be used to calculate the housing requirement and that any other method will be used only in exceptional circumstances.
Hawkins, Phil	Para 4.2	Methodology described in Para 4.2 is premature and risky until we know the government's response to the Planning white paper 'Planning for the Future'.	In March 2020, the Government set a clear deadline of December 2023 for all authorities to have up-to-date Local Plans in place and a statement by Christopher Pincher (19/01/21) made it clear that authorities should not use the Planning White Paper proposals as a reason to delay plan-making activities.
Jackson, Andy	Para 4.2	Methodology described in Para 4.2 is premature and risky until we know the government's response	In March 2020, the Government set a clear deadline of December 2023 for all authorities to have up-to-date Local

		to the Planning white paper 'Planning for the Future'.	Plans in place and a statement by Christopher Pincher (19/01/21) made it clear that authorities should not use the Planning White Paper proposals as a reason to delay plan-making activities.
Keyes, Jacky	Para 4.2	No evidence to show how housing requirement was determined. The calculation and how it was affected by the duty to cooperate should be shown. Should be subject to independent verification.	Disagree. The Standard Methodology calculation is set out in planning practice guidance and uses publicly available data sets. Statements of Common Ground will set out how the DtC has been met.
Meggison, Robert	Para 4.2	Methodology described in Para 4.2 is not democracy but the Council prescribing what the public can comment on. Figure is premature and risky until we know the government's response to the Planning white paper 'Planning for the Future'.	Disagree. The methodology described in Para 4.2 is a standard approach set out in national planning practice guidance. There is an expectation that the standard method will be used to calculate the housing requirement and that any other method will be used only in exceptional circumstances.  In March 2020, the Government set a clear deadline of December 2023 for all authorities to have up-to-date Local Plans in place and a statement by Christopher Pincher (19/01/21) made it clear that authorities should not use the Planning White Paper proposals as a reason to delay plan-making activities.
Hammond Family, Miller Homes and Bargate Homes (HA2 Land at Newgate Lane South) (Pegasus)	Para 4.3-4.6 & Policy H1	The housing requirement should be increased to meet affordable housing need. Plan not positively prepared because it does not meet objectively assessed need and is not informed by agreements	Disagree. The plan meets the borough's affordable housing need. The plan meets the OAN for Fareham and has been informed by ongoing

		<p>with neighbouring authorities in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>Plan not justified as it does not provide an appropriate strategy, taking into account reasonable alternatives. Strategy should properly plan to contribute towards meeting the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities including Gosport. The Plan has also not been prepared on the basis of a proportionate evidence base.</p> <p>Plan not effective as it is not deliverable given uncertainties over deliverability and viability of Welborne and BL1, as well as strong objections made to a number of proposed allocations.</p> <p>Stepped requirement proposed without consideration of significant existing backlog of housing supply. Stepped requirement unjustifiably requires less development in the early years of the plan than the trajectory suggests can be achieved. Unjustifiably proposes a stepped housing requirement to secure a 5YHLS but sets this significantly below the level at which the RPLP would demonstrate a five-year land supply and therefore serves to delay meeting development needs. Does not identify a sufficient developable supply to meet even the proposed housing requirement. Does not provide any evidence that a five-year land supply will be able to be demonstrated at the point of adoption.</p> <p>Former Policy HA2 housing allocation (Land at Newgate Lane South) should be reinstated.</p>	<p>discussions with neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>Disagree. The SA took into account reasonable alternatives and there is now a signed SoCG with PfSH agreeing that the contribution towards unmet need is appropriate.</p> <p>Disagree. Welborne now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory for Welborne. In terms of BL1, the NPPF and PPG allows the Council to include a less detailed, broad location for development to deliver housing in the later years of the Plan. The Council has committed to produce a Supplementary Planning Document to deliver this location which will follow on from the adoption of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Disagree. The stepped housing requirement is set at the level necessary for the Council to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan with a 20% buffer applied. The trajectory at Appendix B along with the requirement</p>
--	--	---	--

			set out in Policy H1 would show the five-year housing land supply position. Land at Newgate Lane South has been considered through the SHELAA.
Brierley, Anne	Para 4.5	Who decides the numbers to be taken as unmet need? Is there a formula set in stone or is it voluntary? 900 homes taken from Portsmouth equates to all the land being built on at Downend Road. Portsmouth have built plenty of student accommodation, perhaps this should have been housing allocations for residents.	Noted. The contribution to unmet need is determined by ongoing discussions with neighbouring authorities and the availability of suitable sites.
Portsmouth City Council	Para 4.5-4.6	Welcome inclusion of unmet need contribution. Ongoing work with PfSH will be important dealing with the distribution of unmet housing need in the sub-region. PCC retains its request to Fareham BC to take a proportion of its unmet housing need. All deliverable supply options should be explored given scale of unmet need indicated by PCC and GBC.	Agreed. FBC will continue to work with PfSH. All sites that have been assessed as being developable in the SHELAA, either have planning permission or are proposed allocations.
Cooke, Janet	Para 4.6	In agreeing to take up shortfall from Portsmouth, FBC are taking a risk as we await Government's response to planning white paper consultation.	<p>Disagree. There is significant unmet need in the wider sub-region and therefore it is likely that we would need to contribute towards unmet need in order to have the plan found sound.</p> <p>In March 2020, the Government set a clear deadline of December 2023 for all authorities to have up-to-date Local Plans in place and a statement by Christopher Pincher (19/01/21) made it clear that authorities should not use the Planning White Paper proposals as a reason to delay plan-making activities.</p>

Hawkins, Phil	Para 4.6	In agreeing to take up shortfall from Portsmouth, FBC are taking a risk as we await Government's response to planning white paper consultation.	<p>Disagree. There is significant unmet need in the wider sub-region and therefore it is likely that we would need to contribute towards unmet need in order to have the plan found sound.</p> <p>In March 2020, the Government set a clear deadline of December 2023 for all authorities to have up-to-date Local Plans in place and a statement by Christopher Pincher (19/01/21) made it clear that authorities should not use the Planning White Paper proposals as a reason to delay plan-making activities.</p>
Jackson, Andy	Para 4.6	In agreeing to take up shortfall from Portsmouth, FBC are taking a risk as we await Government's response to planning white paper consultation.	<p>Disagree. There is significant unmet need in the wider sub-region and therefore it is likely that we would need to contribute towards unmet need in order to have the plan found sound.</p> <p>In March 2020, the Government set a clear deadline of December 2023 for all authorities to have up-to-date Local Plans in place and a statement by Christopher Pincher (19/01/21) made it clear that authorities should not use the Planning White Paper proposals as a reason to delay plan-making activities.</p>
Meggison, Robert	Para 4.6	In agreeing to take up shortfall from Portsmouth, FBC are taking a risk as we await Government's response to planning white paper consultation.	<p>Disagree. There is significant unmet need in the wider sub-region and therefore it is likely that we would need to contribute towards unmet need in order to have the plan found sound.</p>

			<p>In March 2020, the Government set a clear deadline of December 2023 for all authorities to have up-to-date Local Plans in place and a statement by Christopher Pincher (19/01/21) made it clear that authorities should not use the Planning White Paper proposals as a reason to delay plan-making activities.</p>
Russell, Hazel	Para 4.6	<p>In agreeing to take up shortfall from Portsmouth, FBC are taking a risk as we await Government's response to planning white paper consultation.</p>	<p>Disagree. There is significant unmet need in the wider sub-region and therefore it is likely that we would need to contribute towards unmet need in order to have the plan found sound.</p> <p>In March 2020, the Government set a clear deadline of December 2023 for all authorities to have up-to-date Local Plans in place and a statement by Christopher Pincher (19/01/21) made it clear that authorities should not use the Planning White Paper proposals as a reason to delay plan-making activities.</p>
Charlwood, Pamela	Para 4.16	<p>Brownfield/regeneration sites should be used for housing before greenfield sites. Wish to see a commitment from FBC, if necessary, take direct responsibility for such development, particularly for affordable housing. Para 4.16 refers only to Fareham Town Centre brownfield sites but this should be extended as a general principle.</p>	<p>Disagree. Para 4.16 does not mean there are no brownfield sites elsewhere. The brownfield first approach to development enshrined in national policy, and Para 3.38 of the PLP states that the development of previously developed land and under-utilised buildings will be supported particularly if this would help to meet housing or employment needs.</p>



Abrams, Sandra	Policy H1	The autumn consultation has been overturned and housing allocations have been increased by the government against the agreed quotas which was based legally on research of needs. A revised housing quota has therefore been imposed after the electorate had given their consent.	Noted. Planning Practice Guidance is clear that there is an expectation that the standard method will be used to calculate the housing requirement and that any other method will be used only in exceptional circumstances.
Bargate Homes (Land Adjacent to 75 Holly Hill Lane) (Pegasus)	Policy H1	<p>Housing requirement will not meet affordable housing needs. Contribution towards unmet need has not been demonstrated to be sufficient or to be in an appropriate location. Does not meet DtC. Proposed stepped requirement proposed without consideration of significant existing backlog of housing supply. Stepped requirement unjustifiably requires less development in the early years of the plan than the trajectory suggests can be achieved. Unjustifiably proposes a stepped housing requirement to secure a 5YHLS but sets this significantly below the level at which the RPLP would demonstrate a five-year land supply and therefore serves to delay meeting development needs. Does not identify a sufficient developable supply to meet even the proposed housing requirement. Does not provide any evidence that a five-year land supply will be able to be demonstrated at the point of adoption.</p> <p>Land adjacent to 75 Holly Hill should be included as an allocation in Policy H1.</p>	<p>Disagree. The plan meets the borough's affordable housing need. The plan has been informed by ongoing discussions with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies in line with the DtC and there is now a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that the contribution towards unmet need is appropriate. The stepped housing requirement is set at the level necessary for the Council to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan with a 20% buffer applied. The trajectory at Appendix B along with the requirement set out in Policy H1 would show the five-year housing land supply position.</p> <p>Land adjacent to 75 Holly Hill has been considered through the SHELAA.</p>
Bargate Homes (Old Street) (Pegasus)	Policy H1	Housing requirement will not meet affordable housing needs. Contribution towards unmet need has not been demonstrated to be sufficient or to be in an appropriate location. Does not meet DtC. Proposed stepped requirement proposed without consideration of significant existing backlog of housing supply. Stepped requirement unjustifiably	Disagree. The plan meets the borough's affordable housing need. The plan has been informed by ongoing discussions with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies in line with the DtC and there is now a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that

		<p>requires less development in the early years of the plan than the trajectory suggests can be achieved. Unjustifiably proposes a stepped housing requirement to secure a 5YHLS but sets this significantly below the level at which the RPLP would demonstrate a five-year land supply and therefore serves to delay meeting development needs. Does not identify a sufficient developable supply to meet even the proposed housing requirement. Does not provide any evidence that a five-year land supply will be able to be demonstrated at the point of adoption.</p> <p>Land to the west of Old Street should be included as an allocation in Policy H1.</p>	<p>the contribution towards unmet need is appropriate.</p> <p>Disagree. The stepped housing requirement is set at the level necessary for the Council to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan with a 20% buffer applied. The trajectory at Appendix B along with the requirement set out in Policy H1 would show the five-year housing land supply position.</p> <p>Land to the west of Old Street has been considered through the SHELAA.</p>
Bargate Homes and Sustainable Land (Land at Newgate Lane (North and South) (Pegasus)	Policy H1	<p>Support changes to the calculation of housing requirement using standard methodology. Contribution to unmet need inadequate, no justification for figure proposed. Stepped requirement will not meet overall plan requirement. Question achievability of higher housing requirement figures later in plan period. Housing requirement should not be phased to manufacture a 5YHLS. Plan reliant on Welborne and questions deliverability.</p> <p>Land at Newgate Lane (North and South) should be included as an allocation in Policy H1.</p>	<p>Support for changes to housing requirement welcomed.</p> <p>Disagree. The stepped requirement will meet the housing need and is necessary to ensure the Council has a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan. The Council is confident in the delivery assumptions that have been made to inform the trajectory and a SoCG with PfSH has been signed agreeing that the contribution to unmet need is appropriate. The plan is reliant on Welborne; however, the site now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured</p>

			<p>and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory.</p> <p>Land at Newgate Lane (North and South) has been considered through the SHELAA.</p>
Berridge, Michael	Policy H1	Queries how housing figure is arrived at. The number of houses Fareham has been assigned seems excessive – issues with traffic, schools, GP surgeries. Welborne was meant to cater for Fareham's needs.	Noted. Fareham's housing need has increased as determined by the standard methodology calculation, set by Government. Welborne has been subject to some delays meaning housing need must be met elsewhere in the borough.
Bray, Simon	Policy H1	Central Government massaging of years (ie 2014 vs 2018) against which to assess housing need is a cynical approach toward using the building industry to re-boot the economy thus placing more pressure on habitats and further missing biodiversity targets (the most risible effort in Europe – against which it was measured).	Noted. Planning Practice Guidance is clear that there is an expectation that the standard method will be used to calculate the housing requirement and that any other method will be used only in exceptional circumstances.
Bryan, Ron	Policy H1	If further housing developments are being proposed due to delays with Welborne, can't the number of homes at Welborne be reduced accordingly? Future development is a worry as we now have a declining population nationally. Concern that Fareham will lose its semi-rural character.	Noted. However, the contribution from Welborne is still needed in order to meet the housing requirement.
CPRE Hampshire	Policy H1	CPRE Hampshire reject use of out-of-date 2014 based projections in standard methodology. 2018 projections more robust and 2021 census will confirm that they have more validity. FBC should seek early release of Census figures as it has such a significant effect on the Local Plan. There has been a challenge to ONS population projections which impacts Portsmouth and Southampton.	Planning Practice Guidance is clear that there is an expectation that the standard method will be used to calculate the housing requirement and that any other method will be used only in exceptional circumstances.

Dimmick et al (56-66 Greenaway Lane) (Woolf Bond Planning)	Policy H1	<p>Dispute whether proposed plan period will meet obligation to provide strategic policy for at least 15 years post adoption. Plan period should be extended.</p> <p>Plan doesn't go far enough to meet Portsmouth's unmet need request and should make a significantly larger contribution.</p> <p>Phased housing requirement not adequately justified, there is no detailed annual breakdown of supply. Trajectory for Welborne unrealistic. Stepped housing requirement should be replaced with single level need.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council is confident in the timetable outlined in the LDS. However, there are several examples of Local Authorities with recently adopted plans with less than 15 years left of the plan period at the point of adoption.</p> <p>Disagree. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate.</p> <p>Disagree. The phased housing requirement is necessary in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan and there is no requirement to provide detailed annual breakdown of supply. Welborne now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory.</p>
Eastleigh Borough Council	Policy H1	<p>Support the overall approach to housing provision and contribution towards unmet housing needs. A significant PfSH wide unmet housing need will remain which needs to be addressed through work on revised PfSH Strategy but too early to know what implications will be. Supporting text for H1 should commit to a review of the plan should this be</p>	<p>Support welcomed. There is now a signed SoCG with PfSH which references the review of the plan.</p>

		necessary following the completion and approval of the PfSH Strategy.	
Foreman Homes (21 Burr ridge Road)	Policy H1	<p>Dispute whether proposed plan period will meet obligation to provide strategic policy for at least 15 years post adoption. Plan period should be extended.</p> <p>Plan doesn't go far enough to meet Portsmouth's unmet need request and should make a significantly larger contribution.</p> <p>Phased housing requirement not adequately justified, there is no detailed annual breakdown of supply. Trajectory for Welborne unrealistic. Stepped housing requirement should be replaced with single level need.</p> <p>21 Burr ridge Road should be included as an allocation in Policy H1.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council is confident in the timetable outlined in the LDS. However, there are several examples of Local Authorities with recently adopted plans with less than 15 years left of the plan period at the point of adoption.</p> <p>Disagree. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate.</p> <p>Disagree. The phased housing requirement is necessary in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan and there is no requirement to provide detailed annual breakdown of supply. Welborne now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory.</p> <p>21 Burr ridge Road is assessed in the SHELAA.</p>
Foreman Homes (Cartwright Drive) (Woolf Bond Planning)	Policy H1	Dispute whether proposed plan period will meet obligation to provide strategic policy for at least 15	Disagree. The Council is confident in the timetable outlined in the LDS. However, there are several examples

		<p>years post adoption. Plan period should be extended.</p> <p>Plan doesn't go far enough to meet Portsmouth's unmet need request and should make a significantly larger contribution.</p> <p>Phased housing requirement not adequately justified, there is no detailed annual breakdown of supply. Trajectory for Welborne unrealistic. Stepped housing requirement should be replaced with single level need.</p> <p>Land to the east of Cartwright Drive should be included as an allocation in Policy H1.</p>	<p>of Local Authorities with recently adopted plans with less than 15 years left of the plan period at the point of adoption.</p> <p>Disagree. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate.</p> <p>Disagree. The phased housing requirement is necessary in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan and there is no requirement to provide detailed annual breakdown of supply. Welborne now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory.</p> <p>Land to the east of Cartwright Drive is considered in the SHELAA.</p>
Foreman Homes (East of Brook Lane) (Woolf Bond Planning)	Policy H1	<p>Dispute whether proposed plan period will meet obligation to provide strategic policy for at least 15 years post adoption. Plan period should be extended.</p> <p>Plan doesn't go far enough to meet Portsmouth's unmet need request and should make a significantly larger contribution.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council is confident in the timetable outlined in the LDS. However, there are several examples of Local Authorities with recently adopted plans with less than 15 years left of the plan period at the point of adoption.</p>

		<p>Phased housing requirement not adequately justified, there is no detailed annual breakdown of supply. Trajectory for Welborne unrealistic. Stepped housing requirement should be replaced with single level need.</p>	<p>Disagree. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate.</p> <p>Disagree. The phased housing requirement is necessary in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan and there is no requirement to provide detailed annual breakdown of supply. Welborne now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory.</p>
Foreman Homes (East of Titchfield Road) (Woolf Bond Planning)	Policy H1	<p>Dispute whether proposed plan period will meet obligation to provide strategic policy for at least 15 years post adoption. Plan period should be extended.</p> <p>Plan doesn't go far enough to meet Portsmouth's unmet need request and should make a significantly larger contribution.</p> <p>Phased housing requirement not adequately justified, there is no detailed annual breakdown of supply. Trajectory for Welborne unrealistic. Stepped housing requirement should be replaced with single level need.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council is confident in the timetable outlined in the LDS. However, there are several examples of Local Authorities with recently adopted plans with less than 15 years left of the plan period at the point of adoption.</p> <p>Disagree. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate.</p> <p>Disagree. The phased housing requirement is necessary in order to secure a five-year housing land supply</p>

		Land to the east of Titchfield Road should be included as an allocation in Policy H1.	<p>upon adoption of the plan and there is no requirement to provide detailed annual breakdown of supply. Welborne now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory.</p> <p>Land to the east of Titchfield Road has been considered through the SHELAA.</p>
Foreman Homes (Greenaway Lane) (Woolf Bond Planning)	Policy H1	<p>Dispute whether proposed plan period will meet obligation to provide strategic policy for at least 15 years post adoption. Plan period should be extended.</p> <p>Plan doesn't go far enough to meet Portsmouth's unmet need request and should make a significantly larger contribution.</p> <p>Phased housing requirement not adequately justified, there is no detailed annual breakdown of supply. Trajectory for Welborne unrealistic. Stepped housing requirement should be replaced with single level need.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council is confident in the timetable outlined in the LDS. However, there are several examples of Local Authorities with recently adopted plans with less than 15 years left of the plan period at the point of adoption.</p> <p>Disagree. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate.</p> <p>Disagree. The phased housing requirement is necessary in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan and there is no requirement to provide detailed annual breakdown of supply. Welborne now benefits from a</p>



			<p>resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory.</p>
<p>Foreman Homes (Holly Hill) (Woolf Bond Planning)</p>	<p>Policy H1</p>	<p>Dispute whether proposed plan period will meet obligation to provide strategic policy for at least 15 years post adoption. Plan period should be extended.</p> <p>Plan doesn't go far enough to meet Portsmouth's unmet need request and should make a significantly larger contribution.</p> <p>Phased housing requirement not adequately justified, there is no detailed annual breakdown of supply. Trajectory for Welborne unrealistic. Stepped housing requirement should be replaced with single level need.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council is confident in the timetable outlined in the LDS. However, there are several examples of Local Authorities with recently adopted plans with less than 15 years left of the plan period at the point of adoption.</p> <p>Disagree. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate.</p> <p>Disagree. The phased housing requirement is necessary in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan and there is no requirement to provide detailed annual breakdown of supply. Welborne now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory.</p>

Foreman Homes (Land North Greenaway Lane) (Woolf Bond Planning)	Policy H1	<p>Dispute whether proposed plan period will meet obligation to provide strategic policy for at least 15 years post adoption. Plan period should be extended.</p> <p>Plan doesn't go far enough to meet Portsmouth's unmet need request and should make a significantly larger contribution.</p> <p>Phased housing requirement not adequately justified, there is no detailed annual breakdown of supply. Trajectory for Welborne unrealistic. Stepped housing requirement should be replaced with single level need.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council is confident in the timetable outlined in the LDS. However, there are several examples of Local Authorities with recently adopted plans with less than 15 years left of the plan period at the point of adoption.</p> <p>Disagree. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate.</p> <p>Disagree. The phased housing requirement is necessary in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan and there is no requirement to provide detailed annual breakdown of supply. Welborne now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory.</p>
Foreman Homes (Military Road) (Woolf Bond Planning)	Policy H1	<p>Dispute whether proposed plan period will meet obligation to provide strategic policy for at least 15 years post adoption. Plan period should be extended.</p> <p>Plan doesn't go far enough to meet Portsmouth's unmet need request and should make a significantly larger contribution.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council is confident in the timetable outlined in the LDS. However, there are several examples of Local Authorities with recently adopted plans with less than 15 years left of the plan period at the point of adoption.</p>

		<p>Phased housing requirement not adequately justified, there is no detailed annual breakdown of supply. Trajectory for Welborne unrealistic. Stepped housing requirement should be replaced with single level need.</p> <p>Land at Military Road should be included as an allocation in Policy H1.</p>	<p>Disagree. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate.</p> <p>Disagree. The phased housing requirement is necessary in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan and there is no requirement to provide detailed annual breakdown of supply. Welborne now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory.</p> <p>Land at Military Road has been considered through the SHELAA.</p>
Foreman Homes (North Wallington) (Woolf Bond Planning)	Policy H1	<p>Dispute whether proposed plan period will meet obligation to provide strategic policy for at least 15 years post adoption. Plan period should be extended.</p> <p>Plan doesn't go far enough to meet Portsmouth's unmet need request and should make a significantly larger contribution.</p> <p>Phased housing requirement not adequately justified, there is no detailed annual breakdown of supply. Trajectory for Welborne unrealistic. Stepped</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council is confident in the timetable outlined in the LDS. However, there are several examples of Local Authorities with recently adopted plans with less than 15 years left of the plan period at the point of adoption.</p> <p>Disagree. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate.</p>

		<p>housing requirement should be replaced with single level need.</p> <p>Land at North Wallington and Standard Way should be included as an allocation in Policy H1.</p>	<p>Disagree. The phased housing requirement is necessary in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan and there is no requirement to provide detailed annual breakdown of supply. Welborne now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory.</p> <p>Land at North Wallington has been considered through the SHELAA.</p>
Foreman Homes (Posbrook Lane) (Woolf Bond Planning)	Policy H1	<p>Dispute whether proposed plan period will meet obligation to provide strategic policy for at least 15 years post adoption. Plan period should be extended.</p> <p>Plan doesn't go far enough to meet Portsmouth's unmet need request and should make a significantly larger contribution.</p> <p>Phased housing requirement not adequately justified, there is no detailed annual breakdown of supply. Trajectory for Welborne unrealistic. Stepped housing requirement should be replaced with single level need.</p> <p>Land to the east of Posbrook and south of Bellfield should be included as an allocation in Policy H1.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council is confident in the timetable outlined in the LDS. However, there are several examples of Local Authorities with recently adopted plans with less than 15 years left of the plan period at the point of adoption.</p> <p>Disagree. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate.</p> <p>Disagree. The phased housing requirement is necessary in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan and there is no requirement to provide detailed</p>

			<p>annual breakdown of supply. Welborne now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory.</p> <p>Land to the east of Posbrook and south of Bellfield has been considered through the SHELAA.</p>
Foreman Homes (Raley Road) (Woolf Bond Planning)	Policy H1	<p>Dispute whether proposed plan period will meet obligation to provide strategic policy for at least 15 years post adoption. Plan period should be extended.</p> <p>Plan doesn't go far enough to meet Portsmouth's unmet need request and should make a significantly larger contribution.</p> <p>Phased housing requirement not adequately justified, there is no detailed annual breakdown of supply. Trajectory for Welborne unrealistic. Stepped housing requirement should be replaced with single level need.</p> <p>Land to the east of Raley Road should be included as an allocation in Policy H1.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council is confident in the timetable outlined in the LDS. However, there are several examples of Local Authorities with recently adopted plans with less than 15 years left of the plan period at the point of adoption.</p> <p>Disagree. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate.</p> <p>Disagree. The phased housing requirement is necessary in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan and there is no requirement to provide detailed annual breakdown of supply. Welborne now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well</p>

			<p>advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory.</p> <p>Land to the east of Raley Road has been considered through the SHELAA.</p>
Foreman Homes (Romsey Avenue) (Woolf Bond Planning)	Policy H1	<p>Dispute whether proposed plan period will meet obligation to provide strategic policy for at least 15 years post adoption. Plan period should be extended.</p> <p>Plan doesn't go far enough to meet Portsmouth's unmet need request and should make a significantly larger contribution.</p> <p>Phased housing requirement not adequately justified, there is no detailed annual breakdown of supply. Trajectory for Welborne unrealistic. Stepped housing requirement should be replaced with single level need.</p> <p>Romsey Avenue should be included as an allocation in Policy H1.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council is confident in the timetable outlined in the LDS. However, there are several examples of Local Authorities with recently adopted plans with less than 15 years left of the plan period at the point of adoption.</p> <p>Disagree. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate.</p> <p>Disagree. The phased housing requirement is necessary in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan and there is no requirement to provide detailed annual breakdown of supply. Welborne now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as</p>

			<p>delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory.</p> <p>Land to the south of Romsey Avenue has been considered through the SHELAA.</p>
Foreman Homes (Rookery Avenue) (Woolf Bond Planning)		<p>Dispute whether proposed plan period will meet obligation to provide strategic policy for at least 15 years post adoption. Plan period should be extended.</p> <p>Plan doesn't go far enough to meet Portsmouth's unmet need request and should make a significantly larger contribution.</p> <p>Phased housing requirement not adequately justified, there is no detailed annual breakdown of supply. Trajectory for Welborne unrealistic. Stepped housing requirement should be replaced with single level need.</p> <p>Support the land at Rookery Avenue as a housing and employment allocation.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council is confident in the timetable outlined in the LDS. However, there are several examples of Local Authorities with recently adopted plans with less than 15 years left of the plan period at the point of adoption.</p> <p>Disagree. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate.</p> <p>Disagree. The phased housing requirement is necessary in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan and there is no requirement to provide detailed annual breakdown of supply. Welborne now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory.</p>

Funtley Village Society	Policy H1	Scale of development in the Northern and Eastern Wards is an issue. Needs to be more coherent national policy to move skills north of the country.	Noted. The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites.
Gladman	Policy H1	<p>Support contribution towards unmet need, however without a signed SOCG it is difficult to consider whether this level of housing is sufficient to meet wider needs of the area.</p> <p>Support use of standard method and approach to plan for above the minimum requirement. With 218,000 homes predicted not to be built due to COVID-19 from now to 2024/25, it is imperative that FBC identify sufficient land to support the delivery of homes with sufficient headroom in the housing supply.</p> <p>Stepped requirement artificially suppresses delivery in the early years of the plan. Unclear how the council expects to achieve delivery rates set. Backloading of land supply will threaten overall deliverability of the plan. Phasing approach unsound and should be replaced with flat annual requirement.</p> <p>Given the uncertainty surrounding the delivery of strategic scale sites and the potential for unmet need in the wider sub-region, the contingency buffer should be increased to 20%.</p>	<p>Support welcomed, there is now a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that the contribution to unmet need is acceptable.</p> <p>Disagree. Covid does not impact on the housing requirement determined by the standard methodology.</p> <p>Disagree. The stepped requirement is necessary to ensure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan. There is invariably a lag between the grant of planning permission and houses being built and so additional homes boosting the supply early in the plan period would need to have permission now, a flat annual requirement would not achieve this.</p> <p>Disagree. The contingency buffer is considered appropriate particularly given increased certainty over the delivery of Welborne.</p>
Greenaway, David	Policy H1	There is no evidence in the presentation material that the council has consulted over the changes with any other local authority or statutory body (police, fire & rescue service, highways authority	Disagree. There have been ongoing discussions with infrastructure providers as evidenced in the IDP.



		and LEA) regarding effects on infrastructure needs since the requirement was changed from 403 to 541 pa.	
Hallam Land Management (South of Longfield Avenue) (LRM Planning Limited)	Policy H1	Support reversion to Government's published standard methodology. However, no account has been taken of the low level of completions from 2018 onwards. The contribution towards unmet need is only a small proportion of the estimated shortfall across the sub-region. Plan very dependent on delivery at Welborne. No further evidence to justify the windfall allowance. The level of flexibility or contingency has reduced in the overall housing supply strategy.	The standard methodology does not require under delivery to be taken account of as the affordability uplift addresses this. There is now a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that the contribution to unmet need is appropriate. The plan is reliant on delivery at Welborne, however, the site benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, there is greater certainty over the delivery assumptions. The windfall allowance is evidenced by the Windfall Background Paper. The reduced level of contingency buffer is considered appropriate given the greater certainty over delivery at Welborne.
Hamilton Russell Limited and Tarmac Plc (Upper Wharf) (Aspbury Planning Limited)	Policy H1	Suggest caution in the calculation of the Total Housing Requirement, particularly with regard to the accommodation of unmet need from adjoining authorities (notably Portsmouth, but also Gosport, which is especially constrained and shares a land boundary only with Fareham BC). Consequently, it is suggested that the Total Housing Requirement of 9,556 dwellings is likely to be too low and needs to be judiciously increased.	Noted. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that the level of contribution to unmet need is appropriate.  Upper Wharf has been considered through the SHELAA.

		Upper Wharf should be included as an allocation in Policy H1.	
Hampshire County Council (Property)	Policy H1	Supports spatial approach to Policy H1 to distribute development through Local Plan allocations. The County Council considers that this is a sound approach that is positively prepared, justified and deliverable within the Plan period (effective) based on the Borough Council's objectively assessed needs and wider Local Plan evidence base.	Support welcomed.
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	H1	Urge greater use of brownfield sites for new developments rather than building in rural areas of the borough.	Noted. The Council has prioritised the allocation of brownfield sites where available, but unfortunately these are not sufficient to meet the housing requirement for the borough meaning some edge of settlement sites are required.
Home Builders Federation	Policy H1	Support assessment of need using standard method and inclusion of contribution towards unmet need. Not enough evidence to be able to comment on delivery assumptions. There should be a delivery trajectory for each allocated site. Larger buffer (20%) required due to reliance on strategic sites.	<p>Support for standard method and unmet need contribution welcomed.</p> <p>Disagree. Whilst there is a requirement for trajectory, it doesn't specify that it needed to be broken down site by site.</p> <p>Disagree. 11% is considered to be an adequate buffer. There is no guidance on what a suitable buffer is other than a minimum of 10% suggested.</p>
Jackson, Andy	Policy H1	Policy H1 illustrates that whilst a contingency buffer of 1,094 homes has been made, the Plan is heavily reliant on the certainty of delivery on 3,610 houses at Welborne during the life of this plan.	Agree that the plan is reliant on Welborne. Government policy requires that the supply is greater than the housing requirement to ensure that the Plan is sufficiently flexible to accommodate needs not anticipated in the Plan and to provide a contingency

			should delivery on some sites not match expectations.
John, Nicholas	Policy H1	Unreasonable Government Targets, Govt appears to be totally irrational in its expectations and does not see 'the big picture'. The numerical algorithm is flawed. Questions buffer.	Planning Practice Guidance is clear that there is an expectation that the standard method will be used to calculate the housing requirement and that any other method will be used only in exceptional circumstances.
Megginson, Robert	Policy H1	Policy H1 illustrates that whilst a contingency buffer of 1,094 homes has been made, the Plan is heavily reliant on the certainty of delivery on 3,610 houses at Welborne during the life of this plan.	Noted. The plan is reliant on delivery at Welborne and the contingency buffer is there to ensure that the Plan is sufficiently flexible to accommodate needs not anticipated in the Plan and to provide a contingency should delivery on some sites not match expectations.
Metis Homes	Policy H1	Contribution to unmet need in wider subregion inadequate. Issues relating to Solent Nitrates are largely resolved and therefore delivery rates will normalise plus there are further permissions and resolutions to grant. This is sufficient to meet delivery needs and therefore the stepped requirement is not justified.  Land to the rear of 35 Burr ridge Road should be included as an allocation in Policy H1.	Disagree. There is now a signed SoCG with PfSH agreeing that the contribution towards unmet need is appropriate. There is a lag between nitrates being resolved and permissions delivering and therefore the stepped requirement is required to ensure that there is a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan (with 20% buffer applied).  Land to the rear of 35 Burr ridge Road has been considered through the SHELAA.
Millener, George	Policy H1	I feel we have been betrayed. I understood that Welborne would take up the bulk of our housing requirements with additional brownfield sites.	Noted. Welborne has been subject to some delays meaning housing need must be met elsewhere in the borough.

Miller Homes (Land West of Downend Road) (Terence O'Rourke)	Policy H1	<p>Support changes to the calculation of housing requirement using standard methodology. Not sufficient evidence that FBC couldn't take more unmet need. Stepped requirement inconsistent with NPPF and not justified. Insufficient evidence in terms of the housing trajectory. Housing requirement will not deliver sufficient affordable housing.</p> <p>Land to the north of allocation HA4 should be included.</p>	<p>Support for changes to housing requirement welcomed.</p> <p>Disagree, a SoCG with PfSH has been signed agreeing that the contribution to unmet need is appropriate. All sites that have been assessed as being developable either have planning permission or are proposed allocations. The stepped requirement is justified to ensure that the Council have a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan. The plan meets the borough's affordable housing need.</p> <p>Land to the north of allocation HA4 has been considered through the SHELAA.</p>
Persimmon Homes	Policy H1	<p>Comments made in respect of Policy H1 supersede those made previously. Welcome update to housing requirement in line with the standard methodology. It is likely the plan will not be adopted until 2022/23 in which case the plan period should be extended by a year. Contribution towards unmet need insufficient. Affordable housing need indicates that a further uplift to Fareham's LHN may be necessary. Stepped housing requirement at odds with NPPF. Windfall paper (June 2020) does not provide a detailed breakdown of which sites are being considered as windfall. The Council's figures cannot therefore be scrutinised. This element of the supply should not be counted towards the Council's housing requirement. Welborne more likely to start delivering in 205/26, not 2022/23 as per the</p>	<p>Support for changes to housing requirement welcomed.</p> <p>Disagree. The Council is confident in the timetable outlined in the LDS. However, there are several examples of Local Authorities with recently adopted plans with less than 15 years left of the plan period at the point of adoption.</p> <p>Disagree. There is now a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that the contribution towards unmet need is appropriate. The plan meets the borough's affordable housing need.</p>

		<p>Council's Welborne trajectory. This would result in more of the homes being built outside the plan period, reducing the Local Plan supply.</p> <p>Omission sites Land East of Burnt House Lane, Land West of Peak Lane, Land North of Titchfield Road, Land South of Titchfield Road and Land West of Cuckoo Lane should be included as allocations in Policy H1.</p>	<p>The stepped requirement is justified to ensure that the Council have a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan. The NPPF allows for windfall to contribute towards the supply where there is evidence that that they will provide a reliable source of supply. The windfall paper provides justification for an allowance to be included. It is not possible to identify sites coming forward as windfall. The trajectory for Welborne shows completions starting is 2023/24 as set out in the Housing Delivery Action Plan.</p> <p>The omission sites have been considered through the SHELAA.</p>
Prime UK Developments Ltd	Policy H1	<p>Object to wording of H1 on basis that it does not meet NPPF requirements to provide housing needed for different groups. Plan does not meet the requirement for 10% of sites to be under 1ha. No evidence to demonstrate that windfall sites will provide a reliable source of supply, or where they could be delivered. There is a lack of sites allocated within the Local Plan to meet the known housing need within the authority area for all different types of housing need.</p> <p>Land at Sopwith Way should be included in the plan.</p>	<p>Disagree. Housing for different groups is covered by Policy HP5, HP7 and HP8 and there are specific allocations for sheltered housing/affordable housing. In terms of the small site requirement, 9.4% of the supply is on sites 1ha or less plus policy HP2 is in place to enable other small sites to come forward. The NPPF allows for windfall to contribute towards the supply where there is evidence that that they will provide a reliable source of supply. The windfall paper provides justification for an allowance to be included.</p>

			Land at Sopwith Way has been considered through the SHELAA.
Reside Developments (Funtley South) (Turley)		<p>Welcome changes to housing requirement.</p> <p>Over reliance on large and complicated sites (i.e. Welborne and the town centre) leading to under delivery in the early years of the plan period. Would encourage FBC to consider alternative sites that could deliver in the short to medium term particularly given lack of 5 year housing land supply and HDT results.</p> <p>Revised NPPF states at Para 22 that where large-scale developments such as new settlements form part of the strategy, policies should be set within a vision that looks ahead at least 30 years to take into account the timescale for delivery. The Plan will need to be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Support for housing requirement welcomed.</p> <p>Noted. The plan is reliant on delivery at Welborne, however the site now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory. The proposed allocations include a mix of sites. The stepped requirement is in place to ensure that the Council have a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan.</p> <p>Disagree. Para 221 of the revised NPPF states that para 21 does not apply to plans that have already reached Reg 19 stage.</p>
Ross, William	Policy H1	Local Councils should be objecting to demand of central government to build thousands of houses in an already overdeveloped part of the country. Fareham should say no to Portsmouth's request to take unmet need. Whilst more development is inevitable more consideration needs to be given to its location, should be limited to brownfield sites.	Noted. Planning Practice Guidance is clear that there is an expectation that the standard method will be used to calculate the housing requirement and that any other method will be used only in exceptional circumstances.
Russell, Hazel	Policy H1	Over concentration of development in Western Wards. A contingency buffer has been included but	Noted. The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy

		plan is heavily reliant on Welborne. Plan is premature and risky as outcome of White Paper could change methodology again.	and the availability of suitable sites. The plan is reliant on delivery at Welborne and the contingency buffer is there to ensure that the Plan is sufficiently flexible to accommodate needs not anticipated in the Plan and to provide a contingency should delivery on some sites not match expectations. In March 2020, the Government set a clear deadline of December 2023 for all authorities to have up-to-date Local Plans in place and a statement by Christopher Pincher (19/01/21) made it clear that authorities should not use the Planning White Paper proposals as a reason to delay plan-making activities.
Seymour, Robert	Policy H1	Housing requirement unjustified, FBC needs to return these requirement figures to the central source and request a planning process in the centre that is free from corrupting influences.	Noted. Planning Practice Guidance is clear that there is an expectation that the standard method will be used to calculate the housing requirement and that any other method will be used only in exceptional circumstances.
Shaw, Lorraine	Policy H1	Objects to use of 2014 based population projections in determining housing requirement. FBC should be challenging the Government. In terms of unmet need, FBC should not be required to help Gosport and Portsmouth ad infinitum. Development in gap unsustainable. Pressure on roads/sewage/doctors. Recent appeal allowed at Newgate Lane (and potentially other appeals) need to be taken into account in the Local Plan.	Noted. Planning Practice Guidance is clear that there is an expectation that the standard method will be used to calculate the housing requirement and that any other method will be used only in exceptional circumstances. Local planning authorities are under a duty to cooperate with each other on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries. Sites have been assessed through the SA and SHELAA and the supply position will

			need to be updated which will take into account any permissions that have been granted.
Solent University (Warsash Maritime Academy) (Turley)	Policy H1	Welcome changes to H1. Heavy reliance on large and complicated sites. Policy unsound because it will not be effective in delivering housing to meet needs early in plan period. Council should seek to make best use of allocated sites which have the potential to deliver homes in the short to medium term.	Support for changes to Policy H1 welcomed. We look forward to working with Solent University on Warsash Maritime Academy which is relied upon in the five-year housing land supply.
Southampton City Council	Policy H1	Support the overall approach to housing provision and contribution towards unmet housing needs. A significant PfSH wide unmet housing need will remain which needs to be addressed through work on revised PfSH Strategy but too early to know what implications will be. Supporting text for H1 should commit to a review of the plan should this be necessary.	Support welcomed. There is now a signed SoCG with PfSH which references the review of the plan.
T Ware Developments Ltd (Land South of Hope Lodge, Fareham Park Road) (Woolf Bond Planning)	Policy H1	<p>Dispute whether proposed plan period will meet obligation to provide strategic policy for at least 15 years post adoption. Plan period should be extended.</p> <p>Plan doesn't go far enough to meet Portsmouth's unmet need request and should make a significantly larger contribution.</p> <p>Phased housing requirement not adequately justified, there is no detailed annual breakdown of supply. Trajectory for Welborne unrealistic. Stepped housing requirement should be replaced with single level need.</p> <p>Land south of Hope Lodge, Fareham Park Road should be included as an allocation in Policy H1.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council is confident in the timetable outlined in the LDS. However, there are several examples of Local Authorities with recently adopted plans with less than 15 years left of the plan period at the point of adoption.</p> <p>Disagree. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate.</p> <p>The phased housing requirement is necessary in order to secure a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan and there is no</p>



			<p>requirement to provide detailed annual breakdown of supply. Welborne now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory.</p> <p>Land south of Hope Lodge has been considered through the SHELAA.</p>
Trott, Cllr Katrina	Policy H1	The Government's inconsistent approach to housing numbers has led to hugely increased requirement. The plan proposes huge increases on valuable greenfield sites. Should revert to plan agreed in 2020.	Noted. Planning Practice Guidance is clear that there is an expectation that the standard method will be used to calculate the housing requirement and that any other method will be used only in exceptional circumstances.
Vistry Group Plc (Pinks Hill) (Tetra Tech)	Policy H1	Support use of adopted Standard Method for calculating housing need and meeting OAN. However, larger contingency buffer (20%) required given reliance on strategic sites. Higher housing requirement should be considered in terms of meeting affordable housing need. Trajectory for Welborne overly ambitious. There is significant unmet need across the sub-region, contribution does not go far enough.	<p>Support for use of standard method welcomed.</p> <p>Disagree. The contingency buffer is considered appropriate. The plan meets the borough's affordable housing need. Welborne now benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory. There is a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate.</p>

Wilkinson, Shirley		<p>A law passed by central government to try to encourage more development may be 'legal'- but may not be wise in specific cases. A Council may feel that it is being 'bullied' into supplying a prescribed number of houses according to a central government algorithm. It's not sensible or desirable to build so many dwellings in this specific area.</p> <p>Disagrees with DtC – to destroy whole neighbourhoods to 'cooperate' in this way is a betrayal of trust by one's own council.</p>	<p>Noted. Planning Practice Guidance is clear that there is an expectation that the standard method will be used to calculate the housing requirement and that any other method will be used only in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>The Council has a duty to cooperate with neighbouring authorities in order for the plan to be found sound.</p>
Winchester City Council		<p>Supports intention of H1 to meet the Borough's housing requirement under the Standard Methodology. It is noted that the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities will also be subject to the standard methodology requirement. There is still the potential for change of numbers in respect of the requirement to contribute to meeting unmet need in neighbouring authorities, pending an updated Partnership for South Hampshire Joint Strategy. There is some uncertainty around the final numbers that will need to be met and the Duty to Cooperate requirement.</p>	<p>Support welcomed. There is now a signed SoCG with PfSH with agreement that FBC's contribution to unmet need is appropriate.</p>

Representations on policy FTC3 – Fareham Station East			
Number of representations on policy: 2			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Southern Planning for Raymond Brown Minerals & Recycling Ltd		Questions availability, suitability and achievability of site also the increase in numbers since its allocation in adopted plan part 2	Comments noted. The site is considered suitable, available and achievable as evidenced in the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment. The council is confident in its delivery trajectory through regular contact with site promoters. The council has undertaken design concept work that has identified a potential yield.
Southern Water		Local sewerage infrastructure to the site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development. There is a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network in order to provide additional capacity. It is recommended the following criterion is added to Policy "Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider."	Comments noted. Paragraph 11.53 (in relation to Policy D4) requires development proposals to demonstrate that there is adequate wastewater infrastructure and water supply capacity to serve the development or adequate provision can be made available.

Representations on policy FTC4 – Fareham Station West			
Number of representations on policy: 2			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Southern Planning for Raymond Brown		This is a long and very narrow site sandwiched between the railway to the east and protected trees to the west. Multiple constraints include, amongst others, the multiple uses existing on the site, the access constraints including that the existing access crosses land in Flood Zone 2, noise, contamination and amenity issues. Questions over suitability availability and achievability.	Comments noted. As previously stated, the site is considered suitable, available and achievable as evidenced in the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment.
Southern Water (Charlotte Mayall)		Local sewerage infrastructure to the site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development. There is a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network in order to provide additional capacity. It is recommended the following criterion is added to Policy "Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider."	Comments noted. Paragraph 11.53 (in relation to Policy D4) requires development proposals to demonstrate that there is adequate wastewater infrastructure and water supply capacity to serve the development or adequate provision can be made available.

Representations on policy FTC5 – Crofton Conservatories			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Southern Planning for Raymond Brown		This site continues to be in active retail use, following the expiry of a temporary permission for retail use and the potential availability of the site is questioned.	Noted. As previously stated, the Local Plan is not required to only identify sites that are available immediately for development. Crofton Conservatories is identified as a source of supply later in the plan period.
Representations on policy HA1 – Land North and South of Greenaway Lane			
Number of representations on policy: 19			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Annie Bevis		The plan/information given is not compatible with the number of houses expected to be built within the time frame. According to the plan, the building should have started last year. But last year we were advised that toxic chemicals had been found in the Solent and neighbouring lands putting a stop to any building plans.	Noted. The Council has worked hard to find a resolution to the nitrates issue and a number of mitigation schemes are now coming forward, where mitigation is being achieved by taking land out of agricultural use and putting the

			land to alternative uses including re-wilding and tree planting.
Bryan Jezeph Consultancy		<p>Framework incorrectly references the inclusion of land rear of 69 Greenaway Lane – should state 59.</p> <p>Object to criterion d (ecology corridor). This should be determined at detailed stage.</p> <p>Treed areas too extensive and not accurate. Object to criterion g protection of trees. More flexibility needed to account for poor quality specimens Green area adjacent to Lockswood Road required for Suds</p> <p>No need for footpath through whole SE corner</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree. The delivery of this connecting corridor is a fundamental component of creating a cohesive and quality neighbourhood in accordance with NPPF and Policy D1. The framework identifies corridors based on known potential. This can be refined following detailed survey, but the principle of connected corridors and retention and management of future corridors needs to be addressed at this stage.</p> <p>Criterion (g) refers to TPO trees and poor specimen trees can be identified at detailed stage. However, trees are not identified just for visual amenity but their biodiversity and climate change value and included in such areas.</p> <p>Footpath links are indicative and subject to future layout, route</p>

		Object to criterion j off-site sports provision not justified. Alternative wording to criteria suggested	<p>quality, and public open space integration.</p> <p>Disagree. Obligations SPD seeks on site provision and financial contributions off site. Contributions are for the whole allocation and a proportionate approach is appropriate for individual sites.</p>
Anne-Marie Burdfield		<p>There is no joined up “Masterplan” for HA1 with developers working in complete isolation of one another. Questions how sound the environmental impact assessments were and whether another environmental impact assessment must be conducted showing the cumulative effect of HA1 in its entirety. This is contrary to Design Policy D3 para 11.44.</p> <p>Local Plan excludes from the total numbers given those sites which have been identified as suitable for development but have not yet obtained planning permission. This would seem to make the plan unsound</p>	<p>A masterplan/framework is shown in Figure 4.1, which sets out key principles and approaches to development and which follows good design and placemaking requirements of the NPPF and National Design Guide. This Framework/masterplan is currently of limited weight but has been used to help deliver a joined up approach. Alternative approaches that meet NPPF and Development Plan policies must also be considered.</p> <p>The allocation identifies an overall indicative yield for the site based on site assessment.</p>
Coastal Partners		Whilst the site is not predicted to be at risk from a 1:200 or 1:1000 year extreme tidal flood event until at least 2115, the southwest of the	Noted.

		<p>site lies in close proximity to the scheme area of the Hook Lake Coastal Management Study, currently being undertaken by Coastal Partners on behalf of Fareham Borough Council. Due to the scale of the site and its proposed development, Coastal Partners wish to be kept informed of any progress made on the site. Access and egress for the site may also be impacted by flood risk from 2025.</p>	
Janet Cooke		<p>New accesses onto Brook Lane and Lockswood Road, as well as one additional access at Brook Lane, via 4 entry points from Greenaway Lane. The position and proximity of these access points will be a recipe for serious gridlock and accident black spots. Plan does not include an analysis of streets where the majority of the houses are proposed. Why, when there are 830 new dwellings proposed, hasn't more consideration been given to the transport assessment. With an average of 2 cars per dwelling, an additional 1660 vehicles will be on local roads and there is no reference for the mitigation required to reduce congestion by 2037.</p>	<p>The site has been assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal and Transport Assessment and it is considered that there would not be unacceptable impacts. The TA identifies the cumulative effect of traffic at strategic level. Site level assessment is undertaken as part of the planning application process.</p>
CPRE Hampshire		<p>CPRE Hampshire has significant concerns about the piecemeal development already seen, and proposed, in the Warsash area. Population growth in the 10 years 2009-2019 has reached 9% in Warsash and the western wards, while Fareham itself has only grown by 4%. As Warsash has no access to the rail network, this pattern of development could not</p>	<p>Comments noted. The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. Transport, infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP, SA/SEA and HRA.</p>



		<p>be considered sustainable. It therefore fails the soundness tests.</p> <p>An indicative framework as shown in Figure 4.1, but this does not meet the requirements for a masterplan, and it is not adequate for long-term planning to integrate the various separate sites and applications by a series of different developers. Policy HA1 will fail to meet any government aspirations for promoting a sustainable pattern of development as set out in the new July 2021 NPPF Para 11a, or for placemaking and beauty as set out in the NPPF Chapter 12, Paras 126 to 134, and is therefore unsound.</p>	<p>A masterplan/framework is shown in Figure 4.1, which sets out key principles and approaches to development and which follows good design and placemaking requirements of the NPPF and National Design Guide. This Framework/masterplan is currently of limited weight but has been used to help deliver a joined up approach. Alternative approaches that meet NPPF and Development Plan policies must also be considered.</p>
Phillip Hawkins		<p>The total of new homes put forward for specific sites across the Borough (this is not including Welborne) to 2037 is 5,946. This is an unfair and unacceptable distribution for Warsash (proposed at 1001 dwellings) to contribute 17% of the total amount, with HA1 alone contributing 14%. The Western Wards contribution is 21%.</p> <p>There is no integrated “Masterplan” for HA1, with all developers working completely independently of one another. In order to show the true impact of the cumulative effect of HA1, a further environmental impact assessment must be undertaken.</p> <p>Developers have taken advantage of the Local Planning Authorities’s (LPAs) decision to</p>	<p>The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites.</p> <p>A masterplan/framework is shown in Figure 4.1, which sets out key principles and approaches to development and which follows good design and placemaking requirements of the NPPF and National Design Guide. This</p>

		<p>propose HA1 within (the now obsolete) 2017 Plan and have submitted applications that the LPA have decided to grant permission on the Publication Plan. Others claiming their sites fit well with HA1 which has now resulted in boundaries of HA1 being adjusted to accommodate them. This seems to indicate an inappropriate power-shift toward developers</p>	<p>Framework/masterplan is currently of limited weight but has been used to help deliver a joined up approach. Alternative approaches that meet NPPF and Development Plan policies must also be considered.</p> <p>Environmental Impact Assessments relate to planning applications. Sites which are submitted to the Council for consideration as an allocation in the plan are assessed as suitable, available and achievable in the SHELAA and in line with the Development Strategy.</p>
Andrew Jackson		<p>Some housing allocations have been removed, why is HA1 singled out as an allocation and how was the Objectively Assessed Housing Need arrived at for this site?</p> <p>Developers have taken advantage of the LPA's decision to propose HA1 within (the now defunct) 2017 Plan and have submitted applications that the LPA have resolved to grant permission on (many ahead of and likely contrary to) the Publication Plan. Others claiming their sites fit well with HA1 has now resulted in the boundaries of HA1 being adjusted to accommodate them. This seems to mark an inappropriate powershift toward the Developers.</p>	<p>The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. Where evidence that sites are not suitable available or achievable has come to light or where sites have reached development stage, it is no longer allocated in the plan.</p> <p>Applications have been submitted and many approved, with appropriate boundary adjustments being made to conform with permissions.</p>

		<p>Sites identified as suitable for development but have not yet obtained planning permission are excluded from the total numbers given for HA1. This is very misleading for the public who are trying to establish the impact of this plan on their community. These errors contained in the plan confirm that it is unsound.</p> <p>The total new homes proposed for specific sites across the Borough (not including Welborne) to 2037 is 5946. It is an unfair distribution for Warsash (proposed at 1001 dwellings) to contribute 17% of this quantum, with HA1 alone contributing 14%. The Western Wards contribution is 21%.</p> <p>There is no joined up “Masterplan” for HA1 (with all developers working in complete isolation of one another). Therefore, another environmental impact assessment must be</p>	<p>The allocation identifies an overall indicative yield for the site based on site assessment.</p> <p>The distribution of housing is a product of the development strategy and the availability of suitable sites. Transport, infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP, SA/SEA and HRA. Environmental Impact Assessments relate to planning applications. Sites which are submitted to the Council for consideration as an allocation in the plan are assessed as suitable, available and achievable in the SHELAA and in line with the Development Strategy.</p> <p>A masterplan/framework is shown in Figure 4.1, which sets out key principles and approaches to</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>conducted showing the cumulative effect of HA1 in its entirety. This is contrary to Design Policy D3 para 11.44 which states “Coordination of development within and adjacent to existing settlements and as part of area wide development strategies and masterplans is vital to ensure that developments are sustainable, appropriately planned and designed”.</p>	<p>development and which follows good design and placemaking requirements of the NPPF and National Design Guide. This Framework/masterplan is currently of limited weight but has been used to help deliver a joined up approach. Alternative approaches that meet NPPF and Development Plan policies must also be considered.</p>
Hilary Megginson		<p>No joined up “Masterplan” for HA1 (with all developers working in complete isolation of one another). Therefore, another environmental impact assessment must be conducted showing the cumulative effect of HA1 in its entirety. This is contrary to Design Policy D3 para 11.44 which states “Coordination of development within and adjacent to existing settlements and as part of area wide development strategies and masterplans is vital to ensure that developments are sustainable, appropriately planned and designed”. Para 1.16: No mention is made of the 2017 unadopted draft Plan and Officers confirm it is the previous, 2015 plan which is extant. Para 4.8 Allows the LPA to consider Housing sites allocated in the previous adopted (extant) Local Plan. Yet, whilst HA1 did not feature in the extant 2015 Plan, page 38 ignores this, stating that housing</p>	<p>A masterplan/framework is shown in Figure 4.1, which sets out key principles and approaches to development and which follows good design and placemaking requirements of the NPPF and National Design Guide. This Framework/masterplan is currently of limited weight but has been used to help deliver a joined up approach. Alternative approaches that meet NPPF and Development Plan policies must also be considered.</p> <p>The local plan has been through draft stages (as in 2017) and has now reached the publication stage and therefore it is the same plan. The next stages are submission,</p>

		<p>will be provided through HA1 and other local sites.</p> <p>Developers have taken advantage of the LPA's decision to propose HA1 within (the now defunct) 2017 Plan and have submitted applications that the LPA have resolved to grant permission on (many ahead of and likely contrary to) the Publication Plan. Others claiming their sites fit well with HA1 has now resulted in the boundaries of HA1 being adjusted to accommodate them. This seems to mark an inappropriate powershift toward the Developers</p>	<p>then examination and hopefully adoption.</p> <p>Sites which are submitted to the Council for consideration as an allocation in the plan are assessed as suitable, available and achievable in the SHELAA and in line with the Development Strategy.</p>
Robert Megginson		<p>Soundness: Policy HA1 (currently Greenfield sites), is proposed to be re-designated as an urban area (via the re-definition of Settlement Boundaries ref. WW17). In the Foreword to Publication Plan: Greenfield sites are less favoured locations for development. Para 2.10 states Fareham Borough will retain its identity, valued landscapes and settlement definition and will protect its natural, built and historic assets. The proposed allocation of Policy HA1 contradicts these aspirations and those of Para 2.12 "Strategic Priorities" which strive to maximise development within the urban area and away from the wider countryside and to create places which encourage healthier lifestyles. The re-designation of the Policy HA1 to urban status</p>	<p>The strategic priorities set out that development in the urban area will be prioritised, however, there are not sufficient brownfield sites to meet the Borough's housing requirement.</p> <p>The site is not within a designated valued landscape.</p>

		<p>and the movement of the Settlement Boundary to encompass it, is a blatant and possibly, unethical, manoeuvre by stealth of the council, to suit its own planning aspiration and objectives. Publication plan</p> <p>'Foreword' focusses development in urban or edge of settlement locations, rather than greenfield sites. Strategic priority 2. States In the first instance maximise development within the urban area and away from the wider countryside, valued landscapes and spaces that contribute to settlement definition. Strategic Policy DS1 (Paras 5.6 and 3.36) deals with the need (in exceptional circumstances and where necessary and justified) for residential development in the countryside on previously developed land. Additionally, Policy HP1 calls for the efficient use of existing buildings to meet such need on a one-for one replacement dwelling basis. These conditions do not apply to HA1 and therefore it seems the "convenient" alternative was for FBC to redraw the urban boundary.</p>	
Pegasus for Bargate		<p>Considers allocation sound and supported.</p> <p>Alterations needed to wording so that it is not interpreted as precluding a primary access onto Greenaway lane, which has been agreed through an outline permission</p>	<p>Support for allocation noted.</p> <p>Policy states that primary highways access should be focussed on Brook Lane and Lockwood Road. Access to Greenaway Lane is to be 'limited'. This does not preclude a primary access unless it has an</p>

		<p>Supports principle of ped and cycle links subject to land control</p> <p>Object to limitation of 2.5 storey buildings</p> <p>Objects to lack of flexibility on protecting all TPO trees.</p> <p>Supports the deletion of the requirement for Minerals Assessment</p> <p>More flexibility on wording of financial contributions if they are not required. Object to contribution towards health as not justified.</p> <p>Object to provision of junior sports pitches. Not justified. More flexibility required for off-site financial contributions to sports pitches.</p>	<p>unacceptable impact upon the character of Greenaway Lane.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>2.5 storey considered appropriate for the site in line with the surrounding residential properties (as acknowledged by Bargate's Design and Access statement June 2017). Suitably justified increase will be considered at application stage</p> <p>Noted. Site specific proposals will need to justify removal.</p> <p>Support noted</p> <p>Criterion j) considered sufficiently flexible. Justification for contribution sought set out in the IDP.</p> <p>The need for junior sports pitches is evidenced in the Playing Pitch Strategy. The SPD would require more to be provided on site; two</p>
--	--	---	--

			junior pitches on site is considered a minimum with flexibility for financial contributions for the remainder.
Roy Roberts		Services and infrastructure improved before any housebuilding takes place.	Noted. Infrastructure and contributions will be required in line with Policy TIN4. Transport, infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP and HRA.
Hazel Russell		<p>Re-designation of HA1 as urban rather than countryside is unethical and done to suit Council's objectives.</p> <p>No new infrastructure has been planned for the area leading to negative community effects. Allocation fails to meet HP4 as the proposals for development will demonstrably have unacceptable environmental, amenity and traffic implications.</p>	<p>The strategic priorities set out that development in the urban area will be prioritised, however, there are not sufficient brownfield sites to meet the Borough's housing requirement. The site is not within a designated valued landscape.</p> <p>Noted. Infrastructure and contributions will be required in line with Policy TIN4. Transport, infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP and HRA.</p>
Southern Water		Further to our representations submitted in the December 2020 Regulation 19 consultation, we note that our comments regarding additional policy provision for this site have not been	Noted. Paragraph 11.53 (in relation to Policy D4) requires development proposals to demonstrate that there is adequate wastewater



		<p>addressed. Whilst reference is made in criterion j) of the policy to the need for development to be in line with the provisions of Policy TIN4: Infrastructure Delivery, our requirements are site specific, based on individual site assessments of local network capacity, and therefore not applicable in every case.</p> <p>We further note that policy monitoring for TIN4 will be through S106 and CIL contributions (which do not account for foul drainage) and not through the determination of planning applications (page 311). Southern Water has limited powers to prevent connections to the sewerage network, even when capacity is limited. Planning policies and subsequent conditions, therefore, play an important role in ensuring that development is coordinated with the provision of necessary infrastructure. To ensure effective monitoring of this requirement, site specific policies should seek to ensure that the timing of the delivery of housing is coordinated so that development is not occupied before the provision of the network reinforcement required to accommodate it. Without this, there may be an increased risk of foul flooding, which would be contrary to paragraph 170(e) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019), which requires planning policies to prevent new development from contributing to pollution of the environment. In this instance, proposals for</p>	<p>infrastructure and water supply capacity to serve the development or adequate provision can be made available.</p>
--	--	---	---

		824 dwellings north and south of Greenaway Lane will generate a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network in order to provide additional capacity to serve the development.	
Turley on behalf of Taylor Wimpey		Allocation is supported, concerns regarding the potential application of criterion (j) of policy HA1. Contributions towards these sports facilities were not considered necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms at the outline planning application, and therefore any attempt to apply criterion (j) of policy HA1 would not meet the tests set out in Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (As Amended) and paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).	Noted. The need for junior sports pitches is evidenced in the Playing Pitch Strategy. The SPD would require more to be provided on site; two junior pitches on site is considered a minimum with flexibility for financial contributions for the remainder.
June Ward		Very negative impact on the character of Greenaway Lane and with specific regard to safety of those not using cars in village area. I am not in agreement with a number of access points onto Brook Lane and Lockswood Road, these are, either gridlocked on occasions or used as racing circuits at quieter times.	Noted. Access onto Greenaway lane is limited to ensure that the level of traffic and associated works does not undermine its essential character.  The TA identifies traffic impact at strategic level and site level through application process.
Woolf Bond Planning for Dimmick et al		Supports allocation but considers there is scope to increase the dwellings to 850.  Policy indicates the character of Greenaway Lane should be retained but Framework Plan	Support noted. Yield is indicative based on SHELAA assessment. No evidence submitted to support 850.

		indicates this will be a significant movement corridor. It is essential this dual role is reflected.	Access onto Greenaway lane is limited to ensure that the level of traffic and associated works does not undermine its essential character.
Woolf Bond Planning on behalf of Foreman Homes		Promotion of larger allocation is welcome.	Support noted.
Russ Wright		The Revised Publication Local Plan adds new vehicular accesses to HA1 (from Brook Lane) not included in the previous version of the Local Plan. Two proposed access routes above the one furthest South on Brook Lane had been previously removed but have re-appeared in this version? I do not believe the site requires 3 vehicular access points in that short stretch of the road. Please adjust to show just the one access (opposite Thornton Avenue) which was in the previous version of the Local Plan. The introduction of the additional access points without consultation would make this Plan unsound.	<p>The indicative potential principal accesses proposed from Brook Lane, as shown in fig 4.1 remains unchanged from the previous version.</p> <p>More than one access is necessary to ensure permeability of the site; distribution of links to surrounding services and facilities; diffusion of traffic flow and to enable delivery by different developers.</p>

Representations on policy HA3 – Southampton Road			
Number of representations on policy: 2			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Hampshire County Council Property Services		Supports the inclusion of this allocation and reaffirms that HCC's land within the allocation is available and deliverable in the plan period.	Support noted.
National Grid		Notes the route of an overhead transmission line in relation to the site.	Noted.
Representations on policy HA4 – Downend Road East			
Number of representations on policy: 3			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Terence O'Rourke for Miller Homes		<p>Supports the allocation of Land east of Downend Road.</p> <p>Natural England has confirmed that no mitigation measures are required in respect of Downend SSSI because the site is on private land and will not be subject to increased recreational pressure from the development. see P/20/0912/OA. There is no requirement to provide a buffer, and to include this requirement in the policy is unjustified.</p> <p>A minerals assessment is not required. The site is within a minerals and waste consultation area because it lies close to the safeguarded site of</p>	Noted. The policy requirement for this site is based on establishing the principle of development at this location. The references made to aspects being determined through the ongoing planning application process are irrelevant in that respect and the Council feels there is sufficient flexibility within the policy to reflect these points. For example, the reference to a footbridge is worded footway or footbridge. The indicative

		<p>Warren Farm and Down End Quarry. Outline application P/20/0912/OA did not provide this information and the officer's report confirms no objection to the proposed development by Hampshire County Council Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. In any event, if there were requirements for this information, it would be covered by Hampshire County Council's Minerals and Waste Plan Framework, which forms part of the development plan. This policy requirement should be removed.</p> <p>A standalone footbridge (Part I (i)) is not required over the railway as part of the development, it is not justified and is not deliverable within land in control of the landowners.</p> <p>Outline planning application P/20/0912/OA demonstrates how acceptable pedestrian access to Downend Road can be achieved, comprising the delivery of a footway across the bridge in association with the delivery of a traffic signal improvement to the bridge. The officer's report for that application clearly sets out the position in relation to the bridge improvement.</p> <p>No objection is raised by Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority on this matter. As part of its Evidence Base the Council commissioned its own transport consultants (Mayer Brown) to consider the deliverability of the site. This considered the content of the Planning Application (P/20/0912/OA) including the footway improvement across the bridge, concluding the scheme is acceptable as proposed.</p> <p>It is noted that the indicative masterplan for the site, figure 4.3, identifies provision of sports pitches to the east of the site. Whilst we note that the master</p>	<p>Masterplan for the site is based on discussions with the promoter and provides an 'indicative' layout only.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>plan is indicative, it is misleading to suggest that sports pitch provision could be accommodated of this size and scale. Due to the topography of the site, a sports pitch in the scale as indicated on the indicative masterplan would have undesirable visual consequences, such as large retaining walls, also due to necessary levelling works only possible by filling instead of cutting due to the nationally important archaeological remains.</p> <p>As such sports pitch provision should not be shown in this scale as it is misleading to suggest such a provision could be accommodated here.</p>	
Southern Planning for Raymond Brown		<p>Questions that a site which has been refused twice at planning committee, with the first refusal being upheld at appeal can be relied upon as an allocation.</p> <p>No contact appears to have been made with National Rail regarding the narrow access over the rail bridge.</p> <p>Unclear whether highway assessment has considered site allocation HA56.</p>	<p>Disagree. The refusals to grant planning permission have been on the basis of detailed highway design points, including the bridge, which can be overcome. The highway assessment in support of the planning application doesn't take HA56 into account, the strategic transport assessment for the Local Plan however includes both sites.</p>
Veolia		<p>Objects to inclusion of HA4. Allocation borders Downend Quarry.</p> <p>HA4 (h) states that: <i>'The design of the development should take into account the close proximity to the waste transfer station with the potential for odour'</i>. this wording does not go far enough and only references odour (so for example not noise)</p> <p>The policy needs to go much further in directly referencing the <i>Agent of Change</i> principle. This needs to be referenced and explained in the local plan and preferably more formally included by way of a direct policy or policy subtext. The Agent of</p>	<p>Noted, but disagree. The emphasis of the agent of change principle is covered by criterion c) of policy D2 of the Plan which requires sites to demonstrate that future occupants would not be unacceptably adversely impacted from existing activities in the surrounding area.</p>

		Change principle could also be defined in any glossary	
<b>Representations on policy HA7 – Warsash Maritime Academy</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 4</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Coastal Partners		The western side of the site is currently located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 according to the Environment Agency's flood map for planning. It is essential that climate change is taken into consideration when assessing flood risk at the site. Currently the local plan site-specific requirements for Warsash Maritime Academy state that a 'flood risk assessment is required' and that 'development should avoid current flood zones 2 and 3'. This implies that only the existing mapped flood zones should be considered and does not leave scope for future versions or climate change. Coastal Partners would recommend a wording change to avoid any ambiguity and ensure climate change is taken into consideration.	Noted. The Local Plan SFRA assesses the current and future flood risk to this site. In addition, criteria m of the policy notes "The southern section of the site is below the threshold of 5m Above Ordnance Datum which means with predicted sea level rise this area could become at risk of future flooding from tidal sources".
Historic England		Changes made in relation to potential impact on heritage assets are welcomed. Consider policy sound.	Support noted.
Raymond Brown		Questions viability, suitability and achievability of site. Site is remote from facilities and subject to flooding and nature conservation significance.	The Council is confident in the achievability of the site within the plan period.
Turley on behalf of Solent University		Supports the proposed allocation and as site promoter confirms the site is available. Considers	Support noted. Further land promoted lies within Area of Special Landscape Quality.

		the yield should be increased to 150 dwellings as additional land is now available for inclusion.	
<b>Representations on policy HA9 – Heath Road</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 1</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Hampshire County Council Property Services		As landowner, HCC supports the allocation and reaffirms the site is available and deliverable.	Support noted.
<b>Representations on policy HA10 – Funtley Road South</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 1</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Turley for Reside Developments		Welcomes continues allocation of site for housing however site is under-allocated as higher number of dwellings can be delivered as outlined in response to the Regulation 19 consultation on the publication plan.	Noted. Policy is unchanged and points have been raised in earlier Regulation 19 consultation response.



Representations on policy HA13 – Hunts Pond Road			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Hampshire County Council Property Services		HCC as landowner supports the allocation and reaffirms it is available and deliverable.	Support noted.
Representations on policy HA17 – 69 Botley Road			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Southern Water		Local sewerage infrastructure to the site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development. There is a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network in order to provide additional capacity. It is recommended the following criterion is added to Policy "Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider."	Policy is unchanged and these points have been raised in response to the earlier regulation 19 consultation.

Representations on policy HA19 – 399-403 Hunts Pond Road			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
National Grid		Notes the route of an overhead transmission line in relation to the site.	Noted.
Representations on policy HA22 – Wynton Way			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Hampshire County Council Property Services		As landowner, HCC supports the allocation and reaffirms the site is available and deliverable.	Support noted.
Representations on policy HA24 – 335-357 Gosport Road			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Hampshire County Council Property Services		As landowner, HCC supports the allocation and reaffirms the site is available and deliverable.	Support noted.

Representations on policy HA27 – Rookery Avenue			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Foreman Homes		Support for the allocation of the site and amendments made in the revised publication plan.	Support noted.
Representations on policy HA28 – 3-33 West Street			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Coastal Partners		Flood Risk Assessment required to support any application submitted.	Noted. Flood risk assessment included as a requirement in criteria e of the policy.
Representations on policy HA31 – Hammond Industrial Estate			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Gillings for Frontier Estates		Support proposed site allocation. Request that site area is amended to 0.4ha in light of amended red line boundary.	Support Noted. Note that correct site area is 0.42ha

Representations on policy HA38 – 68 Titchfield Park Road			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
National Grid		Notes the route of an overhead transmission line in relation to the site.	Noted.
Representations on policy HA39 – Land at 51 Greenaway Lane			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
BJC Planning for Brian Edwards		<p>Policy should allow development in excess of 2 storeys as per land to south.</p> <p>Site is beneath threshold for off site contributions therefore criterion e should be removed.</p> <p>Off site improvements to existing sports facilities are not justified. Improvements should be funded through CIL.</p> <p>Allocation boundary should be amended to promoted plan.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree, threshold only applies to affordable housing provision.</p> <p>Disagree, the need for junior sports pitches is evidenced in the Playing Pitch Strategy.</p> <p>Boundary on new plan differs from that promoted.</p>

Representations on policy HA40 – Land west of Northfield Park			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Fiona Barlow		Concerned over the shared access with the crematorium. Also concerned over the impact of wildlife and the loss of greenfield.	Concerns noted. Site has a resolution to grant planning permission.
Representations on policy HA42 Land south of Cams Alders			
Number of representations on policy: 2			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Historic England		Previously identified an issue in relation to potential impact on heritage assets. Welcome the changes to the policy and no longer consider the policy to be unsound.	Welcomed.
Southern Planning for Raymond Brown		Considers that the site yield would be difficult to achieve given its layout, ecology and heritage issues.	Comments noted. We acknowledge that part of the site is on a SINCR and criterion b) requires buffer to mitigate impact and criterion c) requires the retention and strengthening of existing tree lined buffer around the perimeter of the site.  In addition, Historic England consider the allocation to be sound.

Representations on policy HA43 - Corner of Station Road			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Coastal Partners		Concern that the site is adjacent to flood zones 2 and 3 and the sites access and egress are shown to partially lie within flood zones 2 and 3. Considers that a FRA should be submitted with any planning application submitted for the site.	Discussions with the Environment Agency have since taken place and safe development is considered to be achievable onsite with appropriate mitigation and careful design.  Site has full planning permission.
Representations on policy HA44 - Assheton Court			
Number of representations on policy: 2			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Coastal Partners		Notes the site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and would expect a flood risk assessment to support any planning application.	Discussions with the Environment Agency have since taken place and safe development is considered to be achievable onsite with appropriate mitigation and careful design.
Southern Water		Concern that previous comments have not been addressed. Requirements vary on a site-by-site basis and a reference to Policy TIN4 is not applicable for every case. Considers that site specific policies should seek to ensure timing of the	Previous comments noted.  Paragraph 11.53 (in relation to Policy D4) requires development proposals to demonstrate that there is adequate

		delivery of housing is coordinated so that development is not occupied before the infrastructure required to accommodate it, concern there is a risk of foul water flooding otherwise. The proposed allocation will generate a need for the reinforcement of the wastewater network.	wastewater infrastructure and water supply capacity to serve the development or adequate provision can be made available.'
<b>Representations on policy HA45 - Rear of 77 Burrridge Road</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 4</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Graham Bell		Concern whether the family's requirement for 3 pitches meets the definition in the PPTS. The policy does not comply with other policies in the Local Plan.	Concerns noted. This policy remains unchanged.  The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current family and owners of the site at this location.
James Wood		Considers that the additional text added to para 5.89 is not a sound reason for allocating the site. Considers that there has been insufficient assessment of alternative sites.  The site does not comply with paragraph 5.94 or Policy HP11.	Concerns noted. This policy remains unchanged.  The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current family and owners of the site at this location.
Michael Edwards		Concern that the site and the location of Burrridge is not suitable to provide 3 pitches. In addition, the short term need for the site is not justified. Suggest other sites in the Borough are examined and the site is removed from the Local Plan.	Concerns noted. This policy remains unchanged.  The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current

			family and owners of the site at this location.
Vaughan Tudor-Williams		<p>Concern whether the family's requirement for 3 pitches meets the definition in the PPTS. Considers that there has been insufficient assessment of alternative sites.</p> <p>Concerns over the sustainability of the site and the impacts on the sewerage network.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. This policy remains unchanged.</p> <p>The need for 3 pitches for gypsy, travellers emanates from the current family and owners of the site at this location.</p>
<b>Representations on policy FTC7 – Land adj to Red Lion Hotel, Fareham</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 1</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Historic England		The site lies within 50m of an area of known archaeological interest. While there is no specific policy requirement in respect of this, policy HE4 is considered to offer sufficient protection to archaeology.	Noted.



Representations on policy FTC8 – 97-99 West Street, Fareham			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Historic England		The site lies within 50m of an area of known archaeological interest. While there is no specific policy requirement in respect of this, policy HE4 is considered to offer sufficient protection to archaeology.	Noted.
Representations on policy FTC9 – Portland Chambers, West Street, Fareham			
Number of representations on policy: 2			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Ian Gray		Portland Chambers is a prominent historic building, façade must be retained and access to any dwelling should be at the rear.	Noted. Historic environment policy H3 ensures the protection of the listed building in line with NPPF guidance.
Historic England		The site lies within an area of known archaeological interest. While there is no specific policy requirement in respect of this, policy HE4 is considered to offer sufficient protection to archaeology.	Noted.

Representations on policy HA46 – 12 West Street, Portchester			
Number of representations on policy: 3			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Coastal Partners		Flood Risk Assessment required to support any application submitted.	Noted. Flood risk assessment included as a requirement in criteria e of the policy.
Historic England		The site lies within an area of known archaeological interest. While there is no specific policy requirement in respect of this, policy HE4 is considered to offer sufficient protection to archaeology. The site has also been granted prior approval.	Noted.
Anne Masters		Planning is now sought for 22 dwellings rather than 8 indicated. Welcome bringing life to Portchester but concerned about effect on parking.	Noted. Site is in highly sustainable location, close to rail station and bus routes. Application for 22 dwellings relates to site allocation HA28. Issues of parking for increased numbers will be considered through the development management process.

Representations on policy HA48 – 76-80 Botley Road			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Robert Marshall, Fareham Society		Sustainable site. Policy should ensure that any future development of the site caused no harm to the living conditions of adjoining residents.	Noted. Yield is indicative based on SHELAA assessment. Development's impact on neighbouring properties will further be considered at application stage.
Representations on policy HA49 - Menin House			
Number of representations on policy: 2			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Southern Water		Southern Water has undertaken a preliminary assessment of the capacity of the existing infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for this proposal. The assessment reveals that existing local sewerage infrastructure to the site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development. Limited capacity is not a constraint to development provided that planning policy and subsequent conditions ensure that occupation of the development is phased to align	Comments noted. Paragraph 11.53 (in relation to Policy D4) requires development proposals to demonstrate that there is adequate wastewater infrastructure and water supply capacity to serve the development or adequate provision can be made available.

		with the delivery of new wastewater infrastructure. Proposals for 50 (26 net) dwellings at this site will generate a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network in order to provide additional capacity to serve the development. Connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of foul water flooding unless the requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation. We recommend the following criterion is added to Policy HA49; 'Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider.'	
The Fareham Society		Policy is supported.	Support welcomed.
<b>Representations on policy HA50 - Land north of Henry Cort Drive</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 7</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Christine Cavell		Concern over the impact of the development on the traffic and parking in the area. Concerns regarding lack of infrastructure include green space.	Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.  Criterion c) in the policy states that the proposal should provide 'replacement, improved community facilities and open space to the South of Henry Cort Drive'.
Claudia Cubbage		Concern that Henry Cort college has not been consulted on the policy.	Noted.

		<p>Concerns regarding habitat loss.</p> <p>Concern over the impact of the development on traffic.</p> <p>Suggests a recycling facility incorporated within plans.</p>	<p>Site will require detailed ecology assessment. Plan policies require a biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Councillor P Davies		<p>Impact on recreational open space in Fareham North West.</p> <p>Impact on traffic and parking.</p> <p>Concern over development density. Impact on the strategic gap</p> <p>Concern over the proximity of the site to services and facilities.</p>	<p>Noted. Criterion c) in the policy states that the proposal should provide 'replacement, improved community facilities and open space to the South of Henry Cort Drive'.</p> <p>Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.</p> <p>Any proposals will be sensitively designed and high quality in line with Policy D1 of the Local Plan. The density will depend on the types and size mix of the units that will be proposed.</p> <p>All sites have been assessed through the SHELAA, which includes accessibility to shops and services, to produce an indicative yield.</p>

D Fudge		Concern over the loss of recreational open space.	Noted Criterion c) in the policy states that the proposal should provide 'replacement, improved community facilities and open space to the South of Henry Cort Drive'.
Kate Knowlton		Concern over the loss of recreational open space.  Impact of the development on the traffic in the area.	Noted Criterion c) in the policy states that the proposal should provide 'replacement, improved community facilities and open space to the South of Henry Cort Drive'.  Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.
Suzette Clark		Concern over the impact of the development on the traffic and parking in the area. Concern over the site suitability and lack of infrastructure.	Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.
Southern Water		Southern Water has undertaken a preliminary assessment of the capacity of the existing infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for this proposal. The assessment reveals that existing local sewerage infrastructure to the site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development. Limited capacity is not a constraint to development provided that planning policy and subsequent conditions ensure that occupation of the development is phased to align with the delivery of new wastewater infrastructure. Proposals for 55 dwellings at this site will generate a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network	Comments noted. Paragraph 11.53 (in relation to Policy D4) requires development proposals to demonstrate that there is adequate wastewater infrastructure and water supply capacity to serve the development or adequate provision can be made available.

		in order to provide additional capacity to serve the development. Connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of foul water flooding unless the requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation. We recommend the following criterion is added to Policy HA50; 'Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider.	
<b>Representations on policy HA51 - Redoubt Court</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 4</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Alan Williams		Concern over the loss of open space, renders policy unsound.	Concerns noted. The allocation is subject to other policies in the plan such as Policy NE10 – Protection and Provision of Open Space.
Historic England		Considers that policy should be tightened to avoid harm to Fort Fareham from development taller than 2 storeys and suggest the following wording to be added to the policy ' <i>In order to protect the setting of Fort Fareham, development should be no more than two stories in height.</i> '	Noted. This is an issue that can be addressed at planning application stage to which strategic HE policies apply.
Mrs J Biginton		Concern over the loss of amenity open space and the impact on wildlife habitats. Also concerned over the impact on parking in the area.	Concerns noted. The allocation is subject to other policies in the plan such as Policy NE10 – Protection and Provision of Open Space.

			All sites will be subject to ecology assessment and suitable provision made for protection and enhancement. All new development will have regard to council's parking standards.
The Fareham Society		Supports the redevelopment of flats in a sustainable location. Concern over the loss of amenity open space and evidence to demonstrate the loss is acceptable.	Concerns noted. The allocation is subject to other policies in the plan such as Policy NE10 – Protection and Provision of Open Space.
<b>Representations on policy HA52 - Land west of Dore Avenue</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 14</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Adam Wells		Concern over the loss of wildlife habitat.	Noted. The allocation is subject to other policies in the plan such as Policy NE1 – Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network.
Andrew Downing		Concern over the loss of wildlife habitat. Also concerned over the access with Dore Avenue and Linden Lea.	Noted. The allocation is subject to other policies in the plan such as Policy NE1 – Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network.  Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.



Carl Rossiter		Concerns over the proximity of the allocation to the crematorium.	Noted. Any proposals will need to be sensitively designed in line with Policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan.
David Gamble		Notes the purchase and intended use of the land is currently subject to a freedom of information request. Concerned over the loss of wildlife habitat and loss of trees, which contradicts policies NE2 and NE10 of the Local Plan.	Noted. The allocation is subject to other policies in the plan such as Policy NE1 – Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network and NE6 – Trees, woodlands and hedgerows.
David Noyce		Concerns over the proximity of the allocation to the crematorium.	Noted. Any proposals will need to be sensitively designed in line with Policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan.
David Rowles		Concerns over the proximity of the allocation to the crematorium.	Noted. Any proposals will need to be sensitively designed in line with Policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan.
Fiona Barlow		Concern over the loss of wildlife habitat.	Noted. The allocation is subject to other policies in the plan such as Policy NE1 – Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network.
Ian Moncaster		Strongly objects to the housing allocation. Concerns over the road safety and access into the site. Also concerned about the impact of the allocation on overlooking and increasing light pollution. Furthermore, notes that the area is used as open space and a wildlife habitat.	Noted. Any proposals will need to be sensitively designed in line with Policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan.  The allocation is subject to other policies in the plan such as Policy NE1 – Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network, NE10 – Protection and

			<p>Provision of Open Space and D2 – Ensuring Good Environmental Conditions.</p> <p>Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.</p>
Mark Robinson		<p>Concern over the loss of open space and wildlife habitat. Also concerned over the access to the site and road safety along Dore Avenue.</p> <p>Suitability of site for accommodating development.</p> <p>Proximity of the development to Portchester Crematorium.</p>	<p>Noted. The allocation is subject to other policies in the plan such as Policy NE1 – Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network and NE10 – Protection and Provision of Open Space.</p> <p>Any proposals will need to be sensitively designed in line with Policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.</p>
Mr Goldson		<p>Concern over the loss of wildlife habitat. Also concerned over parking.</p>	<p>Noted. The allocation is subject to other policies in the plan such as Policy NE1 – Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network.</p>
Natalie Wood		<p>Concern that the allocation will set a precedent for the loss of open space.</p>	<p>Noted. The allocation is subject to other policies in the plan such as</p>

		Other reasonable alternatives should be considered such as empty homes.	Policy NE10 – Protection and Provision of Open Space.
Roger Parsley		Concerns over the proximity of the allocation to the crematorium. Concerns over the access to the site and the loss of wildlife habitat.	Noted. The allocation is subject to other policies in the plan such as Policy NE1 – Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network.
Sandra Spaid		<p>Concern over the loss of wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Impact on parking in the area and concerns over highway safety.</p> <p>Proximity of the development to Portchester Crematorium.</p>	<p>Noted. The allocation is subject to other policies in the plan such as Policy NE1 – Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network.</p> <p>Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.</p> <p>Any proposals will need to be sensitively designed in line with Policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan.</p>
Tim Sutton		<p>Concern over the loss of wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Proximity of the development to Portchester Crematorium.</p>	<p>Noted. The allocation is subject to other policies in the plan such as Policy NE1 – Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network.</p> <p>Any proposals will need to be sensitively designed in line with Policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan.</p>

Representations on policy HA54 - Land East of Crofton Cemetery			
Number of representations on policy: 38			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Allen, Sandra		Too much noise will be created from buildings and it will disrupt the countryside and the wildlife that lives there.	Policy criterion K) states that a "Construction Environmental Management Plan to avoid adverse impacts of construction on the Solent designated sites shall be provided" In addition, the allocation is subject to other policies in the plan such as D1 High Quality Design and NE1 Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network.
Berridge, Richard		Services and infrastructure will not be able to cope and should be improved.	Noted. Infrastructure and contributions will be required in line with Policy TIN4. Transport, infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP SA/SEA and HRA
Griffin, Andrew		No mention of the additional demands for playing pitch provision. A sports hub with required football/hockey/cricket/rugby to meet existing demand should be provided. The land available on the north side of this site would certainly be large enough to accommodate the demand created by these new residents and the existing residents of the village.	The land on the north side of Oakcroft Lane is to be retained and enhanced to provide Solent Wader & Brent Goose habitat mitigation in accordance with Policy NE5. As such it would not be suitable for playing pitch provision. The Playing Pitch Strategy assesses needs across the borough and

			identifies opportunities for improvement at a number of existing locations and other opportunities for new facilities. New provision in this part of the borough is likely to be in the form of a sports hub at site HA55
Andrews, Pamela		No more building in Stubbington and the strategic gap should be retained/maintained.	Noted. Policy criterion C) states that "Development shall only occur on land to the south of Oakcroft Lane" this will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements and is in accordance with the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.
Berridge, Michael		<p>No more building in Stubbington and the strategic gap should be retained/maintained.</p> <p>Development here will impact on the Gosport peninsula.</p>	<p>Noted. Noted. Policy criterion C) states that "Development shall only occur on land to the south of Oakcroft Lane" this will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements and is in accordance with the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (TA) accompanying the Local Plan assesses the impact of all development in the Local Plan</p>

			(including this allocation) on the strategic road network. The TA shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.
Dinenage, Caroline MP		The size of the development would diminish the Fareham, Gosport, Lee-on-the-Solent and Stubbington Strategic Gap and exacerbate the numerous issues residents already face with our local infrastructure. This stretch of countryside keeps communities distinct and prevents urban sprawl, whilst providing valuable green space to the local community	<p>Noted. Policy criterion C) states that “Development shall only occur on land to the south of Oakcroft Lane” this will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements as is in accordance with the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.</p> <p>Transport, infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP SA/SEA and HRA. The allocation is subject to other policies in the Plan such as NE10 Open Space, TIN4 Infrastructure Delivery etc.</p>
E, Patricia		Development will overlook and impact on the amenity of the cemetery and church.	Criterion i) requires the ‘Provision of a heritage statement (in accordance with policy HE3) that assesses the potential impact of proposals on the conservation and setting of the adjacent Grade II* and Grade II Listed Buildings’. In addition, the allocation will be subject to other policies in the plan such as D1 High Quality Design and the wider remit of HE3 Listed Buildings and Structures and/or their

			Settings. This will ensure that development is sensitively designed to protect the amenity of the cemetery and church.
Environment Agency		Pleased to see that development criteria (c) has been included to specify that development should avoid the area of flood risk and that it should be retained as open space.	Support welcomed.
Fareham Society		<p>The proposed development would be a substantial incursion into the Strategic Gap. Previous 2012 and 2017 Studies and Inspector's observations indicate that any significant incursion into the gap of the type proposed in this allocation would be harmful.</p> <p>The allocation is in an unsustainable location.</p>	<p>Noted. Policy criterion C) states that "Development shall only occur on land to the south of Oakcroft Lane" this will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements as is in accordance with the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.</p> <p>Disagree. The site has been assessed as in a sustainable location.</p>
Forrest, Jim		Impact on the strategic gap (in-combination with HA55).	Noted. Policy criterion C) states that "Development shall only occur on land to the south of Oakcroft Lane" this will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements as is in accordance with the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.

Foster, Kevin		Focus housing on brownfield sites	Noted. The Council as part of its development strategy has made every effort to focus development on brownfield sites. However, there are not enough brownfield sites to meet the housing requirement in full. Therefore, sustainable edge of settlement sites have been included as well.
Goddard, Lesley		Focus on building up (increase development storey heights) and use the land in the Strategic gap for climate mitigation.	Noted. The Council is supportive of high-density schemes in appropriate and suitable locations such as the Town Centre. Development must be sensitively designed to reflect the character of the area in accordance with Policy D1 High Quality Design. There are not enough brownfield sites to meet the housing requirement in full, so sustainable edge of settlement sites have been included as well.
Gosport Borough Council		<p>Notwithstanding comments made to previous consultations, the Council would like to place a holding objection to the allocation for the following reason: It is not yet fully understood whether the volume of traffic from the two allocations in the strategic gap (HA54 and HA55) in combination with other developments including those proposed in Gosport negate the benefits derived from the new road infrastructure in terms of alleviating acute accessibility issues to and from the Gosport Peninsula.</p> <p>The Council considers that a transport assessment which includes the cumulative impact of development in the FLP2037 and the emerging</p>	<p>TA has followed the methodology and included sites in Gosport. No significant issues are flagged and no unacceptable impacts predicted. HCC as Highways Authority have not objected to the TA or these sites.</p> <p>FBC have committed to provide GBC with further information on the specific impact of Local Plan growth in terms of flows, delays on the two bypasses.</p> <p>These issues are covered by a Statement of Common Ground with GBC.</p>



		Gosport Borough Local Plan 2038 (GBLP2038) concludes that there is no detrimental impact on the effectiveness of the road infrastructure serving the Gosport Peninsula including the Stubbington Bypass and Newgate Lane East. This work would form part of the Statement of Common Ground between the two local planning authorities.	
Gustar, Mr and Mrs		<p>Too high a housing density for the site.</p> <p>Oakcroft Lane not suitable to accommodate level of traffic.</p> <p>Southern end of the proposed development floods after heavy rain.</p> <p>Impact on existing infrastructure such as doctors and sewer systems</p>	<p>Development will be in line with Design policies within the plan which include D1 – High Quality Design and Place Making, D2 – Ensuring Good Environmental Conditions and D5 – Internal Space Standards</p> <p>Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.</p> <p>Policy criteria states that development is to be avoided within the flood risk area.</p> <p>Infrastructure and contributions will be required in line with Policy TIN4. Transport, infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP SA/SEA and HRA</p>
Hampshire County Council		Policy does not mention the requirement for cycle and walking connections to the site. It is recommended that new policy text is added to specifically refer to the requirement: for walking and cycling routes from the site to existing local shops, Fareham and Stubbington village. Furthermore, the addition of new policy text to refer to Policy TIN1	Noted. Policy TIN1 requires development to provide contributions to the delivery of identified cycle, and pedestrian and other non-road user routes and connects with existing and future public transport networks, giving priority to cycling and pedestrian non-

		sustainable transport to ensure the site can be accessed by non-car modes is recommended.	motorised user movement. In addition, the policy also requires provision of connections to the existing infrastructure, or provision of new infrastructure to enable access to public transport.
Hampshire County Council as Local Highways Authority		Require assurance that allocation will not impact local highway network and any impact can be adequately mitigated.	Support welcomed. Transport Assessment shows principal of development at this location is deliverable. In accordance with policy TIN2, there will be a site-specific transport assessment at application stage which will be shared with the LHA.
Hinton, Bob		The allocation has been subject of a planning application that was refused by the Council. The allocation should therefore be deleted.	Noted. However, the principle of development on the site is considered acceptable by the technical evidence supporting the Local Plan.
Hodgson, John		Impact on traffic.  Suggests a focus for housing on brownfield sites	Transport considerations have been taken into account in the Transport Assessment.  Noted. The Council as part of its development strategy has made every effort to focus development on brownfield sites. However, there are not enough brownfield sites to meet the housing requirement in full. Therefore, sustainable edge of settlement sites have been included as well.
John, Nicholas		Impact of development on the amenity of the cemetery and church.	Criterion i) requires the 'Provision of a heritage statement (in accordance with policy HE3) that assesses the potential impact of proposals on the

		<p>Not a sustainable location.</p> <p>Increase in traffic.</p> <p>Impact on existing infrastructure such as doctors and schools</p> <p>Impact of development on the Strategic Gap</p>	<p>conservation and setting of the adjacent Grade II* and Grade II Listed Buildings'. In addition, the allocation will be subject to other policies in the plan such as D1 High Quality Design and the wider remit of HE3 Listed Buildings and Structures and/or their Settings. This will ensure that development is sensitively designed to protect the amenity of the cemetery and church.</p> <p>Identified as suitable in SHELLA assessment</p> <p>Noted. Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.</p> <p>Noted. Infrastructure and contributions will be required in line with Policy TIN4. Transport, infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP SA/SEA and HRA.</p> <p>Noted. Policy criterion C) states that "Development shall only occur on land to the south of Oakcroft Lane" this will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements and is in accordance with the Technical Review</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>The 2020 Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and Strategic Gaps evidence supporting the Local Plan should be withdrawn. The Council should rely on the 2012 Fareham Borough Gap review as evidence to not propose development within the Strategic Gap.</p> <p>The protection against development in the Strategic Gap must clearly be defined as equal or greater than ASLQ.</p>	<p>of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.</p> <p>Disagree. The 2020 Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and Strategic Gaps provides more updated evidence than the 2012 David Hares report.</p> <p>Disagree. Strategic gap designations focus on restricting coalescence and protecting the identity of individual settlements regardless of the quality of the landscape in question. Whereas ASLQ designations are about the beauty and intrinsic value of a particular landscape area which is much more susceptible to negative impacts from development.</p>
Keyes, Jacky		<p>This development in the Strategic gap could have been avoided if the plan was extended and took in the full contribution of the Welborne development. Extend the Plan to 2045.</p>	<p>Noted. By extending the plan period as suggested, an additional 541 dwellings per annum would be required, resulting in 4,328 homes, more than the remaining Welborne contribution.</p>
Knott, R		<p>Reduce the amount of development within the Strategic Gap.</p>	<p>Noted. Policy criterion C) states that "Development shall only occur on land to the south of Oakcroft Lane" this will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements as is in accordance with the Technical Review</p>

		It is important to preserve village living and its amenities (schools, doctors, dentists, parking, play areas)	of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.  Noted.
Lethbridge, Janet		This development seeks to erode green areas surrounding Stubbington.	Noted.
Ludlam, Chris		Impact on Strategic Gap        Increase in traffic.  Impact on existing infrastructure such as doctors and schools.	Noted. Policy criterion C) states that "Development shall only occur on land to the south of Oakcroft Lane" this will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements as is in accordance with the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps. Noted. Infrastructure and contributions will be required in line with Policy TIN4. Transport, infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP SA/SEA and HRA
McIntosh, Jim		Impact on Strategic Gap	Noted. Policy criterion C) states that "Development shall only occur on land to the south of Oakcroft Lane" this will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements as is in accordance with the Technical Review

			of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.
McIntosh, Sandie		<p>Impact on Strategic Gap.</p> <p>Increase in traffic.</p> <p>Impact on existing infrastructure such as doctors and schools.</p>	<p>Noted. Policy criterion C) states that “Development shall only occur on land to the south of Oakcroft Lane” this will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements as is in accordance with the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.</p> <p>Noted. Infrastructure and contributions will be required in line with Policy TIN4. Transport, infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP SA/SEA and HRA.</p>
Morgan, Linda		Impact on Strategic Gap	<p>Noted. Policy criterion C) states that “Development shall only occur on land to the south of Oakcroft Lane” this will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements as is in accordance with the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.</p>

		The allocation has been subject of a planning application that was refused by the Council. The allocation should therefore be deleted.	Noted. However, the principle of development on the site is supported by the technical evidence that supports the plan.
Morgan, Nicholas		<p>Impact on Strategic Gap</p> <p>Increase in traffic.</p> <p>Impact on existing infrastructure such as doctors and schools.</p>	<p>Noted. Policy criterion C) states that “Development shall only occur on land to the south of Oakcroft Lane” this will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements as is in accordance with the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.</p> <p>Noted. Infrastructure and contributions will be required in line with Policy TIN4. Transport, infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP SA/SEA and HRA</p>
Murray, Kenneth		Impact on Strategic Gap.	Noted. Policy criterion C) states that “Development shall only occur on land to the south of Oakcroft Lane” this will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements as is in accordance with the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.





		<p>Impact on existing infrastructure such as doctors and schools.</p> <p>Redevelopment of Fareham town centre would be more appropriate.</p>	<p>Development of allocation will be subject to other policies in the Plan such as NE1 Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network and Policy NE2 Biodiversity Net Gain.</p> <p>Noted. Infrastructure and contributions will be required in line with Policy TIN4. Transport, infrastructure considerations have been taken into account in the TA, and IDP.</p> <p>The Council is proposing to allocate up to 620 homes at Fareham Town Centre.</p>
Roughton-Bentley, John		The map for Stubbington does not include No's 16A and 17 Lychgate Green in the settlement boundary as previously requested.	Noted. Comment included under Settlement Boundary document.
Pegasus Group (Bargate Homes)		This allocation is not deliverable based on the strong objections made against it and there has already been two refusals of planning permission. The allocation in combination with HA55 is contrary to Policy DS2 in that the two developments combined are likely to harmfully affect the integrity of the Strategic Gap.	Disagree. The Council's evidence base demonstrates allocation is deliverable. Furthermore, Policy criterion C) states that "Development shall only occur on land to the south of Oakcroft Lane" this will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements as is in accordance with the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.

		<p>The Council's decision to refuse permission for 206 dwellings on the site (P/20/0522/FP, refused 17 February 2021). Two of the Council's ten reasons for refusal were:</p> <p><i>"ii) The development of the site would result in an adverse visual effect on the immediate countryside setting around the site.</i></p> <p><i>iii) The introduction of dwellings in this location would fail to respond positively to and be respectful of the key characteristics of the area, in this countryside, edge of settlement location, providing limited green infrastructure and offering a lack of interconnected green/public spaces."</i></p> <p>It is not clear how a reduction in the yield of this site from 206 dwellings to 180 dwellings could overcome these reasons for refusal as the quantum of development is similar. "Adverse visual effects" are still likely to result, compounding the significant harm to the integrity of the Strategic Gap which will result from the development of the HA55 allocation.</p>	<p>Reason iii relates to the current Local Plan policy position concerning development in the countryside. The Council considers the site suitable in principle for development and is therefore proposed as a housing allocation in the submitted plan. The additional reasons for refusal were primarily on design grounds, and the resultant impacts on character and setting. the Council considers that a lower yield and different design will address the design concerns.</p> <p>Noted. a reduction of 25+ dwellings together with an appropriate design response will make a significant difference to the quality of development.</p>
Pegasus Group (Miller Homes)		<p>The allocation in combination with HA55 is contrary to Policy DS2 in that the two developments combined are likely to harmfully affect the integrity of the Strategic Gap.</p>	<p>Policy criterion C) states that "Development shall only occur on land to the south of Oakcroft Lane" . HA55 limits development to only part of the allocation and will be subject to an agreed council led masterplan and design code. The council considers that in combination this will protect the integrity of the strategic gap , maintaining an appropriate visual,physical and experiential</p>

		<p>The Council's decision to refuse permission for 206 dwellings on the site (P/20/0522/FP, refused 17 February 2021). Two of the Council's ten reasons for refusal were:</p> <p><i>"ii) The development of the site would result in an adverse visual effect on the immediate countryside setting around the site.</i></p> <p><i>iii) The introduction of dwellings in this location would fail to respond positively to and be respectful of the key characteristics of the area, in this countryside, edge of settlement location, providing limited green infrastructure and offering a lack of interconnected green/public spaces."</i></p> <p>It is not clear how a reduction in the yield of this site from 206 dwellings to 180 dwellings could overcome these reasons for refusal as the quantum of development is similar. "Adverse visual effects" are still likely to result, compounding the significant harm to the integrity of the Strategic Gap which will result from the development of the HA55 allocation.</p>	<p>separation of the surrounding settlements and their distinctive nature in accordance with the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.</p> <p>Reason iii relates to the current Local Plan policy position concerning development in the countryside. The Council considers the site suitable in principle for development and is therefore proposed as a housing allocation in the submitted plan. The additional reasons for refusal were primarily on design grounds, and the resultant impacts on character and setting. the Council considers that a lower yield and different design will address the design concerns.</p> <p>Noted. a reduction of 25+ dwellings together with an appropriate design response will make a significant difference to the quality of development.</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>Persimmon Homes</p>		<p>Support in principle for allocation however it is considered that the policy as written, is not sound.</p> <p>Site is capable of delivering 206 new homes. The net density applied by the Council bares little relationship to the character and prevailing density of the surrounding area and has not had regard to the detailed technical work undertaken and submitted by PHSC as part of the 2020 application / appeal proposals. The 180 dwelling capacity is not justified by evidence.</p> <p>It is clear that the site forms a vital component of the Council's housing land supply both in terms of the five year supply and the Local Plan supply across the plan period more generally. Therefore, the Council should not be seeking to unnecessarily (and without adequate justification) limit the capacity of the site to 180 homes. This is at odds with requirement in the NPPF to positively plan for development, including meeting the housing needs of the Borough and the extensive unmet needs of neighbouring LPAs</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>The site at Oakcroft is developable if proposals are sensitively designed and prepared in line with the allocation policy outlined in the Revised Publication Local Plan. The allocation seeks to ensure that any development occurs at a scale, massing and layout which is sensitive to features of the area. The application which was refused did not meet these requirements, with the number of homes proposed significantly higher, and the proposed development failing to respond positively to the key characteristics of the area. A proposal which is prepared in line with the policy will provide much needed homes in the area along with appropriate infrastructure provision, as well as wildlife habitat mitigation, open space and a network of footpaths.</p> <p>The site does not form part of the Council's current housing land supply. As an allocation in the Local Plan, it may form part of the five year supply depending on the speed of delivery but of course, a 5YHLS would be achieved on adoption of the Local Plan. This point seems to relate more to the current situation, applications and appeal.</p>
------------------------	--	---	---

		<p>Persimmon has provided its anticipated delivery trajectory for the HA54 site (based on a 208 site capacity). It is suggested that the Planning Status section of the HA54 Policy should make reference to the live appeal.</p> <p>Support for the southern part of the site (south of Oakcroft Lane) being removed from the Strategic Gap designation.</p> <p>Considers policy criterion c) stating <i>that areas at risk of flooding now and in the future must be avoided</i> repeats policy provisions that are found elsewhere in the Plan and thus should be deleted.</p> <p>Criterion f) (building heights), it is considered that the requirements of this element of the policy could be adequately addressed through the application of Policy D1: Design and should be deleted. Should the Council seek to retain Criterion f), the maximum building height should be two storey with accommodation in the roof (i.e. 2.5 storeys).</p> <p>Criterion k) (Construction Environmental Management Plan to support a planning application), it is Persimmon's view that this requirement would be better set out in an updated Local List (or a separate policy in the draft Plan).</p>	<p>Support welcomed</p> <p>Criterion are added to policy to ensure applicants are fully aware of the main requirements and issues affecting the site. Whilst this may look like duplication, it is important to communicate to developers, landowners and residents about the type of development coming forward.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The Council's assessment of the site's context indicates that 2 storeys is an appropriate scale. Adding rooms in the roof will need to be justified at application stage Noted. The local list will be updated following adoption of the Local Plan.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Criterion i), it is Persimmon view that this policy provision is addressed through other Local Plan policies, national planning policy and legislation (notably the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended)). It is also considered that it is not necessary for the Criterion i) to specify what new provision and/or contributions should be sought from the development.</p> <p>The NPPF requires Local Plans to avoid unnecessary duplication of policies. In order for the Plan to be consistent with national policy (and therefore meets NPPF soundness test), the following criteria should be deleted from HA54, d), e), g), h), i) and j).</p> <p>Land to the north of Oakcroft Lane (that forms part of Persimmon's HA54 site) is identified on the Framework Plan as part of the Longfield Avenue proposal. Persimmon has had no discussions with the Council (or the promotor of the HA55 site) on this matter. It is therefore surprising and concerning that the Council has identified Persimmon controlled land on the Framework Plan for HA55. The deliverability of HA55 is questioned if it requires land under the control of Persimmon Homes. To avoid any confusion for reader of the Plan, this land should not be shown as shaded green on the HA55 Framework Plan.</p>	<p>Criterion are added to policy to ensure applicants are fully aware of the main requirements and issues affecting the site. Whilst this may look like duplication, it is important to communicate to developers, landowners and residents about the type of development coming forward.</p> <p>The land is not part of the framework plan, i.e. it is outside of the allocation boundary. The land to the north of Oakcroft lane has been included to demonstrate the amount of green infrastructure forthcoming within the Strategic gap. This reason was communicated to Persimmon during the consultation period.</p>
--	--	--	--

		It should be noted that as part of the Oakcroft Land appeal proposal, Persimmon Homes submitted a site specific 'shadow' HRA which conclude that with appropriate mitigation there would be no adverse impact on site integrity either alone or in-combination with other plans or projects on the Solent designated sites.	Noted
RSPB		Policy must include reference to the Low Use site F17D in the site allocation map and consideration towards the impacts of the site allocation upon Low Use site F17D within the SWBGS. The Local Plan cannot be considered sound until the classification of the site is noted for policy HA54, alongside mitigation as recommended by SWBGS for the loss of the Low Use Site; this is in addition to the mitigation proposed for the Secondary Support Site (F17C).	Disagree. Policy Criterion d) recognises the impact of development to the SWBG network (which includes site F17D) and states the requirement for "Land to the north of Oakcroft Lane shall be retained and enhanced to provide Solent Wader & Brent Goose habitat mitigation in accordance with Policy NE5." This mitigation is in accordance with the SWBGS.
Smith, Nigel		Impact on Strategic Gap	Policy criterion C) states that "Development shall only occur on land to the south of Oakcroft Lane" this will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements as is in accordance with the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.
Tooley, Ed		Impact on Strategic Gap  Increase in traffic.	Policy criterion C) states that "Development shall only occur on land to the south of Oakcroft Lane" this will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual

			<p>separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements as is in accordance with the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.</p> <p>Transport Assessment shows the principle of development at this location is acceptable.</p>
Webb, Barrie		Allocation will not promote the use of walking and cycling. Routes identified in draft LCWIP do not have the potential to accommodate a modal shift to non-motorised transport from the allocation.	Disagree. Allocation will be subject to policies in the Plan such as TIN1 which promotes and requires provision for sustainable and active travel modes.
White, Aimee		Impact of development on the amenity of the cemetery and church.	Criterion i) requires the 'Provision of a heritage statement (in accordance with policy HE3) that assesses the potential impact of proposals on the conservation and setting of the adjacent Grade II* and Grade II Listed Buildings'. In addition, the allocation will be subject to other policies in the plan such as D1 High Quality Design and the wider remit of HE3 Listed Buildings and Structures and/or their Settings. This will ensure that development is sensitively designed to protect the amenity of the cemetery and church.



## Representations on policy HA55 – Land south of Longfield Avenue

Number of representations on policy:

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Mike Ablett		Object to infill on Stubbington Strategic Gap. Concerns regarding infrastructure including schools, transport and waste. Loss of identity for Stubbington.	<p>Noted. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Criteria B states “The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings”</p> <p>Appropriate infrastructure considered through Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and suitable on-site provision and financial contributions towards off-site infrastructure provision will be sought.</p>
Sandra Allen		Infrastructure is not in place. Concerns regarding air pollution.	<p>Noted. Appropriate infrastructure considered through Infrastructure Delivery Plan and suitable on-site provision and financial contributions towards off-site infrastructure provision will be sought. New development will be required to comply with Local Plan policy NE8 – Air Quality.</p>

Michael Archer		<p>Smaller sites scattered across the borough will spread the burden of infrastructure. Concerns of loss of Strategic Gap.</p>	<p>Noted. Local Plan includes a number of small sites but the quantity of small sites available will not meet the Borough's housing need. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements. Smaller sites scattered across the borough actually increase burden on infrastructure as they do not present the critical mass to provide new infrastructure, but their cumulative impact is significant.</p> <p>Criteria B states "The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings"</p> <p>Appropriate infrastructure considered through IDP and suitable on-site provision and financial contributions towards off-site infrastructure provision will be sought.</p>
Gordon Ash		<p>Concern regarding the impact of development on air quality, and efficient flow of traffic on Stubbington Bypass.</p> <p>Concerns regarding increased traffic accidents.</p> <p>Concerns regarding loss of wildlife habitat and hedgerows.</p> <p>Concerns development will increase nitrate pollution in the Solent</p>	<p>Noted. New development will be required to comply with Local Plan policy NE8 – Air Quality. No access is proposed for the development onto the Bypass as detailed on the masterplan. The design of the bypass includes future growth so site will not impede flows. The Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable and any application will be subject to localised assessment at planning application stage. Development would be required to be in line with TIN2: Highway Safety and Road Network. Highway safety audits will be undertaken as part of any planning application.</p>

			<p>Site will be developed in accordance with a masterplan which will provide environmental mitigation and seeks to incorporate existing ecological features. Development will be required to comply with Policy NE6 – Trees, woodland and hedgerows. Development will only be permitted where it can be ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the designated sites in the Solent in accordance with policy NE4 – Water Quality Effects on the SPAs, SACs and Ramsar sites of the Solent.</p>
Peter Backllog		<p>Concern regarding loss of Strategic Gap  Concerns regarding increased traffic  Concerns regarding lack of infrastructure including roads and doctors  Concerns regarding air pollution  Council should resist Government pressure on housing  Welborne should be accelerated</p>	<p>Noted. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Criteria B states “The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings”</p> <p>The Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable and any application will be subject to localised assessment at planning application stage.  Appropriate infrastructure considered through Infrastructure Delivery Plan and suitable on-site provision and financial contributions to off site infrastructure will be sought.  New development will be required to comply with Local Plan policy NE8 – Air Quality.</p>

			<p>Without a Local Plan which allocates sufficient sites, the Borough would be unable to defend against hostile, unsustainable development.</p> <p>The Council are continuing to work with developers to progress Welborne.</p>
Michael Berridge		<p>Concerned about loss of Strategic Gap.</p> <p>Building in this area will have an adverse effect on Gosport residents as A32 will become worse.</p> <p>Fareham should challenge Government regarding housing numbers.</p>	<p>Noted. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Criteria B states “The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings”</p> <p>Appropriate infrastructure considered through Infrastructure Delivery Plan and suitable on-site provision and financial contributions towards off-site infrastructure will be sought.</p> <p>The Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable and any application will be subject to localised assessment at planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council have repeatedly campaigned to Government regarding housing numbers (as detailed in the Housing Delivery Test Action Plan). However, the Council must continue to progress the Local Plan.</p>
Vittorio Boccolini		<p>Concerned about increased traffic and air quality</p>	<p>Noted. The Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable and any application will be subject to localised assessment at planning application stage.</p>

			<p>Appropriate infrastructure considered through Infrastructure Delivery Plan and suitable on-site provision and financial contributions to off-site infrastructure will be sought.</p> <p>New development will be required to comply with Local Plan policy NE8 – Air Quality.</p>
Nick Carter		<p>Concerned that promises were made that if Welborne was approved no housing would be built in the Strategic Gap. Roads will be unable to cope with increased traffic.</p>	<p>Noted. The additional housing requirement imposed by Government has meant that additional housing sites have had to be identified.</p> <p>The Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable and any application will be subject to localised assessment at planning application stage.</p> <p>Appropriate infrastructure considered through Infrastructure Delivery Plan and suitable on-site provision and financial contributions to off-site infrastructure will be sought.</p>
Pamela Charlwood		<p>Questions how large number of dwellings can be provided with a reasonable quality of living for residents. Site encroaches on Strategic Gap. Unclear what other sites were considered. Development will add to congestion</p>	<p>Development will be in line with Design policies within the plan which include D1 – High Quality Design and Place Making, D2 – Ensuring Good Environmental Conditions and D5 – Internal Space Standards. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements. All sites submitted for consideration for Local Plan housing allocations are assessed through the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Assessment (SHELAA). The Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable and any application will be subject to localised assessment at planning application stage.</p> <p>Appropriate infrastructure considered through Infrastructure Delivery Plan and suitable on-site</p>

			provision and financial contributions to off-site infrastructure will be sought.
David Cockshoot		<p>The boundary of the developable area has not been fixed and could therefore be subject to encroachment into green infrastructure. Areas should be defined in meters.</p> <p>Concerns regarding increased volume of traffic. Supports the retention of mature trees and hedges and the pathway around the site.</p>	<p>Noted. The Technical Review states that development could be accommodated in the area but without providing a definitive new boundary. Therefore, keeping the land within the SG allows the policy to guide the development of the masterplan to ensure visual and physical separation of settlements in line with the policy.</p> <p>The Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements whilst delivering new housing at a suitable density.</p> <p>The Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable and any application will be subject to localised assessment at planning application stage.</p> <p>Appropriate infrastructure considered through Infrastructure Delivery Plan and suitable on-site provision and financial contributions to off-site infrastructure will be sought.</p> <p>Support welcomed.</p>
Ruth Cole		<p>Strategic Gap should not be developed. Development should instead be located in the countryside to the north of Fareham.</p>	<p>Noted. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Criteria B states “The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings”</p>

			The Welborne development to the north of Fareham will also be taking place.
Edwin Cooke		Strategic Gap should not be developed. MOD sites in the surrounding areas should be used.	<p>Noted. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Criteria B states “The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings”</p> <p>Sites can only be considered which are within the Borough and have been promoted for development. However, there are many former MOD sites in neighbouring authorities which are being considered for housing to meet the housing requirements of those authorities in question.</p>
CPRE		<p>Development will diminish the form and function of the Strategic Gap. Likely to have detrimental impact upon the ecological network.</p> <p>Fareham’s housing numbers should not include 900 homes from Portsmouth. Removal of their added need would weaken the justification for this site.</p> <p>Site is not in a sustainable location due to distance from railway station.</p> <p>Indicative framework does not meet the requirements for a masterplan.</p> <p>Site will fail to meet NPPF aspirations of sustainable pattern of development or for placemaking and beauty.</p>	<p>Noted. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Criteria B states “The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings”</p>

		<p>Para 127 of the NPPF states “Design policies should be developed with local communities, so they reflect local aspirations, and are grounded in an understanding and evaluation of each area’s defining characteristics.”</p>	<p>Local authorities have a duty to cooperate with neighbours particularly over strategic issues such as the provision of housing. The Council has agreed to help its neighbours by contributing to sub-regional unmet need. This approach has been agreed with through the statement of common ground with PfSH and shows to the inspector that the Council has done all it can to contribute to meeting unmet need. The site is considered a sustainable location being adjacent to the existing settlement boundary, adjacent to local public transport routes and local services and facilities.</p> <p>A council-led masterplan and design code will be developed as set out in criteria a.</p> <p>The design policies of the local plan have been developed through the Local Plan preparation process and subject to a number of public consultations.</p>
Mr & Mrs Cross		<p>Urban sprawl creating gridlock, this site will add more pressure, 1250 houses is too many.</p> <p>Loss of vital green space will harm wildlife and deny locals of space important to mental health &amp; general welfare.</p> <p>Increased flood risk due to run off from urbanisation.</p> <p>Development will create large carbon footprint.</p>	<p>Noted. Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements. Masterplan will provide environmental mitigation, seek to incorporate existing ecological features and provide access to additional greenspaces.</p> <p>Development will be required to comply with policy CC2 – Managing Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems which requires development to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems.</p> <p>The Local Plan seeks to address issues of Climate Change through policies including NE2 – Biodiversity Net Gain and NE8 – Air Quality.</p>
Marie Cummings		<p>1250 new homes would be detrimental to the area.</p> <p>Will result in the loss of countryside.</p>	<p>Noted. Masterplan will provide environmental mitigation, seek to incorporate existing ecological</p>



		Additional Transport will result in impact on health. No mention of facilities such as doctors, dentists, care homes and nurseries. Unsustainable.	features, maximise open landscapes and provide access to additional greenspaces. Policy includes requirement for infrastructure provision and financial contributions towards health, education, transport and care home. Infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP SA/SEA and HRA. Site is sustainably located with public transport and access to services.
Defence Infrastructure Organisation		Do not object in principle however have concerns regarding location of development in relation to security of operational MOD site (HMS Collingwood). Concerns regarding the impact of noise and light from HMS Collingwood. Indicative framework plan shows residential development adjacent to the western boundary of HMS Collingwood. MOD would welcome the opportunity to work with the Local Planning Authority and the Developers to ensure these impacts are mitigated. Concerns regarding the increased traffic impact on HMS Collingwood – request that the transport impacts of the proposed development on HMS Collingwood are included in the site-specific Transport Assessment.	Noted. The Council would welcome working with the MOD in the preparation of the masterplan to address the points raised. Site will also need to be planned and developed in accordance with Policy D2: Ensuring Good Environmental Conditions.
Caroline Dinenage MP		Consider 1250 homes will exacerbate pressures on local infrastructure. Development will negate works to road infrastructure. Impact on getting in and out of Gosport. Will diminish strategic gap and valuable green space.	Noted. Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable. No access is proposed for the development onto the Bypass as detailed on the masterplan. The design of the bypass included headroom for future growth so the scheme will not negate the bypass. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements. Masterplan will provide environmental mitigation, seek to incorporate

			existing ecological features and provide access to additional greenspaces.
Stephen Dugan		<p>Concerned that strategic gap will significantly decrease in size.</p> <p>Impact of traffic on Longfield Avenue and Stubbington Bypass.</p> <p>Believe Hampshire Highway assessments are flawed.</p> <p>Unfortunate that Government have changed methodology to meet stated building target rather than actual housing need.</p>	<p>Noted. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Transport Assessment is an approved tried and tested approach which shows principle of development at this location is acceptable. Localised highway impacts will be assessed through the site specific transport assessment at the planning application stage. The Council have repeatedly campaigned to Government regarding housing numbers (as detailed in the Housing Delivery Test Action Plan)</p>
Jim Forrest		<p>Green infrastructure includes a high proportion of parkland, play space and sports facilities, not countryside. Loss of sense of separation from Strategic Gap particularly when considered with HA54. At odds with Local Plan aspirations for “conservation and enhancement of natural and historic landscapes and assets”.</p>	<p>Noted. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Masterplan will provide environmental mitigation, seek to incorporate existing ecological features. The Local Plan includes developments outside of settlements in order to meet the borough’s housing need.</p>
Kevin Foster		<p>Development will destroy Strategic Gap.</p> <p>Development should be on brownfield sites, not greenfield.</p>	<p>Noted. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Masterplan will provide environmental mitigation, seek to incorporate existing ecological features.</p> <p>Criteria B states “The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure</p>

			acceptable noise levels within dwellings” Local Plan allocates a number of brownfield sites for housing however there are insufficient sites to meet the Borough’s need.
Mandy Frost		Concerned about increased traffic and impact on wildlife. Increase in population will raise crime rate. Policy only refers to a school, no infrastructure such as doctor surgery. Development will cause further parking problems for residents of Longfield Avenue.	Noted. Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable. Site will be developed in accordance with a masterplan which will provide environmental mitigation and seeks to incorporate existing ecological features. Criteria j includes reference to health and a local centre. Infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP, SA/SEA and HRA. Localised highway impacts will be assessed and mitigated through site specific transport assessment at planning application stage.
Andrew Gardner		Development of 1250 homes will cause congestion on Longfield Avenue, local roads will be unable to cope. Increased air pollution and noise. Trees along Longfield Avenue should be retained. A park which can be accessed by the new development and existing Bishopsfield Road estate should be provided. Concerned about sufficient school places above primary.	Noted. Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable. Local Plan policy NE8 – Air Quality requires development to minimise emissions and contribute to the improvement of local air quality. Masterplan will seek to incorporate existing ecological features and policy NE6 – Trees, Woodland and hedgerows seeks to avoid the unnecessary loss of non-protected trees. Infrastructure contributions will be required towards education as detailed in criteria j. Infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP, SA/SEA and HRA.
Jane Gardner		Development of 1250 homes will cause congestion on Longfield Avenue, local roads will be unable to cope. Increased air pollution and noise. Trees along Longfield Avenue should be retained.	Noted. Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable. Local Plan policy NE8 – Air Quality requires development to minimise emissions and contribute to the improvement of local air quality.

		<p>A park which can be accessed by the new development and existing Bishopsfield Road estate should be provided.</p> <p>Concerned about sufficient school places above primary.</p>	<p>Masterplan will seek to incorporate existing ecological features and policy NE6 – Trees, Woodland and hedgerows seeks to avoid the unnecessary loss of non-protected trees.</p> <p>Infrastructure contributions will be required towards education as detailed in criteria j. Infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP, SA/SEA and HRA.</p>
Lesley Goddard		<p>Objects to loss of the Strategic Gap. Development in Fareham should increase building heights rather than building on green space. Use town centre to build attractive blocks.</p>	<p>Noted. Local Plan allocations seek to maximise the development whilst also ensuring they are in keeping with their surrounding areas.</p> <p>Criteria B states “The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings”</p> <p>Fareham Town Centre has been identified as a broad location for housing growth later in the plan period.</p>
Gosport Borough Council		<p>Notwithstanding comments made to previous consultations, the Council would like to place a holding objection to the allocation for the following reason: It is not yet fully understood whether the volume of traffic from the two allocations in the strategic gap (HA54 and HA55) in combination with other developments including those proposed in Gosport negate the benefits derived from the new road infrastructure in terms of alleviating acute accessibility issues to and from the Gosport Peninsula.</p> <p>The Council considers that a transport assessment which includes the cumulative impact of development in the FLP2037 and the emerging Gosport Borough</p>	<p>The Strategic Transport Assessment has followed the standard methodology (agreed with the highway authority) and includes higher housing numbers for these sites than are in the Plan. It also includes an element of growth in Gosport including adopted Local Plan and tempo growth projections. No significant issues are flagged and no unacceptable impacts predicted. The Highways Authority is comfortable with the conclusions for these two sites.</p> <p>FBC have committed to provide GBC with further information on the specific impact of Local Plan growth in terms of flows on the two bypasses.</p>

		Local Plan 2038 (GBLP2038) concludes that there is no detrimental impact on the effectiveness of the road infrastructure serving the Gosport Peninsula including the Stubbington Bypass and Newgate Lane East. This work would form part of the Statement of Common Ground between the two local planning authorities.	These issues are covered by a Statement of Common Ground with GBC.
Ian Gray		Fareham Council should prevent development and retain the “lung” between Fareham & Stubbington	<p>Noted. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Criteria B states “The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings”</p>
Colin Grice		<p>Development will create backlogs at major pinch-points on the traffic network.</p> <p>Doctor surgeries will not be able to cope.</p> <p>Need the arable land for crops.</p> <p>Protect the Strategic Gap</p>	<p>Noted. Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Policy includes requirement for infrastructure provision and financial contributions towards new health, education, transport and care home infrastructure. Infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP, SA/SEA and HRA.</p> <p>The Borough would not be able to meet its identified housing and needs on brownfield land, and for this reason, the allocation of residential development on</p>

			agricultural land in this Plan has been necessary to meet the identified housing need.
Hallam Land		<p>Hallam supports:  Site is a legitimate and necessary part of the housing land supply strategy.  Site allocation aligns with the Local Plan strategy to achieve Good Growth.  The location of the site enables active travel.  Technical review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and Strategic Gap identifies that the development would not have a significant impact on the objectives of the Strategic Gap.  Evidenced by the SA, the site would deliver positive social and economic benefits.  SA &amp; HRA acknowledge mitigation measures will be achieved either by scheme elements or Local Plan policies.  Site has been assessed as nitrate nutrient negative and can therefore enable additional capacity within the borough's nutrient budget.  Development could lead to adverse effect on breeding and overwintering birds. Policy proposes sufficient habitat mitigation. HRA conclusion that the allocation as a whole is not likely to cause significant effects on European designated sites.</p> <p>Hallam suggested changes:  Criterion A - Agree that development proposals should be based on a masterplan, consider this should be a collaborative exercise rather than Council led.</p>	<p>Noted. Support welcomed.</p> <p>The masterplanning is Council led to ensure key components of the site, such as the width of the remaining strategic gap, can be controlled to ensure that development is acceptable. However, it is a collaborative process with all interested parties.</p>

		<p>SPD is not necessary as collaborative masterplan with appropriate engagement can achieve the same outcome.</p> <p>Disagree with the phrase “in accordance with the HA55 Strategic Land Use Framework Plan” as it gives statutory weight to the illustrative plan. The masterplanning process should develop the illustrative framework plan.</p> <p>Agree a site wide Design Code would be appropriate to guide future detailed development proposals, not necessary to require the level of detail suggested by Stage 3A of the National Model Design Code prior to submission of outline planning application. Design coding will need to adapt over the timespan of the site’s build out.</p> <p>Criterion B - The boundary of the Strategic Gap should be redrawn at Tanners Lane. Propose alternative wording.</p> <p>Criterion C – Agree with the concept of focussing development east of Peak Lane, in addition to environmental mitigation, land west of Peak Lane could also provide recreational and educational opportunity. Propose alternative wording.</p> <p>Criterion D – Agree development should prioritise walking &amp; cycling. Should also provide easy access to public transport. Propose alternative wording.</p> <p>Criterion E – Agree.</p>	<p>Noted. the Council will consider the most appropriate format in due course.</p> <p>The council notes the identified suggested changes to the criterion advocated by the respondent. The council considers that the current policy and requirements are appropriate, necessary, and suitable. However, while the Council disagrees with many of the detailed points in this representation, we are committed to work with the promoters in a collaborative manner to ensure the delivery of a high quality new neighbourhood for Fareham.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Criterion F – Agree. Scale of development proposed is sufficient to deliver dedicated transport coverage. Criteria overlaps with Criteria C. New wording proposed.</p> <p>Criterion G – Agree, there is overlap between criteria B, C &amp; G. Propose alternative wording.</p> <p>Criterion J – Agree a new primary school and local centre is required. Proposed allocation can make land available for sports hub, delivery mechanism will need to be discussed. More flexible approach required to care/specialist housing. Specific criteria should be added for 3% self &amp; custom build for this site as increased housing requirement has not been reflected in self &amp; custom build evidence.</p>	
Hampshire County Council as Local Highways Authority		<p>Supports policy criteria e – no access onto Stubbington Bypass.</p> <p>Require assurance that allocation will not impact local highway network and any impact can be adequately mitigated.</p>	<p>Support welcomed. Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable. In accordance with policy TIN2, there will be a site-specific transport assessment at the application stage which will be submitted to the LHA. The LHA has been engaged throughout the process on the STA and supporting technical note.</p>
Julie Harding		<p>Location of development makes sense but number of homes is too high. Severe impact on traffic. Should avoid edge of town areas and make the Strategic Gap ad ASLQ. Government should review housing numbers in light of people moving to the north due to working from home flexibility.</p>	<p>Noted. Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable. Development in urban area is preferred however not enough sites to meet the borough's housing need. Edge of settlement provides links to existing infrastructure and is more sustainable than isolated sites.</p> <p>The Council have repeatedly campaigned to Government regarding housing numbers (as detailed in the Housing Delivery Test Action Plan).</p>



Tim Haynes		Allocation undermines integrity of the Strategic Gap. Site is contrary to evidence base. Site does not have strategy compliant solution to Brent Geese and Wader designations.	Noted. Development in the Strategic Gap is justified by the Technical Review. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements. Bird mitigation will be brought forward in accordance with BG&W guidance with substantial on site provision required through criterion h of the policy. Any proposals will be accompanied by a mitigation management and monitoring plan.
Historic England		Parts of the site lie within an area of known archaeological interest. While there is no specific policy requirement in respect of this, policy HE4 is considered to offer sufficient protection to archaeology.	Noted.
Nigel Hoggett		Plan is unsound as it does not demonstrate why the Council have gone against residents' views.	Disagree. All consultation responses are read, considered and responded to in the statement of consultation. Residents' views are one of several inputs that needed to be balanced in the development of the Local Plan, such as governments housing requirements and the position of stakeholders and infrastructure providers.
Fiona Holt		Object to the number of homes as will swamp local area and amenities. Development will negate benefits of Stubbington Bypass. Area is often subject to flooding	Noted. The development will bring additional infrastructure as outlined in criteria j. Infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP, SA/SEA and HRA. Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable. There will be no direct access onto the Stubbington Bypass from the development. Bypass was also designed with headroom for future growth. Development will be required to comply with policy CC2 – Managing Flood Risk and Sustainable

			Drainage Systems which requires development to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems.
Sarah Jamieson		Object to development in the Strategic Gap.	<p>Noted. Development in the Strategic Gap is justified by the Technical Review. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Criteria B states “The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings”</p>
Nicholas John		Plan is unsound. Existing Fareham/Stubbington Gap is vital to prevent settlement coalescence. Evidence presented to support this allocation is contrary to previous review of the Strategic Gap. Previous evidence to support the gap as it stands was submitted by the council and found sound at examination.	Disagree. Development in the Strategic Gap is justified by the Technical Review. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements. Given the housing need, the Council has had to look again at areas outside the existing urban areas.
Jacky Keys		SA & SEA states this site would have a detrimental impact on the Strategic Gap. Council must comply with the SA & SEA.	<p>The SA &amp; SEA was assessing a larger extent than that proposed for residential development in the revised plan. The SA stated that areas of the site are likely to be developable if appropriately master planned.</p> <p>Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p>

Lee Residents Association		<p>Proposed development is not in line with policy CS22 of the FBC adopted Local Plan. (Also, Strategic Policy DS2 in the 2037 proposed plan)</p> <p>Detrimental impact on the road network compounded by the Solent Economic Zone and any other developments within the Strategic Gap or to the south.</p> <p>Development will unavoidably aggravate traffic congestion levels in Air Quality Management Zone.</p> <p>That the proposed development P/20/0646/OA, is not in line with Fareham's adopted Local Plan and the revised Local Plan 2037.</p>	<p>Noted. The revised plan has been prepared to replace the Core Strategy and is not required to comply with the previously adopted plan but needs to be found sound in its own right. The need to look for sites outside of settlements is justified by the housing need. The proposed allocations are justified by the Technical Review.</p> <p>The Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.</p> <p>Localised highway impacts will be assessed through the site specific transport assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The planning application does not form part of the revised plan.</p>
Janet Lethbridge		<p>Against this development, it reduces green space. Concerned about the flexibility of the development area.</p>	<p>Noted. The Technical Review states that development could be accommodated in the area but without providing a definitive new boundary. Therefore, keeping the land within the SG allows the policy to inform the development of the masterplan to ensure visual and physical separation of settlements in line with the policy.</p> <p>The Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p>
Robert Marshall for Fareham Society		<p>Concerned regarding development in the Strategic Gap. Evidence presented to support this allocation is contrary to previous review of the Strategic Gap. 2020 study notes that establishing a GI framework is recommended, no indication that this has been undertaken.</p> <p>Some advantages to allocating large site as can absorb large proportion of Borough's need and site has good accessibility rating.</p> <p>Absence of evidence of site selection.</p>	<p>Noted. The Technical Review states that development could be accommodated in the area but without providing a definitive new boundary. Therefore, keeping the land within the SG allows the policy to inform the development of the masterplan to ensure visual and physical separation of settlements in line with the policy.</p> <p>The Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic</p>

		<p>Additional year-round screening from Longfield Avenue and Peak Lane required.</p> <p>Concerned about the flexibility of the development area.</p> <p>Play space and sports hub should be included in developable area.</p>	<p>gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Site selection in accordance with evidence set out in the SHELAA and the development strategy.</p> <p>The design of the scheme, including screening and landscaping, will be subject to all other policies in the Plan, particularly D1: High Quality Design and Place Making. The flexible development edge is considered essential at this stage to allow for the detail of land take and densities through the design and masterplanning work, but the Council Led approach will ensure that the development edge retains the balance between development need and extent and feel of the gap. Open nature of Sports hub and pitches is considered a use compatible with the purposes of the strategic gap, which is to prevent settlement coalescence.</p>
Janet Matthews		<p>Concerned about the impact of this development on infrastructure and wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of settlement separation.</p> <p>Loss of arable farmland.</p> <p>Welborne should be enough.</p>	<p>Noted. Policy includes requirement for infrastructure provision and financial contributions towards health, education, transport and care home. Infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP, SA/SEA and HRA.</p> <p>Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements. Masterplan will provide environmental mitigation, seek to incorporate existing ecological features and provide access to additional greenspaces.</p> <p>The Borough would not be able to meet its identified housing and needs on brownfield land, and for this reason, the allocation of residential development on agricultural land in this Plan has been necessary to meet the identified housing need.</p>

			The additional housing requirement imposed by Government has meant that additional housing sites have had to be identified.
Jim McIntosh		Impact on Strategic Gap	<p>Noted. The Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.in accordance with the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.</p> <p>Criteria B states “The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings”</p>
Sandie McIntosh		<p>Impact on Strategic Gap. Increase in traffic.</p> <p>Impact on existing infrastructure such as doctors and schools.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.in accordance with the Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps.</p> <p>Criteria B states “The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings”</p>

			<p>Policy includes requirement for infrastructure provision and financial contributions towards health, education, transport and care home.</p> <p>Infrastructure and environmental considerations have been taken into account in the TA, IDP, SA/SEA and HRA.</p>
George Millener		<p>Welborne and brownfield sites should be enough housing.</p> <p>Development will cause additional traffic on over-crowded roads.</p>	<p>Noted. The Borough would not be able to meet its identified housing and needs on brownfield land alone, and for this reason, the allocation of residential development on agricultural land in this Plan has been necessary to meet the identified housing need.</p> <p>The additional housing requirement imposed by Government has meant that additional housing sites have had to be identified.</p> <p>Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.</p>
David Mugford		<p>Fareham Today shows development extending to the bypass but the plan only shows a smaller portion. A green corridor should be retained.</p>	<p>The Fareham Today does not show any of the detail, only the site extent. The Local Plan document provides the detail. The plan protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p> <p>The development provides publicly accessible and managed green infrastructure throughout the site as illustrated on the framework plan.</p>
Robert Murphy		<p>Edge of settlement is contrary to government policy. Council should increase densities in urban areas.</p> <p>Allocation is contrary to existing strategic gap policy.</p> <p>Focus development on town centre brownfield sites.</p>	<p>Noted. Development in urban areas is preferred however not enough sites to meet the borough's housing need. Edge of settlement provides links to existing infrastructure and is more sustainable than isolated sites.</p> <p>Development in the Strategic Gap is justified by the Technical Review. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p>

			Local Plan allocates a number of brownfield sites for housing however there are insufficient sites to meet the Borough's need.
Paul Needham		Concern of loss of Strategic Gap. FBC always asserted the strategic gap would remain, preventing coalescence of settlements. Development will impact on traffic and air quality. Loss of Countryside means loss of wildlife habitat.	Noted. Development in urban areas is preferred however not enough sites to meet the borough's housing need. Edge of settlement provides links to existing infrastructure and is more sustainable than isolated sites. Development in the Strategic Gap is justified by the Technical Review. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements. Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable. New development will be required to comply with Local Plan policy NE8 – Air Quality. Site will be developed in accordance with a masterplan which will provide environmental mitigation and seeks to incorporate existing ecological features.
Oliver Martin		Allocation in Strategic Gap is not sound as it contravenes previous policy, which was judged to be sound - and stated there would be no building in the strategic gap. The proposal is further unsound as it is contrary to the wishes of people who live in the area bordered by the Strategic Gap. Further, the proposal puts the vast majority of new builds in one area, which does not have any representation on the Planning Committee.	Disagree. The revised plan has been prepared to replace the Core Strategy and is not required to comply with the previously adopted plan but needs to be found sound in its own right. The need to look for sites outside of settlements is justified by the housing need. The proposed allocations are justified by the Technical Review. The Local Plan allocated sites in sustainable locations across the borough. Members of the planning committee represent the interests of all wards.
Alan Parrott		Unsound due to impact on an already overcrowded area.	Disagree. Development in the Strategic Gap is justified by the Technical Review. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual

			separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements. Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable. Policy requires substantial on-site infrastructure as well as financial contributions to off-site infrastructure.
Pegasus Group for Bargate Homes		The allocation in combination with HA54 is contrary to Policy DS2 in that the two developments combined are likely to harmfully affect the integrity of the Strategic Gap. Allocation Contradicts Technical Review.	Disagree. Development in the Strategic Gap is justified by the Technical Review. The Technical Review states that development could be accommodated in the area but without providing a definitive new boundary. Therefore, keeping the land within the Strategic Gap allows the policy to inform the development of the masterplan to ensure visual and physical separation of settlements in line with the policy.
Pegasus for Hammond Miller and Bargate		The allocation in combination with HA54 is contrary to Policy DS2 in that the two developments combined are likely to harmfully affect the integrity of the Strategic Gap. Allocation contradicts Technical Review.	Disagree. Development in the Strategic Gap is justified by the Technical Review. The Technical Review states that development could be accommodated in the area but without providing a definitive new boundary. Therefore, keeping the land within the Strategic Gap allows the policy to inform the development of the masterplan to ensure visual and physical separation of settlements in line with the policy.
Tara Potter		The council has reneged on the agreement it made in December 2019. The strategic gap must be maintained and it is unreasonable (and unnecessary) to build 1250 houses in this area. The roads could not cope with such an increase in traffic. The housing will significantly transform the area from a rural feel to a suburban feel.	Noted. The additional housing requirement imposed by Government has meant that additional housing sites have had to be identified. Development in the Strategic Gap is justified by the Technical Review. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements. Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.
Raymond Brown		Allocation in contrary to council's own policy. Current planning application is subject to a number of objections.	Disagree. Development in the Strategic Gap is justified by the Technical Review. The Technical Review states that development could be accommodated in the area



			<p>but without providing a definitive new boundary. Therefore, keeping the land within the Strategic Gap allows the policy to inform that development of the masterplan to ensure visual and physical separation of settlements in line with the policy.</p> <p>Planning application objections have been considered in the development of the site allocation policy requirements. Objections to the Local Plan have been considered through the preparation of Statements of Common Ground.</p>
Pamela Rigg		<p>Against the construction of this site altogether. We continue to soil seal despite knowing this to be utterly wrong - for us now and more importantly for the future of our children. We need to review what we need to be legally compliant with and with that goes co-operation. Again, for the future of everyone.</p>	<p>Noted. The additional housing requirement imposed by Government has meant that additional housing sites have had to be identified.</p> <p>The Borough would not be able to meet its identified housing and needs on brownfield land, and for this reason, the allocation of residential development on agricultural land in this Plan has been necessary to meet the identified housing need.</p>
Shelley Rose		<p>Insufficient primary school provision, no provision for additional medical facilities or care home.</p> <p>Insufficient road infrastructure leading to air pollution, noise and accidents.</p> <p>Development does not consider resident's health and welfare.</p>	<p>Disagree. Allocation includes education proposals as discussed with Hampshire County Council as education authority including a new primary school and financial contributions to off-site secondary school provision.</p> <p>Criteria j includes a requirement for health and transport provision or financial contributions and an extra care scheme. Contributions will be spent by service providers in line with their priorities.</p> <p>Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.</p> <p>Local Plan evidence base includes health background paper.</p>
Robert Seymour		<p>Unsustainable number of dwellings.</p> <p>Loss of natural environment.</p> <p>Not enough green space.</p> <p>Insufficient infrastructure.</p>	<p>Noted. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p>

		Impact on mental health.	Masterplan will provide environmental mitigation, seek to incorporate existing ecological features. Development will be required to comply with Policy NE6 – Trees, woodland and hedgerows. Criteria j ensures infrastructure provision and financial contributions including but not limited to health, education and infrastructure. Development will result in an increase in accessible green space.
Colin Skinner		Object to the development. Too much traffic congestion. Development will negate the benefits of the Stubbington Bypass. Likely to be flood risk. Additional load at Peel Common sewerage works.	Noted. Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable. Allocation will have no direct access to Stubbington Bypass. Bypass was designed with capacity headroom for future growth. Allocation will be required to comply with policy CC2 – Managing Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems. Southern Water have been consulted in relation to the local plan and the allocation.
Nigel Smith		Insufficient consideration has been given to the need to maintain the strategic gap between Fareham and Stubbington. It is an important source of recreation and nature. It is not an appropriate area for further creeping development. Insufficient attention has been given to the strong local views.	Noted. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements. Masterplan will provide environmental mitigation, seek to incorporate existing ecological features. All consultation responses are read, considered and responded to in the statement of consultation. Local views are one of several factors to be considered in developing the Plan.
Malcom Stevens		Development will block countryside views. Traffic levels will increase. Increased air pollution. Concerns regarding human and animal welfare	Noted. People/property do not have a right to a view. Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable. New development will be required to comply with Local Plan policy NE8 – Air Quality.

			<p>Local Plan evidence base includes health background paper.</p> <p>Masterplan will provide environmental mitigation, seek to incorporate existing ecological features.</p> <p>Criteria B states “The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings”</p>
John Stone		<p>Increased traffic concerns</p> <p>Air pollution</p> <p>No consideration to quality of life.</p>	<p>Noted. Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable. New development will be required to comply with Local Plan policy NE8 – Air Quality.</p> <p>Local Plan evidence base includes health background paper.</p>
Gareth Titheridge		<p>Insufficient infrastructure to cope.</p> <p>Services are overburdened</p> <p>Impact on character of area.</p> <p>Impact on parking and highway safety</p> <p>Traffic increases and noise levels.</p> <p>Flood risk concerns</p> <p>Concerned for impact on wildlife.</p>	<p>Noted. Criteria j ensures infrastructure provision and financial contributions including but not limited to health, education and infrastructure.</p> <p>Local Plan consultation includes specific consultees including police, fire and NHS.</p> <p>Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.</p> <p>Allocation will be required to comply with policy CC2 – Managing Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems.</p> <p>Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements. Masterplan will provide environmental mitigation, seek to incorporate existing ecological features.</p>
Ed Tooley		Object to proposals	Noted. Council led masterplan will ensure that a

		<p>Concerns regarding impact on Strategic Gap Increase in traffic. Noise</p>	<p>scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements. Masterplan will provide environmental mitigation, seek to incorporate existing ecological features.</p> <p>Criteria B states “The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings”</p> <p>Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.</p>
Tracey Viney		<p>Development removes Strategic Gap. Contrary to DS2. Fareham Today not fit for purpose as consultation document. Insufficient consultation Bird mitigation will not be suitable/sufficient. Development will reduce space for exercise and loss of open space will impact well-being.</p>	<p>Disagree. Criteria B states “The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings”</p> <p>Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Fareham Today Magazine is not the consultation document, it is an information leaflet to direct people towards the consultation. The Revised Local Plan is the document which is subject to consultation. The Local Plan has been subject to 5 rounds of consultation.</p>

			<p>Bird mitigation will be brought forward in accordance with BG&amp;W guidance. Any proposals will be accompanied by a mitigation management and monitoring plan. Criterion h of the allocation policy sets the requirements for mitigation land.</p> <p>Development will provide new sports hub and provide additional green space.</p>
Barrie Webb		<p>Development will not be able to comply with promoting walking and cycling as routes identified in the LCWIP do not have the potential to accommodate a modal shift. No data to assess the effectiveness of walking and cycling schemes across the borough. Question validity of transport modelling and assumption scheme will lead to a reduction in traffic levels.</p>	<p>Disagree. Computer modelling is the accepted basis for the evidence and is conducted in a manner that meets all industry standards and assumptions. Policy TIN1, TIN2 and TIN3 set the policy framework for the Highway Authority and the Council to place requirements on developers that focus on modal shift and sustainable alternatives to highway capacity.</p>
Jane Wedick		<p>Separation of Fareham &amp; Gosport is essential. Needs a green corridor.</p>	<p>Noted. Criteria B states “The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings”</p> <p>Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements. Green infrastructure shall be provided throughout the site.</p>
Aimee White		<p>Building should take place on brownfield sites such as Daedalus rather than greenfield.</p>	<p>Noted. Daedalus is a valued sub-regionally important employment site as detailed in Employment policies E2 and E3.</p> <p>The Borough would not be able to meet its identified housing and needs on brownfield land, and for this reason, the allocation of residential development on</p>

			greenfield land in this Plan has been necessary to meet the identified housing need.
Shirley Wilkinson		Area is crowded and congested. Environmental and traffic concerns about development in the Strategic Gap.	<p>Noted. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements. Masterplan will provide environmental mitigation, seek to incorporate existing ecological features. Criteria B states "The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings"</p> <p>Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.</p>
Alan Williams		Allocation made in response to planning application. Should be made on the basis of sound planning policy.	<p>Allocation is in accordance with development strategy. The need to look for sites outside of settlements is justified by the housing need. The proposed allocation is justified by the Technical Review. The Strategic Transport Assessment shows principle of development at this location is acceptable.</p>
Andrew Wilson		The land is in the Strategic Gap which should remain undeveloped.	<p>Noted. Development in the Strategic Gap is justified by the Technical Review. Council led masterplan will ensure that a scheme is delivered which protects the integrity of the strategic gap and maintains a visual separation and distinctive nature of the surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Criteria B states "The built form, its location and arrangement will maximise the open nature of the existing landscape between the settlements of Fareham and Stubbington, limiting the effect on the</p>

			integrity of the Strategic Gap in line with DS2 through appropriate design including the absence of visually intrusive physical barriers and structures to ensure acceptable noise levels within dwellings"
<b>Representations on policy HA56 Land west of Downend Road</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 35</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Southern Water	HA56	Assessment reveals that existing local sewerage infrastructure to the site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development. Proposals for 550 dwellings will generate a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network in order to provide additional capacity to serve the development.	Noted. The Policy refers to TIN4 which in turn relates to the IDP that sets out requirements for infrastructure provision.
Vittorio Boccolini	HA56	Area already heavily congested in peak times (motorway exit and Delme). Allocation will only increase traffic and air pollution. Proposed link is insufficient.	Proposed network changes and additions will ensure that the site does not create any additional congestion and will potentially improve the current situation at Delme roundabout. Modelling, using industry standard assumptions evidence this.
Anne Brierly	HA56	Disappointed that HA56 has been included after being told it was no longer being progressed. Area suffers significant congestion and there is no room for a bypass like in other parts of the Borough. Proposed link road will just become another rat run and will add to existing congestion.	HA56 is included in the Plan as the government housing requirement increased and the Council was forced to include additional sites. Existing highways situation is acknowledged but proposed scheme in principle relieves pressure on existing congestion points and allows a freer

			movement of traffic around the Portchester/Downend area.
Michael Clayforth-Carr	HA56	550 homes will have a profound and dramatic effect on all residents who live in the area. Plan is not sound by claiming that 'current traffic levels and waiting times would actually reduce as a result of traffic being redistributed locally'.	Disagree. The modelling undertaken in support of the allocation uses approved highway authority operated model and shows how the link road would impact the highway network in a positive way. This has been independently verified.
R Coffin	HA56	550 is excessive for the location. Rail bridge is inadequate for additional traffic. Additional traffic would also add to congestion on A27 and add to air pollution in the area.	Proposed network changes and additions will ensure that the site does not create any additional congestion and will potentially improve the current situation at Delme roundabout. Modelling, using industry standard assumptions, evidences this.
Patricia Cope	HA56	Area marked as 'school' is in the location of an old quarry and will require thorough investigation to assess suitability.	Noted. Assessment of ground conditions and design would be conducted through the planning application process.
Barry Cullen	HA56	Local Plan defies all logic by suggesting that the current traffic levels would actually reduce as a result of traffic being redistributed locally. Modelling is unreliable and refuted by experiences of residents and councillors alike.	Disagree. The proposals alter how traffic would use Downend Road and access the motorway and impact on Delme roundabout. Link road provides benefits in that regard. Modelling is the accepted basis for the evidence and is conducted in a manner that meets all industry standards and assumptions.
Shaun Cunningham	HA56	Site has been included yet the public is informed they are not allowed to make any comment as to why it is included in the Plan. Important information with regard to on-site access for example can't be commented on.	Disagree. HA56 as a new policy was subject to the consultation and many responses were received on the policy. Issues like detailed access arrangements, however, are not normally part of a Local Plan consultation, which establishes the



			principle of development, and the site would be subject to the planning application process.
Graham Durrant	HA56	There are many studies into the severe ill-effects of living close to high voltage power cables. How can council say it is 'sound' to build houses and a school so close to power lines?	Noted. Any regulatory requirements for building close to overhead power lines will inform the design and layout of the scheme when proposed through a planning application. However, the presence of the power line is not an absolute constraint to development at this location. The framework plan ensures development areas are not located beneath the high voltage power lines.
D Fudge	HA56	Reiterating impact that 900 houses will have on existing residences with extra cars and lack of supporting infrastructure. Claim that current traffic levels and waiting times would be reduced is nonsense and laughable.	Disagree. The proposals alter how traffic would use Downend Road and access the motorway and impact on Delme roundabout. Link road provides benefits in that regard. Modelling is the accepted basis for the evidence and is conducted in a manner that meets all industry standards and assumptions. Policy includes requirements for supporting infrastructure.
Mark Gibbard	HA56	Plan is unsound as it will surely result in more people being injured or killed on Downend Road.	Note the concern over safety and traffic accidents, however all proposals are subject to road safety audits and assessments. The proposals alter how traffic would use Downend Road and access the motorway and impact on Delme roundabout. Link road provides benefits in that regard. Modelling is the accepted basis for the evidence and is conducted in a manner that meets all industry standards and assumptions.

Lesley Goddard	HA56	Another greenfield site being built on. Need to build up not out – so build over car parks.	Noted. The Local Plan development strategy focuses as much development as is appropriate on Fareham Town Centre and in existing settlements before looking at edge of settlement sites.
Iris Grist	HA56	Both Downend East and West are on Portsdown Hill and should be removed from the Plan. Plan says there are no allocations on the Hill.	Disagree. Whilst the two sites are located on the lower slope of Portsdown Hill, the ASLQ incorporates the slopes north of the motorway. There is a clear visual differentiation between the two areas and so the two allocation sites are considered appropriate for inclusion, whilst all land north of the M27 is included within the ASLQ.
Arthur Hackney	HA56	Development of the greenspace either side of the Motorway Approach Road (A27) will cause character and appearance damage, especially on the western side of the road – which would intrude substantially into the lower slopes of Portsdown Hill. This is at odds with the Local Plan vision.	Disagree. Whilst the site is located on the lower slope of Portsdown Hill, the designated ASLQ incorporates the slopes north of the motorway only in this location. There is a clear visual differentiation between the two areas and so the two allocation sites are considered appropriate for inclusion, whilst all land north of the M27 is included within the ASLQ.
Hampshire County Council (as Local Highway Authority)	HA56	The LHA recommends that HA56j policy text needs to include the following additional text: <i>off-site highway improvement works and contributions to the A27 transport corridor for walking, cycling and public transport schemes.</i>	Noted. Criterion j already includes requirements for off-site highway improvement and mitigation works
Alan Hawkins	HA56	Bewildering how a survey has suggested that 900 units will alleviate traffic problems in the area. The magic link road will actually provide an excellent rat	The proposals alter how traffic would use Downend Road and access the motorway and impact on Delme roundabout. Link road provides for

		run to Downend Road for motorway traffic heading for Portchester.	benefits in that regard. The link road is what takes pressure off Delme and Cams Hill approach. Modelling is the accepted basis for the evidence and is conducted in a manner that meets all industry standards and assumptions.
Richard Healey	HA56	Though the map implies vehicle access at both ends, the June 2021 Downend Sites Highway Review document states that the traffic modelling assumes all vehicular access is from Downend Road. The plan and evidence are therefore inconsistent. This matters a great deal to the feasibility of the HA56 Policy.	Disagree. The reference in the document referred to is in regard to the strategic transport assessment produced for the Local Plan. The independent review also analysed the modelling undertaken by the site promoter (using the same model) which has access at both ends of the link road.
Highways England	HA56	In agreement that it appears that the impacts of the Land West of Downend West site allocation on M27 Junction 11 (and the nearby Delme Roundabout) can be successfully mitigated so that the safe and efficient operation of the SRN is not compromised. This conclusion should be formally confirmed through the provision of a site-specific Transport Assessment.	Noted.
Mark Hoddinott	HA56	New proposed link road is only described at a high level. Existing roads are already subject to considerable congestion. Neither the plan nor the supporting documents offer a convincing explanation that the new link road will not introduce additional congestion and safety concerns.	Noted. However, the Local Plan and supporting evidence are required to demonstrate that the principle of development at this location is achievable and deliverable and any impacts can be mitigated. The detail of any highway designs, as well as site layouts etc. would be determined through the planning application process. At that stage a more detailed and localised site specific transport assessment would be required.

Alan Knobel	HA56	There is mention of road and traffic improvements which would mean this development would not impact traffic, but no detail on this. Plan provides no explanation of how existing problems can be overcome.	Noted. However, the Local Plan and supporting evidence are required to demonstrate that the principle of development at this location is achievable and deliverable and any impacts can be mitigated. The detail of any highway designs, as well as site layouts etc. would be determined through the planning application process. At that stage a more detailed and localised site specific transport assessment would be required.
Trevor Ling	HA56	Raised question over how robust the transport model is at the local level as there is no comprehensive list of assumptions used or sensitivity analysis provided. There is not enough detail.	Noted. However, the Local Plan and supporting evidence are required to demonstrate that the principle of development at this location is acceptable and any impacts can be mitigated. The detail of any highway designs, as well as site layouts etc. would be determined through the planning application process. At that stage a more detailed and localised site specific transport assessment would be required.
Alexander Marshall	HA56	The Plan and supporting evidence do not include the transport modelling used to determine the mitigation of impacts so unable to comment on its validity. Concern that the plan on page 151 shows unidirectional access into site.	Noted. The transport modelling which has determined the impact on existing traffic flows is not part of the evidence base as this is part of the land promoters base of work. However, Council commissioned a review of that modelling contained within the 'Highway Technical Support for Local Plan - Downend Sites' document which concludes with the findings. Proposed access to site would be two way at

			both eastern and western end of link road.
Robert Marshall for Fareham Society	HA56	Landscape impact of this allocation would be significant and harmful and access arrangements raise considerable concerns including unidirectional access into site as shown on framework plan and problems arising from queue traffic leading to stacking back to the motorway. Site is also not a sustainable location.	Disagree. Whilst the site is located on the lower slope of Portsdown Hill, the designated ASLQ incorporates the slopes north of the motorway only in this location. There is a clear visual differentiation between the two areas and so the two allocation sites are considered appropriate for inclusion, whilst all land north of the M27 is included within the ASLQ. The Local Plan and supporting evidence are required to demonstrate that the principle of development at this location is achievable and deliverable and any impacts can be mitigated. The detail of any highway designs, as well as site layouts etc. would be determined through the planning application process. At that stage a more detailed and localised site specific transport assessment would be required. Proposed access to site would be two way at both eastern and western end of link road.
Terrence O'Rourke for Miller Homes	HA56	Supports the allocation but evidence suggests site can deliver 650 homes not 550. Policy should retain flexibility on numbers and reference to Framework Plan should be removed because of concerns over locational elements.	Noted but disagree. The Framework Plan has been informed by work with the developer and is considered appropriate on that basis. The 550 is considered the indicative capacity for the site based on suitable dwelling density and land take requirements.
Portsmouth City Council	HA56	Notes and welcomes the inclusion of the site. Site is well located in principle for helping to	Noted and support welcomed. However, no specific sites in the Plan

		accommodate Portsmouth's unmet need given its proximity to the city and new and planned transport links.	have been allocated specifically for unmet need. The contribution to unmet need forms part of the housing requirement, and the supply of sites meets that requirement.
Christopher Prowse	HA56	The highway link through the site will provide an ideal 'rat run' for traffic and there is no evidence in the documentation that there has been any consideration given to this issue. The proposed highway link can only increase the volume of through traffic.	The proposals alter how traffic would use Downend Road and access the motorway and impact on Delme roundabout. Link road provides for benefits in that regard. The 'rat run', link road, is what takes pressure off Delme and Cams Hill approach. Computer modelling is the accepted basis for the evidence and is conducted in a manner that meets all industry standards and assumptions.
Southern Planning Practice for Raymond Brown	HA56	Site was previously considered and discounted largely due to access issues and impact on landscape. Arrangements for access are not thoroughly explained and open, expansive character of landscape will make it difficult to integrate.	Whilst the site is located on the lower slope of Portsdown Hill, the designated ASLQ incorporates the slopes north of the motorway only in this location. There is a clear visual differentiation between the two areas and so the allocation site is considered appropriate for inclusion. The Local Plan and supporting evidence are required to demonstrate that the principle of development at this location is achievable and deliverable and any impacts can be mitigated. The detail of any highway designs, as well as site layouts etc. would be determined through the planning application process. At that stage a more detailed and localised

			site specific transport assessment would be required.
Kevin Saunders	HA56	Additional 550 homes on top of 350 at appeal will only make traffic situation considerably worse. Proposals for signals will make matters worse for all. Link road will become a rat run. Need to learn from mistakes and poor traffic planning with a more detailed traffic assessment required.	The proposals alter how traffic would use Downend Road and access the motorway and impact on Delme roundabout. Link road provides for benefits in that regard. The 'rat run' is what takes pressure off Delme and Cams Hill approach. The detail of any highway designs, as well as site layouts etc. would be determined through the planning application process. At that stage a more detailed and localised site specific transport assessment would be required.
Cllr Katrina Trott	HA56	New access arrangements on A27 motorway approach road will add to congestion on A27. Question over validity of highway modelling.	Noted but disagree. The proposals alter how traffic would use Downend Road and access the motorway and impact on Delme roundabout. Link road provides for benefits in that regard and takes pressure off Delme and Cams Hill approach. Modelling is the accepted basis for the evidence and is conducted in a manner that meets all industry standards and assumptions.
Barrie Webb	HA56	Development will not be able to comply with promoting walking and cycling as routes identified in the LCWIP do not have the potential to accommodate a modal shift. No data to assess the effectiveness of walking and cycling schemes across the borough. Question validity of transport modelling and assumption scheme will lead to a reduction in traffic levels.	Disagree. Modelling is the accepted basis for the evidence and is conducted in a manner that meets all industry standards and assumptions. Policy TIN1, TIN2 and TIN3 set the policy framework for the Highway Authority and the Council to place requirements on developers that focus

			on modal shift and sustainable alternatives to highway capacity.
Malcom Webster	HA56	Proposed housing schemes will generate significantly more traffic, how will proposed scheme possibly reduce levels. Question validity of transport modelling and assumptions that scheme will lead to a reduction in traffic levels.	The proposals alter how traffic would use Downend Road and access the motorway and impact on Delme roundabout. Link road provides for benefits in that regard and takes pressure off Delme and Cams Hill approach. Computer modelling is the accepted basis for the evidence and is conducted in a manner that meets all industry standards and assumptions.
Audrey Welsh	HA56	No safe way for school children to cross the railway to go to school. Virtual footpath is not enough. Concern over archaeological interests and loss of open space.	Noted. The policy and framework plan seek to establish the principle of development at this location including the nature of supporting infrastructure required. The specifics of site layouts will be determined through the planning application process. Road crossings and footpaths will also be part of that process. The policy identifies the need for pedestrian priority safe crossings.
Anthony Wilde	HA56	Protest the Plan and question validity of transport modelling and assumptions that scheme will lead to a reduction in traffic levels. Congestion will increase air pollution. Integrated transport policy is required to remove some of the vehicles from the road.	The proposals alter how traffic would use Downend Road and access the motorway and impact on Delme roundabout. Link road provides for benefits in that regard and takes pressure off Delme and Cams Hill approach. Modelling is the accepted basis for the evidence and is conducted in a manner that meets all industry standards and assumptions. The policy includes requirements for sustainable transport initiatives which



			is supported by the policy hook in TIN2.
Edward Wynn	HA56	Question validity of transport modelling and assumptions that scheme will lead to a reduction in traffic levels.	The proposals alter how traffic would use Downend Road and access the motorway and impact on Delme roundabout. Link road provides for benefits in that regard and takes pressure off Delme and Cams Hill approach. Modelling is the accepted basis for the evidence and is conducted in a manner that meets all industry standards and assumptions.
<b>Representations on policy BL1</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 18</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Southern Planning Practice for Raymond Brown	BL1	Allocation is too vague. It is impossible to deduce how the number has been derived at. No evidence that suitability, availability and achievability of the site has been assessed.	Disagree. The NPPF (para 68) allows the Local Plan to identify broad locations for growth for years 11-15 of the plan. PPG states that for these sites plan-makers will need to demonstrate that there is a reasonable prospect that they are likely to come forward within the timescale envisaged. Council has committed to deliver SPD to secure delivery.
Southern Water	BL1	Existing local sewerage infrastructure has limited capacity. This is not a constraint provided that policy and conditions ensure that occupation of the development is phased to align with the delivery of	Noted. Council has committed to producing a supplementary planning document which will include requirements to meet infrastructure

		new wastewater infrastructure. This development will generate a need for reinforcement of the network. Request inclusion of criterion in line with other allocation policies.	needs. Nature of 'allocation' differs slightly from others so strict criterion aren't necessary.
Vittorio Boccolini	BL1	Lack of identified infrastructure for town centre sites for schools, pollution and GPs but especially traffic where 620 new homes will bring an additional 1,000 cars.	Disagree. Town centre site is considered most sustainable location possible with access to train station, bus routes and services which will reduce the need to travel in line with highway authority aspirations.
Peter Boyle	BL1	Cannot work out how 655 more homes in Fareham Town Centre is feasible. No details on future of car park or Fernham Hall.	Noted. Town Centre location is identified as a Broad Location for development meaning it will be subject to further assessment on exact capacity and proposed form including future of existing uses. Council has committed to undertaking a supplementary planning document to set out this detail.
Duncan Campbell	BL1	West street shops should be reallocated and concentrated to shopping centre and west street redeveloped for blocks of flats.	Noted. Town Centre location is identified as a Broad Location for development meaning it will be subject to further assessment on exact capacity and proposed form including future of existing uses. Intention is to retain retail and commercial uses but complement them with new residential opportunities. Council has committed to undertaking a supplementary planning document to set out this detail.
Christopher Chowns	BL1	The quantum of development in the Fareham Centre development area needs to be revisited with an aim of increasing the number of dwellings	Noted. The proposed number of dwellings is considered suitable when considering all other issues and considerations. Future supplementary

		proposed and looking at 5-6 storeys with landmark buildings.	planning document will set the framework and requirements for the development area.
Sheila Doherty	BL1	Town Centre allocation is huge and will cause severe traffic congestion in an already heavily congested area and will destroy Fareham shopping centre. Lack of infrastructure provision.	Disagree. Town Centre is considered a sustainable location with access to public transport links (trains, buses) and easy access to facilities and services. Intention is to retain and complement retail and commercial uses and regenerate the town centre into a focal point for the Borough.
Andrew Downing	BL1	620 homes in the Town Centre will severely impact the shopping centre and civic centre.	Disagree. Town Centre is considered a sustainable location with access to public transport links (trains, buses) and easy access to facilities and services. Intention is to retain and complement retail and commercial uses and regenerate the town centre into a focal point for the Borough.
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	BL1	Support mixed use commercial and housing developments of empty retail and commercial property to maintain economic activity and the current high levels of employment. The town centre will continue to undergo considerable change from retail towards blended and flexible retail, residential, creative, hospitality, experiential and service businesses.	Noted. The development of the Town Centre will be guided by a supplementary planning document which provides the framework for a mixed use redevelopment of the area.
Historic England	BL1	Object to Policy on basis that it is unsound as have not seen any evidence demonstrating that the whole site is available or how the dwellings figure has been arrived at. It is difficult to assess potential impact without further detail of the development. Concern over nature of building heights and the harm caused to neighbouring heritage assets on the high street.	Noted. NPPF and PPG allow for broad locations to be identified where less detail is presented. This location is for later in the Plan period and will be subject to a supplementary planning document which will provide the detail and set the framework. That will be consulted upon in due course.

Robert Hitchins	BL1	Allocation looks ambitious although may be achievable if more floors are built on top but concern is loss of car parking in this area.	Noted. The proposed number of dwellings is considered suitable when considering all other issues and considerations including levels of car parking. Future supplementary planning document will set the framework and requirements for the development area.
Mark Hoddinott	BL1	It is a good idea to redevelop the town centre given change in shopping trends and reallocate part of town centre for increased housing and leisure facilities.	Noted. Support welcomed.
Robert Marshall for Fareham Society	BL1	Accepted that new housing in the town centre would be sustainably located and therefore welcomed, but there is no evidence to show that site could accommodate quantum stated and it is necessary at this stage to have a reasonably clear idea of how 620 would be accommodated.	The NPPF and PPG allows the Council to include a less detailed, broad location for development to deliver housing in the later years of the Plan. The Council has committed to produce a Supplementary Planning Document to deliver this location which will follow on from the adoption of the Local Plan.
Pegasus Group for Bargate Homes (75 Holly Hill Lane)	BL1	Plan is not deliverable given the uncertainties which exist around the delivery and viability of BL1. This policy is high level and aspirational, and as such it should not form part of the housing supply for the Plan period. BL1 requires a 30 year delivery timescale, and the Plan should be amended to reflect this.	Disagree. The NPPF and PPG allows the Council to include a less detailed, broad location for development to deliver housing in the later years of the Plan. The Council has committed to produce a Supplementary Planning Document to deliver this location which will follow on from the adoption of the Local Plan.
Pegasus Group for Hammond Family, Miller Homes and Bargate Homes (Land at Newgate Lane South)	BL1	Plan is not deliverable given the uncertainties which exist around the delivery and viability of BL1. This policy is high level and aspirational, and as such it should not form part of the housing supply for the Plan period. BL1 requires a 30 year delivery	Disagree. The NPPF and PPG allows the Council to include a less detailed, broad location for development to deliver housing in the later years of the Plan. The Council has committed to

		timescale, and the Plan should be amended to reflect this.	produce a Supplementary Planning Document to deliver this location which will follow on from the adoption of the Local Plan.
Persimmon Homes	BL1	There is no assessment or supporting evidence base that shows there is a reasonable prospect that the site will be available and could be viably developed. Agree that Local Plans should be ambitious, but they should also be realistic and deliverable. BL1 should continue to be identified in the Plan (in order to allow the proposed Town Centre SPD to be brought forward) but any supply for BL1 should be excluded from the plan period supply.	Disagree. The NPPF and PPG allows the Council to include a less detailed, broad location for development to deliver housing in the later years of the Plan. The Council has committed to produce a Supplementary Planning Document to deliver this location which will follow on from the adoption of the Local Plan.
David Richards	BL1	Support the redevelopment option for Fareham shopping centre but it would have been better to have investigated the actual specifics of development that could be achieved on site. Could remove other greenfield sites from the plan and include whole of town centre within the masterplan.	Noted and support welcomed. The proposed number of dwellings is considered suitable when considering all other issues and considerations. Future supplementary planning document will set the framework and requirements for the development area.
Andy Swarbrick	BL1	Inclusion a complete shock with limited consultation if any. More active consultation should have taken place. Lack of any detail or consideration of impacts on surrounding areas. Should have a revised section on development of town centre for further consultation that may include housing developments.	Noted. Town Centre location is identified as a Broad Location for development meaning it will be subject to further assessment on exact capacity and proposed form including future of existing uses. Intention is to retain retail and commercial uses but complement them with new residential opportunities. Council has committed to undertaking a supplementary planning document to set out this detail. This will be subject to consultation and build on foundations

			established through Town Centre Vision document.
Audrey Welsh	BL1	Needs to be a strategy to revitalise the town/village centres as this will re-invigorate the community.	The town centre redevelopment will consider a mix of uses as well as dwelling types and access requirements.

Representations on HP1 - New Housing Development			
Number of representations on policy: 4			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Alan Baker	5.2	Concern that the plan does not provision for adaptable and accessible housing for disabled persons. Considers at least 5% of new housing should be for disabled persons.	This policy remains unchanged. Policy HP7 makes provision for adaptable and accessible housing.
Gladman		Policy is not positively prepared as it restrictive and does not significantly boost the supply of housing. The policy should be amended to be more flexible.	Noted.
Bargate Homes (Pegasus)		The Policy should cross refer to Policy HP2 and HP4. It currently does not list all circumstances in which housing will be permitted outside the urban area.	This policy remains unchanged.  Disagree. Policy HP2 is a separate policy which relates to site of 4 dwellings or less. Policy HP4 is a contingency policy to be used in the event that the Council does not have a 5-year Housing Land Supply.
Hammond, Miller and Bargate (Pegasus)		The Policy should cross refer to Policy HP2 and HP4. It currently does not list all circumstances in which housing will be permitted outside the urban area.	This policy remains unchanged.  Disagree. Policy HP2 is a separate policy which relates to site of 4 dwellings or less. Policy HP4 is a contingency policy to be used in the event that the Council does not have a 5-year Housing Land Supply.

Representations on HP2 - New small-scale development outside the Urban Areas			
Number of representations on policy: 5			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Andy Jackson		Policy conflicts with paragraph 5.13 of the Local Plan in relation to the definition of small-scale development. Confusion as to whether it includes sites of less than 1ha or not more than 4 units.	Noted. Policy is clear that it includes sites of not more than 4 units.
Gladman		Supports principle of small-scale development beyond urban area boundary. Suggests policy should have no limitations on size. Contradicts HP1 and criteria should be incorporated into HP2.	Support welcomed. However, disagree with removing limitation on numbers. Purpose of the policy is to encourage windfall sites for smaller developments, including self-build, in sustainable locations. A higher threshold would require sites to be identified and allocated within the plan. The policy is permissive subject to meeting certain criteria. The limited number is also intended to ensure a more successful integration with existing character.  Policy DS1 clarifies where development in the countryside is acceptable.
Hazel Russell		Policy conflicts with paragraph 5.13 of the Local Plan in relation to the definition of small-scale development. Confusion as to whether it includes sites of less than 1ha or not more than 4 units.	Noted. Policy is clear that it includes sites of not more than 4 units.



Metis Homes		Considers that there is no evidence or justification to support the policy approach. Considers that the four dwelling limit should be removed and the 1ha size limit kept in line with the NPPF and other plan policies.	Disagree with removing the 4 unit threshold. Purpose of the policy is to encourage windfall sites for smaller developments, including self build, in sustainable locations. It is not intended as a reflection of 'minor development' as defined in the NPPF. A higher threshold would require sites to be identified and allocated within the plan. The policy is permissive subject to meeting certain criteria. The limited number is also intended to ensure a more successful integration with existing character.
The Fareham Society		Considers that the revisions made to this policy do not alter previous comments made.	Noted.

### Representations on HP4 - Five-year Housing Land Supply

**Number of representations on policy: 23**

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Bargate Homes (Pegasus)		Concern that Policy HP4 is more restrictive than Policy DSP40 in the current Adopted Local Plan. Policy is inappropriate because it adds restrictions which may prevent sustainable sites from coming forward. Lack of clarity as to how criteria c) will be applied to a planning proposal particularly in relation to 'the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'.	Disagree. The Council has successfully applied adopted Policy DSP40 at planning appeals. Policy HP4 applies the same principles.  Criteria c) will be applied on a case-by-case assessment of the site and its context.

Hammond, Miller and Bargate (Pegasus)		Concern that Policy HP4 is more restrictive than Policy DSP40 in the current Adopted Local Plan. Lack of clarity as to how criteria c) will be applied to a planning proposal particularly in relation to 'the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'.	Criteria c) will be applied on a case-by-case assessment of the site and its context.
Caroline Dinenage MP		Concern with the link to policy DS1. Concerned that sites could come forward which would have a cumulative impact and would not be sufficiently assessed.	Noted.
CPRE Hampshire		Significant concerns regarding the unintended consequences of this policy, specifically it's link with Policy DS1. Concern that sites may be selected outside of the urban area in the first instance.	Disagree. Policy HP4 and the link to Policy DS1 directly relate to situations where applications may be submitted for countryside sites and so the additions of these policies are required to help the Council determine those applications.
David Rodgers		The revision made to the policy text from 'may be' to 'will be' is not sound as it does not allow planning proposals to be consulted on with local residents or a fair planning committee process. Concern that there will be speculative planning proposals for development outside urban area boundaries.	Noted. Policy HP4 is a contingency policy to be used in the event that the Council does not have a 5-year Housing Land Supply. The Council has successfully applied adopted Policy DSP40 for speculative planning applications at planning appeals.
Dimmick et al (Woolf Bond Planning)		Concern as to how criteria c) will be applied to a planning proposal particularly in relation to 'the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside' and should be deleted. In addition, the policy fails to provide a solution towards maintaining a 5 year supply of housing.	Noted. Criteria c) will be applied on a case-by-case assessment of the site and its context.  Disagree. The adopted policy DSP40 has been successfully applied to date.
Foreman Homes (Woolf Bond Planning) 21 Burrige Road		Concern as to how criteria c) will be applied to a planning proposal particularly in relation to 'the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside' and should be deleted. In addition, the policy fails to provide a solution towards maintaining a 5 year supply of housing.	Noted. Criteria c) will be applied on a case-by-case assessment of the site and its context.  Disagree. The adopted policy DSP40 has been successfully applied to date.

Foreman Homes (Woolf Bond Planning) East of Brook Lane		Concern as to how criteria c) will be applied to a planning proposal particularly in relation to 'the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside' and should be deleted. In addition, the policy fails to provide a solution towards maintaining a 5 year supply of housing.	Noted. Criteria c) will be applied on a case-by-case assessment of the site and its context.  Disagree. The adopted policy DSP40 has been successfully applied to date.
Foreman Homes (Woolf Bond Planning) Greenaway Lane		Concern as to how criteria c) will be applied to a planning proposal particularly in relation to 'the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside' and should be deleted. In addition, the policy fails to provide a solution towards maintaining a 5 year supply of housing.	Noted. Criteria c) will be applied on a case-by-case assessment of the site and its context.  Disagree. The adopted policy DSP40 has been successfully applied to date.
Foreman Homes (Woolf Bond Planning) Cartwright Drive		Concern as to how criteria c) will be applied to a planning proposal particularly in relation to 'the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside' and should be deleted. In addition, the policy fails to provide a solution towards maintaining a 5 year supply of housing.	Noted. Criteria c) will be applied on a case-by-case assessment of the site and its context.  Disagree. The adopted policy DSP40 has been successfully applied to date.
Foreman Homes (Woolf Bond Planning) East of Titchfield Road		Concern as to how criteria c) will be applied to a planning proposal particularly in relation to 'the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside' and should be deleted. In addition, the policy fails to provide a solution towards maintaining a 5 year supply of housing.	NPPF  Criteria c) will be applied on a case-by-case assessment of the site and its context.  Disagree. The adopted policy DSP40 has been successfully applied to date.
Foreman Homes (Woolf Bond Planning) Posbrook Lane		Concern as to how criteria c) will be applied to a planning proposal particularly in relation to 'the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside' and should be deleted. In addition, the policy fails to provide a solution towards maintaining a 5 year supply of housing.	Noted. Criteria c) will be applied on a case-by-case assessment of the site and its context.  Disagree. The adopted policy DSP40 has been successfully applied to date.
Foreman Homes (Woolf Bond Planning) Raley Road		Concern as to how criteria c) will be applied to a planning proposal particularly in relation to 'the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'	Noted. Criteria c) will be applied on a case-by-case assessment of the site and its context.

		and should be deleted. In addition, the policy fails to provide a solution towards maintaining a 5 year supply of housing.	Disagree. The adopted policy DSP40 has been successfully applied to date.
Foreman Homes (Woolf Bond Planning) Romsey Avenue		Concern as to how criteria c) will be applied to a planning proposal particularly in relation to 'the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside' and should be deleted. In addition, the policy fails to provide a solution towards maintaining a 5 year supply of housing.	Noted. Criteria c) will be applied on a case-by-case assessment of the site and its context.  Disagree. The adopted policy DSP40 has been successfully applied to date.
Foreman Homes (Woolf Bond Planning) Rookery Avenue		Concern as to how criteria c) will be applied to a planning proposal particularly in relation to 'the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside' and should be deleted. In addition, the policy fails to provide a solution towards maintaining a 5 year supply of housing.	Noted. Criteria c) will be applied on a case-by-case assessment of the site and its context.  Disagree. The adopted policy DSP40 has been successfully applied to date.
Foreman Homes (Woolf Bond Planning) Land N of Greenaway Lane		Concern as to how criteria c) will be applied to a planning proposal particularly in relation to 'the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside' and should be deleted. In addition, the policy fails to provide a solution towards maintaining a 5 year supply of housing.	Noted. Criteria c) will be applied on a case-by-case assessment of the site and its context.  Disagree. The adopted policy DSP40 has been successfully applied to date.
Foreman Homes (Woolf Bond Planning) North Wallington		Concern as to how criteria c) will be applied to a planning proposal particularly in relation to 'the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside' and should be deleted. In addition, the policy fails to provide a solution towards maintaining a 5 year supply of housing.	Noted. Criteria c) will be applied on a case-by-case assessment of the site and its context.  Disagree. The adopted policy DSP40 has been successfully applied to date.
Gladman		Gladman supports this approach in principle, with some modifications. Suggest that the policy wording is amended from 'may be' to 'will be'. Also suggest that in criterion a) the reference to scale is removed to allow for additional flexibility in the housing supply. Considers criterion b) to be too onerous as sites well related to existing settlement could be considered to be sustainable.	Noted. Policy has been amended to 'will be'.  Criterion a and b) are required to help the Council determine applications that come forward where the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply.

Gosport Borough Council		Objects to the wording of Policy HP4 as it has the potential to significantly undermine the Local Plan's policies which protect the countryside and the Strategic Gap. The policy is not considered to be effective for delivering cross-boundary objectives. Concern that the policy implies that if the Council does not meet its 5-year housing land supply the first area of search is outside of the urban area boundary. Other sites that are more sustainable such as brownfield sites should be identified in the policy as preferable.	Disagree. Criterion c) of the Policy provides sufficient wording in relation to protecting the integrity of the Strategic Gap.
Persimmon Homes		Supports the revision to the policy of 'may be' to 'will be'.  Further clarification is sought in respect of criterion b which states that a development should be 'integrated into the existing settlement' as to whether this is a physical integration or in design terms. Suggest that the wording for criterion c) is deleted and replaced with a cross reference to Policy DS2.	Support noted.  Disagree. Paragraph 5.27 provides further detail and sufficient flexibility in relation to criterion b) of the policy.  Criterion c) provides more detail than DS2.
Phil Hawkins		HA1 fails to meet criteria e) of HP4 as the proposal would have unacceptable environmental, amenity/facility and traffic implications.	Noted. Policy HP4 does not relate to housing allocations in the LP, it is a contingency policy to be used in the event that the Council does not have a 5-year Housing Land Supply.
Raymond Brown (Southern Planning)		No objection to the principle of the policy. Objects to the detailed criteria of the policy which goes beyond paragraph 11 of the NPPF. Criteria should be re-assessed to accord with the NPPF.	Disagree. The adopted policy DSP40 has been successfully applied to date.
T Ware Developments (Woolf Bond Planning)		Concern as to how criteria c) will be applied to a planning proposal particularly in relation to 'the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside' and should be deleted. In addition, the policy fails to	Noted. Criteria c) will be applied on a case-by-case assessment of the site and its context.

		provide a solution towards maintaining a 5 year supply of housing.	Disagree. The adopted policy DSP40 has been successfully applied to date.
<b>Representations on policy HP5 - Provision of Affordable Housing</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 13</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Caroline Dineage MP		Concerns regarding the unintended consequences of this policy, specifically it's link with Policy DS1.	Noted. The link between DS1 and HP5 directly relates to situations where applications may be submitted for countryside sites and so the additions of these policies are required to help the Council determine those applications.
Chris Moore		Concern there is no provision in the plan for bungalows.	Noted.
Home Builders Federation	5.33 and HP5	<p>Suggest that the additional text in para 5.33 is added to the policy.</p> <p>Suggests the plan incorporates the First Homes requirements.</p> <p>Affordable home ownership proportion is inconsistent with the NPPF.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Local Plan benefits from the transitional arrangements in relation to First Homes.</p> <p>Inconsistency noted. NPPF 2021 published after the consultation began clarified the requirement.</p>
Mike Beale		The affordable portion in the Local Plan should be increased.	Disagree. The affordable proportions in the plan have been tested through the Viability Assessment.

Rak Murphy		References to affordable housing should be replaced by 'social housing for rent by persons on FBC waiting list'.	Disagree. There are different types of affordable housing as set out in the NPPF glossary and Local Plan glossary.
Tetra Tech on behalf of Vistry Group		Plan should consider adopting a higher housing requirement and allocating more sites to allow for a greater affordable housing provision.	Disagree. The plan meets the borough's affordable housing need.
Turley on behalf of Reside Developments		The Local Plan should provide more clarity in relation to First Homes through Policy HP5.	The Local Plan benefits from the transitional arrangements in relation to First Homes.
Alex Child (The Planning Bureau)	5.33	Commends the plan on the differential affordable housing rates and supports the stance towards older persons housing in relation to affordable.	Support welcomed.
Andy Jackson	5.41	Concern that the definition of occupancy rates is inconsistent in the Local Plan and has an implication for nitrates calculations	The occupancy rate used to calculate nutrient neutrality is the average national occupancy as calculated by the Office of National Statistics. Natural England recommended this occupancy rate for use in nutrient neutrality calculations because it can be consistently applied across all affected areas in the sub-region.
Anne Marie Burdfield	5.41	Concern that the definition of occupancy rates is inconsistent in the Local Plan and has an implication for nitrates calculations	The occupancy rate used to calculate nutrient neutrality is the average national occupancy as calculated by the Office of National Statistics. Natural England recommended this occupancy rate for use in nutrient neutrality calculations because it can be consistently applied across all affected areas in the Sub-region.

BJC Planning on behalf of Land and Partners	5.41	Policy should be more flexible to allow financial contributions to be made in lieu of on-site provision for sites proposing self and custom build. Concern on site provision would make self-build schemes unviable.	Disagree. The Local Plan Viability Assessment includes affordable housing contributions as well as self and custom build as set out in para 5.36, it is for the developer to show otherwise that viability is an issue, so the policy is considered appropriate.
Hazel Russell	5.41	Concern that the definition of occupancy rates is inconsistent in the Local Plan and has an implication for nitrates calculations	The occupancy rate used to calculate nutrient neutrality is the average national occupancy as calculated by the Office of National Statistics. Natural England recommended this occupancy rate for use in nutrient neutrality calculations because it can be consistently applied across all affected areas in the Sub-region.
June Ward	5.41	Concern that the definition of occupancy rates is inconsistent in the Local Plan and has an implication for nitrates calculations	The occupancy rate used to calculate nutrient neutrality is the average national occupancy as calculated by the Office of National Statistics. Natural England recommended this occupancy rate for use in nutrient neutrality calculations because it can be consistently applied across all affected areas in the Sub-region.
Phil Hawkins	5.41	Concern that the definition of occupancy rates is inconsistent in the Local Plan and has an implication for nitrates calculations	The occupancy rate used to calculate nutrient neutrality is the average national occupancy as calculated by the Office of National Statistics. Natural England recommended this occupancy rate for use in nutrient neutrality calculations because it can



			be consistently applied across all affected areas in the sub-region.
<b>Representations on HP6 - Exception Sites</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 2</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Caroline Dinenage MP		Concern with the link to policy DS1. Concerned that sites could come forward which would have a cumulative impact and would not be sufficiently assessed.	This policy remains unchanged.  Disagree. The link to HP6 directly relates to situations where applications may be submitted for countryside sites and so the additions of these policies are required to help the Council determine those applications.
Gosport Borough Council		Object to the wording as it has potential to undermine the Local Plan's policies which aim to protect the countryside and the strategic gap. Concerned the proposed wording will undermine the effectiveness of the strategic gap between Fareham, Gosport, Lee-on-the-Solent and Stubbington. Concern that the policy could be used to enable much larger scale development and that it could lead to a series of 1ha entry home exception sites developed adjacent to the GBC boundary. Suggest amending policy to include Fareham settlements only and include an upper limit of what constitutes 'small sites'.	This policy remains unchanged.  Disagree. The link to HP6 directly relates to situations where applications may be submitted for countryside sites and so the additions of these policies are required to help the Council determine those applications. In addition, HP6 is consistent with national policy requirements.

## Representations on HP7 - Adaptable and Accessible Dwellings

Number of representations on policy: 2

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Gladman		Note that the policy would need to be justified by robust evidence and does not consider a general reference to an ageing population to be sufficient justification for of the policy requirements. The Council need to be aware of the impact that these requirements have on scheme viability and the knock-on effects on the delivery of housing and should demonstrate that consideration has been given to this requirement within the viability study. PPG demonstrates that M4(3) standards should only be applied to affordable homes within the Councils control.	<p>Disagree. The Specialist Housing Needs Background paper provides robust evidence to support the inclusion of Policy HP7.</p> <p>In addition, an addendum to the Council's Viability Study includes a breakdown on M4 (2 and 3) policy costs.</p> <p>Criterion b) has been updated to reflect the PPG.</p>
Miller Homes for Terence O'Rourke		Policy should provide greater flexibility in meeting the percentage of dwellings meeting M4(2 and 3) standards to reflect changing need and site circumstances. Policy does not take into consideration the requirements of the PPG. Policy should be amended to provide greater flexibility.	<p>Disagree. M4 (2 and 3) standards have been tested through the Council's Viability Study and sites remain viable.</p> <p>In addition, an addendum to the Council's Viability Study includes a breakdown on M4 (2 and 3) policy costs.</p>

Representations on HP8 - Older Persons and Specialist Housing Provision			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Prime UK Developments Ltd		Objects to policy as there is concern that there is not enough land within the urban area to accommodate general housing need, let alone specialist housing. Policy requires significant changes for it to be sound. The site at Sopwith Way would accommodate part of this need.	Noted. This policy remains unchanged.  Specialist Housing paper has evidenced the level of need in the Borough.
Representations on HP9 - Self and Custom Build Homes			
Number of representations on policy: 2			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Gladman		Support the inclusion of policy HP9. However, raise concerns regarding the evidential justification for 40 dwellings being the trigger for self and custom build provision. Request re-wording that if up-to-date evidence indicates that there is a demand in the particular location then scheme is encouraged to make provision.	Support noted. The evidence to support the requirement for sites of 40 dwellings is set out in the Self and custom build background paper. The broad spread of demand indicated by the register does not indicate a requirement to specify a location.
Miller Homes from Terence O'Rourke		Questions the requirement for the policy because of the practical implications of delivery and the lack of need. Concern that the policy could provide an oversupply of self and custom build units.	Noted.

		Considers it extremely challenging to incorporate self and custom build plots into strategic sites, specific sites should be identified for this sole purpose. The policy should be supported with appropriate evidence to demonstrate such a demand and parameters should be established within the policy.	
<b>Representations on HP11 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 2</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Michael Edwards		Concern over the requirement and effectiveness of HP11 and consider that the Borough's gypsy and traveller need should be revised.	Noted.
Graham Bell		Considers that the site at the rear of 77 Burrridge Road does not comply with the criteria in policy HP11 and is therefore not a suitable gypsy plot.	The site at 77 Burrridge Road is a separate allocation which meets the relevant criteria in the NPPF and the 2015 PPTS.
<b>Representations on policy E1 – Employment Land Provision</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 13</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Steve Carrington – Foreman Homes (Land North of Military	E1	Support Policy E1.	Noted.

Road Report and Standard Way Report)			
Southern Planning Practice on behalf of Frobisher Developments Ltd.	6.3	The text should be amended to include ' <i>and developers</i> ' after the reference to Hampshire County Council to recognise the contributions from developers.	Noted.
Southern Planning Practice on behalf of Frobisher Developments Ltd.	6.6	It is not only Covid which will affect the local economy, the shakeup of business models, tax changes and supply chains following Brexit will also have an impact as adjustments are made by businesses.	Noted.
Southern Planning Practice on behalf of Frobisher Developments Ltd.	6.12.1	There is a shortage of supply for medium and large warehouses and a strong demand for such as confirmed by Properformics.	Noted.
CPRE Hampshire	6.8 to 6.20	Stantec assessment likely to be an overestimate of needs. Allocation and over provision of 121,000 sq.m. is entirely unnecessary.	Disagree. The Stantec assessment is considered an informed assessment of market requirements, and to provide for no office space on past take up rates would be ill advised. The substantial over provision of employment space is predominantly a result of two strategic sites at Welborne and Daedalus, both of which have specific challenges for delivery and extended timescales. The flexibility offered by the Local Plan development strategy ensures that short term requirements can be catered for in a way that supports current market trends.
Eastleigh Borough Council	E1	Welcomes the contribution towards built employment floorspace, primarily within the proposed Daedalus and Welborne allocations for meeting both local and wider strategic employment	Noted and agreed.

		needs. The sub-regional importance of the Solent Enterprise Zone also continues to be recognised.	
Gosport Borough Council	E1	Supports the employment allocations at Daedalus (Policies E1, E2 and E3) as it will create new employment opportunities for Gosport residents reducing the need to leave the Peninsula and offer genuine transport choices other than the private car and thereby reducing congestion and air pollution.	Noted and agreed.
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	E1	Plan should recognise changing needs of employers by providing localised mixed development, flexible workspaces and smaller units for growing businesses.	Noted. The addition of four smaller scale sites distributed across the borough, in support of opportunities at strategic sites and support for existing employment areas is intended to provide the flexibility and choice required in todays changing market.
Hampshire County Council Property Services	E1	Supports the amendments to this Policy which reflects the current scale of future employment needs and increases flexibility for employment land provision in line with the amendment to the national use classes order as made on 1st September 2020 and current methodology.	Noted and agreed.
Michael Sparks for Cambria Land	E1	Employment land supply identified within the Plan is neither flexible nor responsive and there is no certainty about delivery of the majority of the large employment allocations. Additional employment land supply should be identified to ensure the needs for businesses looking for suitable new premises in locations that have good access to the strategic highway network can be met.	Disagree. Four additional allocations have been added that represent sites available for development in the short term and with good links to the strategic highway network. Plan recognises that allocations at Daedalus and Welborne will deliver within the plan period, but these remain a vital part of the borough's employment land supply. All the sites included have been assessed as deliverable and achievable.
Portsmouth City Council	E1	Notes amended approach to office space need, to set a more positive, 'aspirational' target. The	Noted and agreed.

		inclusion of additional smaller employment sites to ensure flexibility and deliverability, instead of relying on significant provision from two strategic sites, is supported. The overprovision of employment space for the plan period is noted and no objection.	
Southampton City Council	E1	Welcome the contribution towards built employment floorspace, primarily within the proposed Daedalus and Welborne allocations for meeting both local and wider strategic employment needs. The sub-regional importance of the Solent Enterprise Zone also continues to be recognised. Request a reference be added to the Plan to the PfSH 'cities first' approach to office development in any scenario whereby Fareham was exceeding the office targets set out for its Borough by the emerging PfSH Strategy or evidence base.	Noted.
Southern Planning for Frobisher Developments Ltd	6.16	Role of local submarkets should also be recognised as they partly dictate which businesses go where. The text should be amended as highlighted: By providing a range of types of site in different geographical locations and economic submarkets suiting different needs, the Plan will ensure that both short and long term employment need can be provided for, as well as offering choice and flexibility in terms of suitable sites for different uses.	Noted but disagree. The Plan already states in para 6.16 that sites have been allocated in different geographical locations across the borough which suit different needs. This is considered appropriate given there is no assessment of sub-markets in the Local Plan evidence base.
Southern Planning for Frobisher Developments Ltd	6.20	Important to provide an oversupply. It is "far preferable to have a surplus of employment land in the Local Plan" This will encourage sustainable economic growth, local and inward investment, overcomes potential barriers to business and is flexible enough to meet the employment needs of the Borough in accordance with the NPPF.	Noted and agreed.

Representations on policy E2 – Faraday Business Park			
Number of representations on policy: 2			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Southern Planning Practice on behalf of Frobisher Developments Ltd.	E2	Supported.	Noted.
Gosport Borough Council	E2	Supports the employment allocations at Daedalus (Policies E1, E2 and E3) as it will create new employment opportunities for Gosport residents reducing the need to leave the Peninsula and offer genuine transport choices other than the private car and thereby reducing congestion and air pollution.	Noted and agreed.
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	E2	Daedalus provides a substantial area of new space which is supported.	Noted and agreed.
Representations on policy E3 – Swordfish Business Park			
Number of representations on policy: 2			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Gosport Borough Council	E3	Supports the employment allocations at Daedalus (Policies E1, E2 and E3) as it will create new employment opportunities for Gosport residents reducing the need to leave the Peninsula and offer	Noted and agreed.



		genuine transport choices other than the private car and thereby reducing congestion and air pollution.	
Hampshire County Council	E3	This site does not lie within Hampshire County Council's Minerals Consultation Area, and so neither a Mineral Assessment nor Mineral extraction need to be considered for development in this area.	Noted.
<b>Representations on policy E4 – Solent 2</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 1</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Natural England	E4	It is welcomed that the wording has been updated to require development to demonstrate 'compliance with Strategic Policy NE1 with regards to impacts on the local ecological network'. We refer you to our previous advice that the Policy should also outline that where impacts cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated, a comprehensive compensation package should be required that addresses the loss of all priority habitat on site, rather than just specifying protected trees, that seeks to enhance and connect habitat in the locality.	Noted.

Representations on policy E4a – Land north of St Margaret’s Roundabout			
Number of representations on policy: 2			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Hampshire County Council Property Services	E4a	Hampshire County Council as a landowner supports the inclusion of this draft allocation and has provided information that confirms this site is available, deliverable and developable. This allocation will contribute (indicative 4000m2) to the supply of employment floorspace required over the plan period for the borough.	Noted.
Robert Marshall for Fareham Society	E4a	Given the location this is a sensible site for employment use. The only caveat is that its prominent roundabout setting makes it a highly visible site which would make a high standard of building design and good quality and extensive landscape screening on the road frontage essential. Insert in the text of the allocation a reference to the above along with an indication that this may affect the sites capacity.	Noted but disagree. All site capacities are indicative in the allocation text.

## Representations on policy E4b – Land north of Military Road, Wallington

Number of representations on policy: 3

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Ron Bryan	E4b	I found it a bit confusing about the section marked for North of Military Road, Wallington, which is the area I am concerned about, as complaints have been made about building in and around Military Road. I would like a clearer picture of your intentions.	Noted. The allocation policy sets out the principle of development for the amount of employment floorspace deemed acceptable at this location and some more detailed criteria on access. Further detail for the development of the site would come during the planning application process.
Arthur Hackney	E4b	Green field site lost and wildlife at risk. Standard Way is un-restricted and carries heavy lorries and fast-moving Industrial Park/Motorway-bound traffic. Safety would be impossible to achieve since access is close to a tight, blind and dangerous bend. Noise and airborne pollution levels would be unavoidably high, creating unpleasant working conditions. It is difficult to see how this can be considered an 'appropriate' location as defined in the criteria set out in your Local Plan Vision at Section 2.10 in size comparison to the other sites and yet their environmental impact is huge. The site would create increased industrial traffic on roads which are already heavily loaded with an increased burden of pollution by noise and emissions in areas which are already on or beyond acceptable limits.	The need for employment sites is set out in Policy E1 and is based on the flexibility and choice required by national policy. Any applications on the site will be subject to all policies in the Plan meaning issues such as ecology, air and noise pollution and transport impacts will be assessed. The policy includes a specific link to TIN4 which provides the policy hook for requiring improvements and/or financial contributions to offset any impacts from the development.

		There are many vacant industrial units available in the area generally it is hard to see that these proposals can be justified on a 'needs' basis. The proposed access route is problematical. Noise and pollution are becoming a serious issue, especially for residents of Wallington Shore Road.	
Robert Marshall for Fareham Society	E4b	This land is subject of undetermined planning application P/20/0636/OA. The above application is for 3,132 sq m floorspace. At even this level the Fareham Society had concerns on the ability to provide a satisfactory site layout. The indicative floorspace in the allocation is 4,750 sq m. and it is considered that this would constitute an unacceptable overdevelopment. Traffic surveys with the above application indicated that significant additional traffic would be generated on Standard Way and Pinks Hill. This led to Hampshire County Council highways saying that improvements would be required on the narrow Pinks Hill. The acceptability or otherwise of this allocation would depend upon this. The text to the allocation should be worded to reflect the above matters.	Noted but disagree. Capacity is deemed indicative but deliverable. Policy includes link to TIN4 which is policy hook to request highway works or financial contributions to make improvements if deemed required by the Highway Authority.
<b>Representations on policy E4c – Little Park Farm</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 1</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Southern Planning Practice for Frobisher Developments	E4c	Site Specific Requirements – no objection.	Noted.

## Representations on policy E4d – Standard Way

Number of representations on policy: 2

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Arthur Hackney	E4b	Green field site lost and wildlife at risk. Standard Way is un-restricted and carries heavy lorries and fast-moving Industrial Park/Motorway-bound traffic. Safety would be impossible to achieve since access is close to a tight, blind and dangerous bend. Noise and airborne pollution levels would be unavoidably high, creating unpleasant working conditions. It is difficult to see how this can be considered an 'appropriate' location as defined in the criteria set out in your Local Plan Vision at Section 2.10 in size comparison to the other sites and yet their environmental impact is huge. The site would create increased industrial traffic on roads which are already heavily loaded with an increased burden of pollution by noise and emissions in areas which are already on or beyond acceptable limits. There are many vacant industrial units available in the area generally it is hard to see that these proposals can be justified on a 'needs' basis. The proposed access route is problematical. Noise and pollution are becoming a serious issue, especially for residents of Wallington Shore Road.	The need for employment sites is set out in Policy E1 and is based on the flexibility and choice required by national policy. Any applications on the site will be subject to all policies in the Plan meaning issues such as ecology, air and noise pollution and transport impacts will be assessed. The policy includes a specific link to TIN4 which provides the policy hook for requiring improvements and/or financial contributions to offset any impacts from the development.
Robert Marshall for Fareham Society	E4d	This is the subject of undetermined application P/19/0169/OA for the same floorspace referred to in the allocation. The Fareham Society raised no objection to this. However, there is one caveat to	Noted but disagree. The policy includes link to TIN4 which is a policy hook to request highway works or financial contributions to make

		the soundness of the allocation. As with allocation E4b access would be via Pinks Lane and Standard Way. HCC seek on improvements to Pinks Lane with costs shared with allocation E4b. The text to the allocation should be worded to reflect this to ensure adequate access arrangements for the development.	improvements if deemed required by the Highway Authority.
<b>Representations on policy E5 – existing Employment Areas</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 3</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Southern Planning Practice for Frobisher Developments Ltd	E5	<p>Live-work accommodation is not catered for in policy despite this being an aim of the Local Plan. It is mentioned in supporting text only, and then specifically in the context of development acceptable in the countryside. The second part of Policy E5 should be amended to align with the plan's aims in the following way:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The proposals are not for residential development (excluding live-work units); and</li> <li>ii. All appropriate alternative forms of employment use (including live-work units) have been dismissed as unsuitable or unviable; and</li> </ul> <p>It is also not clear why it is necessary to demonstrate that the proposal will create additional jobs to satisfy Policy E5. Alteration and redevelopment of premises may not always be driven by an expanding workforce. These works may be required for health and safety reasons, for reasons of efficiency (which</p>	<p>Noted but disagree. Whilst support for live work units is part of the plans aims, the strategic employment nature of existing employment areas means that residential accommodation is not suitable for those areas.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

		does not necessarily translate to job creation) or to improve amenity. Proposals submitted for these reasons would fall foul of this policy. There is no requirement in the NPPF to demonstrate that economic proposals need to create jobs. Nor does the text of the policy justify it. This subclause should be deleted.	
Gosport Borough Council	E5	Supports Policy E5. It is important that existing employment sites in Fareham including a number on the Gosport Peninsula are protected including those along Newgate Lane and close to Fareham Town Centre as they provide employment to Gosport residents and are potentially accessible by bus, cycling or walking.	Noted and agreed.
Michael Sparks Associates for Cambria Land	E5	The Spurlings Industrial Estate is identified as an EEA within the Plan, but the nearby land at Down Barn Farm, which is also in use for employment related operations (including offices and an unsafeguarded waste use) has not been given the same designation. Policy E5 and the Policies Map should be amended to identify the established employment operations at Down Barn Farm as an Existing Employment Area.	Disagree. There are a number of sites within the Borough that are not considered to be suitable for protection for future employment uses. Whilst some of these sites contain small scale businesses that do contribute to overall economic development in the Borough, they are not considered to be strategic in nature and thus alternative uses can be considered if this is the desire of the market.
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	E5	Not supportive of any losses of allocations to housing.	Noted and agree. Policy E5 provides the framework for resisting such losses of employment land.

Representations on policy E6 - Boatyards			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Gosport Borough Council	E6	This policy is supported as the availability of waterfront sites around the Solent is limited and the marine businesses, they support contribute to one of the key sectors of the sub-regional economy of which Gosport marine sites form part of a cluster.	Noted.
Representations on policy E7 – Solent Airport			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Gosport Borough Council	E7	It is important that the airfield is retained to support a large number of employers at the Daedalus site which provides one of the key reasons for many businesses to locate and expand on the site. The justification text highlights that the Solent Airport has consent for up to 40,000 flight movements per year. There are no indications in the FLP2037 that any changes will be sought on this matter.	Noted.



Representations on policy R1 – Retail Hierarchy and Protecting the Vitality and Viability of Centres			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Robert Marshall, Fareham Society	7.6	An amendment to this paragraph says that “the majority of new retail and town centre development will be directed to Fareham Town Centre in line with the Council’s Town Centre Vision 2017”. This is too vague a document to be relied upon and is one that has not gone beyond an initial consultation stage.	Noted but disagree. This document gives a clear indication of the Council’s vision for the Town Centre and is therefore relevant for inclusion in the Local Plan.
Representations on R2 – Out of Town Shopping			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Andy Jackson	7.18	Out of town shopping is not defined.	Town and district centres are defined and therefore areas which fall outside of these would be considered out of town centres.

Representations on policy R4 – Community & Leisure Facilities			
Number of representations on policy: 2			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Hampshire County Council		Support the intentions of Policy R4 and supports the amendments to this Policy which would reinforce the unique role and function of public service providers and their need for managed change to deliver operational service improvements over the Plan period.	Support welcomed.
Robert Marshall – Fareham Borough Council		The suggested change would unacceptably dilute the grounds for contesting the loss of a community facility by removing the requirement for any replacement to be equivalent and requiring simply that it be sufficient.	Noted but disagree. The policy ensures that any provision would meet the needs of the local community and makes provision for improved quality, function and accessibility.
Representations on policy CC1 - Climate Change			
Number of representations on policy: 10			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Cooke, Janet		The Local Plan should set ambitious targets and action plans to achieve reduction in carbon. Development should only be permitted where it maximises renewable energy generation, reduces energy consumption and is located where it will minimise emissions from transport.	Current national policy and legislation do not require the setting of specific carbon reduction targets. However, the Plan contains policies and measures designed to secure the mitigation and adaption of climate

			<p>change in accordance with the relevant policy and legislative framework.</p> <p>The Plan contains policies relating to renewable energy generation, covered in Policy CC4 and building sustainability covered in high quality design D1.</p> <p>The Council's development strategy was influenced by factors such as "Transport corridors and opportunities to encourage more active travel modes" as stated in paragraph 3.6 of the Plan. Furthermore, Policy TIN1 promotes sustainable and active travel modes as part of new development.</p>
CPRE Hampshire		<p>Supports policy aspirations. However, Criterion (a) does not go far enough to encourage/enforce a truly sustainable pattern of development and is unlikely to lead to a meaningful reduction of emissions from private car use. It should be strengthened to enable a spatial strategy more likely to meet the requirements set out in Section 19(1A) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and the new NPPF. There should be a requirement for mass public transport hubs to be the first approach for development, and to enable Fareham to refuse car-dependent applications.</p> <p>The Revised Publication Local Plan simply adds a comment in Criterion (e) about Building Regulations, but</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The Council's development strategy was influenced by factors such as "Transport corridors and opportunities to encourage more active travel modes" as stated in paragraph 3.6 of the Plan. Furthermore, Policy TIN1 promotes sustainable and active travel modes as part of new development and the hierarchical approach to providing mitigation, with additional capacity being last on the list. Active travel links are also a key requirement and will be delivered through a coordinated approach using the</p>

		this is merely tinkering around the edges of what could and should be achieved.	<p>LCWIP developed by the highway authority.</p> <p>The Council cannot require development to exceed the buildings regulations any further than what is permitted by National policy. However, this Council supports development which chooses to do so.</p>
Goddard, Lesley		The Plan does little in respect of reducing climate change. Development should be close to carbon neutral and land should be set aside for rewilding.	The Plan contains policies and measures designed to secure the mitigation and adaption of climate change in accordance with the relevant policy and legislative framework.
Hampshire County Council		Pleased to note policy	Noted.
Hampshire County Council		County Council wishes to be reassured that the Revised Publication Plan goes far enough in supporting the Government and County Council's policies on climate change.	The Council is satisfied that the Revised Publication Plan meets the requirements of national policy and Section 19(1A) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which in turn supports the County Council's policies on climate change.
Hawkins, Phillip.		<p>No targets have been set for CO2 emission reductions.</p> <p>Development must only be permitted where, after taking account of other relevant local plan policies, it maximises the potential for generating renewable energy and is-designed to reduce energy consumption as much as possible. The location of development needs also to recognise the need to minimise emissions from transport.</p>	<p>Current national policy and legislation does not require the setting of specific carbon reduction targets.. However, the Plan contains policies and measures designed to secure the mitigation and adaption of climate change in accordance with the relevant policy and legislative framework.</p> <p>The Plan contains policies relating to renewable energy generation, covered</p>

			<p>in Policy CC4 and building sustainability covered in high quality design D1.</p> <p>The Council's development strategy was influenced by factors such as "Transport corridors and opportunities to encourage more active travel modes" as stated in paragraph 3.6 of the Plan. Furthermore, Policy TIN1 promotes sustainable and active travel modes as part of new development.</p>
Jackson, Andy		<p>Policy states 'Green infrastructure' but the Borough does not have a Green Belt.</p> <p>Development must only be permitted where, after taking account of other relevant local plan policies, it maximises the potential for generating renewable energy and is designed to reduce energy consumption as much as possible. The location of development needs also to recognise the need to minimise emissions from transport.</p>	<p>Green Infrastructure refers to "A network of multi-functional green and blue spaces and other natural features, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental, economic, health and wellbeing benefits for nature, climate, local and wider communities and prosperity." This is different to Green Belt which is a designation.</p> <p>The Plan contains policies relating to renewable energy generation, covered in Policy CC4 and building sustainability covered in high quality design D1.</p> <p>The Council's development strategy was influenced by factors such as "Transport corridors and opportunities to encourage more active travel modes" as stated in paragraph 3.6 of</p>

			the Plan. Furthermore, Policy TIN1 promotes sustainable and active travel modes as part of new development.
Persimmon Homes		It is assumed that this new element of the Policy is referring to the Optional Building Regulations. If this is the intention of the Policy, the Policy working should confirm / clarify this.	The policy is referring to a general support for development which chooses to exceed current building regulation standards with regards to sustainability and efficiency of new buildings.
Russell, Hazel		<p>Development must only be permitted where, after taking account of other relevant local plan policies, it maximises the potential for generating renewable energy and is-designed to reduce energy consumption as much as possible. The location of development needs also to recognise the need to minimise emissions from transport.</p> <p>No targets have been set for CO2 emission reductions.</p> <p>Policy states 'Green infrastructure' but the Borough does not have a Green Belt.</p>	<p>The Plan contains policies relating to renewable energy generation, covered in Policy CC4 and building sustainability covered in high quality design D1. The Council's development strategy was influenced by factors such as "Transport corridors and opportunities to encourage more active travel modes" as stated in paragraph 3.6 of the Plan. Furthermore, Policy TIN1 promotes sustainable and active travel modes as part of new development.</p> <p>Current national policy and legislation do not require the setting of specific carbon reduction targets. However, the Plan contains policies and measures designed to secure the mitigation and adaption of climate change in accordance with the relevant policy and legislative framework.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure refers to "A network of multi-functional green and</p>

			blue spaces and other natural features, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental, economic, health and wellbeing benefits for nature, climate, local and wider communities and prosperity.” This is different to Green Belt which is a designation.
Ward, June		<p>Policy states ‘Green infrastructure’ but the Borough does not have a Green Belt.</p> <p>No targets have been set for CO2 emission reductions.</p> <p>Development must only be permitted where, after taking account of other relevant local plan policies, it is designed to reduce energy consumption.</p>	<p>Green Infrastructure refers to “A network of multi-functional green and blue spaces and other natural features, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental, economic, health and wellbeing benefits for nature, climate, local and wider communities and prosperity.” This is different to Green Belt which is a designation.</p> <p>Current national policy and legislation do not require the setting of specific carbon reduction targets which tracks national and international obligations in Local Plans. However, the Plan contains policies and measures designed to secure the mitigation and adaption of climate change in accordance with the relevant policy and legislative framework.</p> <p>The Plan contains policies relating to building sustainability covered in high quality design D1.</p>

Notter, John		Policy takes no account on how the dramatic changes in climate will affect the area in providing basic resources such as fresh water in long periods of drought to an increased population and the resulting social disorder that could result from this.	The Plan as a whole, contains policies and measures designed to secure the mitigation and adaption of climate change in accordance with the relevant policy and legislative framework. With particular regard to water resources, Policy D4 requires development to achieve the minimum the Optional Technical Housing Standard for Water efficiency of no more than 110 litres per person per day. In addition, development that achieves the even higher 100 litres per person per day is supported.
--------------	--	---	--

### Representations on policy CC2 - Managing Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems

**Number of representations on policy: 4 (This is an unchanged policy)**

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Natural England		Welcomes revised policy wording. However, it is recommended the Policy also makes clear that where SuDS are proposed as a fundamental part of Habitat sites mitigation, developments will need to demonstrate the long-term (in perpetuity) monitoring, maintenance/replacement, and funding arrangements.	<p>Noted. Paragraph 8.27.1 states that where applications for development that propose SuDS to ensure development does not result in direct water quality impacts on designated sites, they will need to provide a suitable framework for the in-perpetuity monitoring, maintenance/replacement of those SuDS.</p> <p>In addition, Policy NE1 and its supporting text ensures development is only permitted where designated sites are protected and there are</p>



			measures in place (where appropriate) to ensure no adverse effect on site integrity.
Coastal Partners	8.17	Some sites may not be in current flood zone 2 or 3 but with climate change are indicated to be at risk as soon as 2025. Therefore, it is recommended that the text be altered to clarify a FRA is required for all development within flood zone 2 and 3, or are shown to be within flood zone 2 or 3 as a result of climate change.	Noted. The Council has produced a Local Plan SFRA assessing flood risk both now and in the future to its proposed allocations. The Council will also require an FRA for applicable development in accordance with Policy CC2, the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance.
Coastal Partners	8.22	The paragraph wording suggests that the scheme is currently in development which is misleading. The scheme relied heavily on the prospect that significant contributions to the detailed design and construction and despite intensive negotiations between Portsmouth City Council and the private developer, a mutually agreeable method for securing the contribution has not been identified. Without 3rd party contributions the planned scheme will not go ahead in its current form. It is recommended that the text is altered.	Noted. However, this is recognised in the supporting text at Paragraph 8.22: "The Environment Agency and the Eastern Solent Coastal Partnership (ESCP) have developed plans to reduce the risk of flooding particularly along the coastal stretch from Portchester Castle and Port Solent." Paragraph 8.22 then goes on to state "However, the implementation of these defences relies on a substantial funding contribution which at the time of writing has not been identified." Therefore, it is clear that the scheme has not commenced and is contingent on sufficient funding.
Coastal Partners		The Local Plan refers to the Eastern Solent Coastal Partnership (ESCP) throughout and in particular the Climate Change policy section. The ESCP rebranded in 2020 to Coastal Partners and therefore all references to the ESCP should be changed to Coastal Partners (CP).	Noted. References to ESCP were correct at the time of writing.

Representations on policy CC3 - Coastal Change Management Areas			
Number of representations on policy: 3 (This is an unchanged policy and supporting text)			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Coastal Partners	Figure 8.1	Eastern Solent Coastal Partnership (ESCP) should be changed to Coastal Partners (CP). The map shown as Figure 8.1 is now out of date. Below is a newer version which should be used instead. Please contact coastal.team@havant.gov.uk if you would like the original file.	Noted. References to ESCP were correct at the time of writing.
Coastal Partners	8.43	It is suggested the wording is changed. <i>"Coastal Partners, in partnership with Portsmouth City Council, Fareham Brough Council, The Environment Agency and Quadrant Estates developed plans to reduce the risk of flooding along the coastal stretch from Portchester Castle and Port Solent. However, the scheme requires significant funding to proceed which at time of writing has not been identified. Fareham Borough Council and Portsmouth City Council remain committed to trying to reduce flood and coastal erosion to the existing communities and will investigate alternative delivery models for the future."</i>	Noted. Wording of paragraph 8.43 was correct at the time of writing. Paragraph 8.43 does state "the implementation of these defences relies on a substantial funding contribution which at the time of writing has not been identified." making it clear that the project has not commenced and is contingent on sufficient funding.
Coastal Partners	8.44	The following wording change is suggested after last sentence in paragraph <i>"Therefore it is important that flood and erosion risk management is taken into consideration where necessary"</i> .	Noted. Flood risk and coastal change is taken into consideration as part of National policy and Policy CC2 and Policy CC3.
Natural England		The reference to the 'English Coast Path' should be updated to the 'England Coast Path' in the Policy.	Noted. Wording was correct at the time of writing.

Marine Management Organisation	8.57-8.59	We note that marine planning and the South Marine Plan is referred to within the Local Plan	Noted.
<b>Representations on policy CC4 - Renewable and Low Carbon Energy</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 3</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Burdfield, Anne Marie	8.60	This paragraph mentions the requirement of meeting CO <sub>2</sub> emission reduction targets, but no targets have been set or any targets towards renewable energy generation in the Plan.	Current national policy and legislation do not require the setting of specific carbon reduction or renewable energy production targets. However, the Plan contains policies and measures designed to secure the mitigation and adaption of climate change (including reductions in CO <sub>2</sub> emissions) in accordance with the relevant policy and legislative framework.
Hawkins, Phillip	8.60	This paragraph mentions the requirement of meeting CO <sub>2</sub> emission reduction targets, but no targets have been set in the Plan.	Current national policy and legislation do not require the setting of specific carbon reduction targets. However, the Plan contains policies and measures designed to secure the mitigation and adaption of climate change (including reductions in CO <sub>2</sub> emissions) in accordance with the relevant policy and legislative framework.
Jackson, Andy	8.60	This paragraph mentions the requirement of meeting CO <sub>2</sub> emission reduction targets, but no targets have been set in the Plan.	Current national policy and legislation do not require the setting of specific carbon reduction targets. However, the Plan contains policies and

			measures designed to secure the mitigation and adaption of climate change (including reductions in CO <sub>2</sub> emissions) in accordance with the relevant policy and legislative framework.
<b>Representations on policy NE1 - Protection of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and the Local Ecological Network</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 5 (This is an unchanged policy and supporting text)</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Hawkins, Phillip		This Policy requires designated sites to be "protected and enhanced". However, Policy NE4 regarding nutrient impacts on designated sites states permissions will be granted where the integrity of designated sites be maintained. There is no mention of enhancement. In addition, Para 9.54 indicates that proposals for development should provide a net reduction in eutrophication for designated sites in an unfavourable condition, restoring the condition to favourable. There appears to be an inconsistency between Policy NE1 and NE4 and this contravenes the Habitat Regulations.	Both Policy NE1 and NE4 would apply when dealing with protected sites. The Plan and its policies should be read as a whole and is Habitat Regulations compliant.
Burdfield, Anne-Marie		This Policy requires designated sites to be "protected and enhanced". However, Policy NE4 regarding nutrient impacts on designated sites states permissions will be granted where the integrity of designated sites be maintained. There is no mention of enhancement. In addition, Para 9.54 indicates that proposals for development should provide a net reduction in eutrophication for designated sites in an unfavourable condition,	Both Policy NE1 and NE4 would apply when dealing with protected sites. The Plan and its policies should be read as a whole and is Habitat Regulations compliant.

		restoring the condition to favourable. There appears to be an inconsistency between Policy NE1 and NE4 and this contravenes the Habitat Regulations.	
Russell, Hazel		This Policy requires designated sites to be “protected and enhanced”. However, Policy NE4 regarding nutrient impacts on designated sites states permissions will be granted where the integrity of designated sites be maintained. There is no mention of enhancement. In addition, Para 9.54 indicates that proposals for development should provide a net reduction in eutrophication for designated sites in an unfavourable condition, restoring the condition to favourable. There appears to be an inconsistency between Policy NE1 and NE4 and this contravenes the Habitat Regulations.	Both Policy NE1 and NE4 would apply when dealing with protected sites. The Plan and its policies should be read as a whole and is Habitat Regulations compliant.
Prince-Wright, Russell		In previous consultations, the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Trust stated the wording needed to be changed in the policy to ensure development proposals must protect, enhance and not have significant adverse impacts... They also stated it is important that as well as having regard for important 'natural landscape features' the policy seeks to enhance and reconnect ecological networks where they have been compromised	Noted. Comments made by the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust to previous Local Plan consultations have already been taken into consideration.
Jackson, Andy		In previous consultations, the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Trust stated the wording needed to be changed in the policy to ensure development proposals must protect, enhance and not have significant adverse impacts... They also stated it is important that as well as having regard for important 'natural landscape features' the policy seeks to enhance and reconnect ecological networks where they have been compromised	Noted. Comments made by the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust to previous Local Plan consultations have already been taken into consideration.

Representations on policy NE2 - Biodiversity Net Gain			
Number of representations on policy: 10 (This is an unchanged policy)			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Prince-Wright, Russell		In previous consultations, the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Trust stated changes were necessary to Policy 'NE2: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation' to ensure that the delivery of 'net gains' in biodiversity is the minimum required achievement. In addition, Natural England also commented on the policy at the time that it strongly recommends that all developments achieve biodiversity net gain, including a requirement for all planning applications to be accompanied by a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP) that has been approved by a Hampshire County Council (HCC) Ecologist.	Noted. Comments made by the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust and Natural England to previous Local Plan consultations have already been taken into consideration.
Burdfield Anee-Marie		In previous consultations, the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Trust stated changes were necessary to Policy 'NE2: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation' to ensure that the delivery of 'net gains' in biodiversity is the minimum required achievement. In addition, Natural England also commented on the policy at the time that it strongly recommends that all developments achieve biodiversity net gain, including a requirement for all planning applications to be accompanied by a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP) that has been approved by a Hampshire County Council (HCC) Ecologist.	Noted. Comments made by the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust and Natural England to previous Local Plan consultations have already been taken into consideration.

		.	
Jackson, Andy		In previous consultations, the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Trust stated changes were necessary to Policy 'NE2: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation' to ensure that the delivery of 'net gains' in biodiversity is the minimum required achievement. In addition, Natural England also commented on the policy at the time that it strongly recommends that all developments achieve biodiversity net gain, including a requirement for all planning applications to be accompanied by a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP) that has been approved by a Hampshire County Council (HCC) Ecologist.	Noted. Comments made by the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust and Natural England to previous Local Plan consultations have already been taken into consideration.
Megginson Hilary		In previous consultations, the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Trust stated changes were necessary to Policy 'NE2: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation' to ensure that the delivery of 'net gains' in biodiversity is the minimum required achievement. In addition, Natural England also commented on the policy at the time that it strongly recommends that all developments achieve biodiversity net gain, including a requirement for all planning applications to be accompanied by a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP) that has been approved by a Hampshire County Council (HCC) Ecologist.	Noted. Comments made by the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust and Natural England to previous Local Plan consultations have already been taken into consideration.
CPRE Hampshire		Support for Policy	Support welcomed.
CPRE Hampshire	9.32	Significant concerns about the revised text in this paragraph regarding the ability to assess habitat condition and type, and to enforce any failure to achieve promised improvements.	Noted. Further guidance is expected in the emerging Environment Bill and secondary Legislation around monitoring and enforcement.

CPRE Hampshire	9.35	Paragraph should be updated to reflect the updated Defra Metric 3.0 which has recently been released.	Noted. Use of the most up-to-date metric will be a material consideration at the planning application stage.
Terence O'Rourke (Miller Homes)		<p>The Environment Bill will cover the requirement for development sites to deliver net biodiversity gain. In order to ensure the plan is consistent with national policy, the requirement for biodiversity net gain should be set at the national level.</p> <p>It may be very challenging to demonstrate 10% net gain at the planning application stage and then later control and monitor. Furthermore, features introduced into a development now to ensure biodiversity net gain is achieved may not be relevant, function or be necessary throughout the lifetime of the development.</p>	<p>Disagree. Paragraph 179b of the NPPF states that "plans should: identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity". Policy NE2 provides the mechanism and means to secure and achieve such measurable net gains.</p> <p>The policy approach is consistent with emerging legislation, supports the wider objectives contained within the 25 Year Environment and is being successfully administered in Local Authorities across the country. Further guidance is expected in the merging Environment Bill and secondary Legislation around monitoring and enforcement.</p>
Natural England	9.32	Noted new wording in paragraph 9.32	Noted.
Natural England	9.35	Paragraph should be updated to reflect the updated Defra Metric 3.0 which has recently been released.	Noted. Use of the most up-to-date metric will be a material consideration at the planning application stage.
Natural England		It is recommended that the policy should align as closely with the Environment Bill and anticipated framework for mandatory net gain. The Policy should confirm the intention for a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to be developed to provide further detail within an appropriate timescale.	Noted. As stated in paragraph 9.44, the Council will consider the production of SPD if the Government guidance/Environment Bill requires further local clarification.
Persimmon Homes		Paragraph 174d of the NPPF does not require 'at least 10% net gain'. This provision is set out in the Environment Bill which has not yet received royal	Disagree. Paragraph 179b of the NPPF states that "plans should: identify and pursue opportunities for



		<p>assent. Therefore, at present, the requirement for 10% should be deleted and the amount of net gain should be determined through negotiation between an applicant, the Council and Natural England.</p> <p>The Policy should be redrafted so that at least 10% BNG (or whatever percentage eventually materialises through the Bill) will only be required once the Bill has become law.</p>	<p>securing measurable net gains for biodiversity". Policy NE2 provides the mechanism and means to secure and achieve such measurable net gains.</p> <p>The policy approach is consistent with emerging legislation, supports the wider objectives contained within the 25 Year Environment and is being successfully administered in Local Authorities across the country. Any changes to the Environment Bill in particular the 10% requirement will be a material consideration at the planning application stage.</p>
Persimmon Homes	9.30	<p>This paragraph states that the Policy will not apply to land contained within the Welborne Plan. Once the Environment Bill becomes law all planning application will be required to achieve this required BNG increase. There are no provisions in the Bill to exempt sites (including Welborne) from this requirement. As such, Paragraph 9.30 should be deleted.</p>	<p>Welborne is subject to its own Plan with biodiversity commitments.</p>
Hoggett, Nigel	9.32	<p>Paragraph is vague and not positively prepared. It should be that All new developments are encouraged and supported to promote biodiversity, through means such as inclusion of swift bricks, bat boxes and hedgehog highways.</p>	<p>Noted. The Defra metric for calculating Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) relies upon assessing habitats to calculate a biodiversity score. As such it is difficult to factor in features such as swift bricks and bat boxes into BNG calculations. As a result, these are supported as valuable contributions towards the biodiversity of new development but don't form part of BNG requirements.</p>

Jamieson, Sarah	9.32	Paragraph is vague and not positively prepared. It should be that All new developments are encouraged and supported to promote biodiversity, through means such as inclusion of swift bricks, bat boxes and hedgehog highways.	Noted. The Defra metric for calculating Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) relies upon assessing habitats to calculate a biodiversity score. As such it is difficult to factor in features such as swift bricks and bat boxes into BNG calculations. As a result, these are supported as valuable contributions towards the biodiversity of new development but don't form part of BNG requirements.
<b>Representations on policy - NE3 Recreational Disturbance on the Solent Special Protection Areas (SPAs)</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 3 (This is an unchanged policy)</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Viney, Tracey		Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy is ineffective and does not satisfactorily mitigate for recreational disturbance impacts on the Solent designated sites. The level of disturbance is increasing year on year along the coast with increases in dog ownership and increases canoes, paddleboards, kite surfers and other forms of water based recreation.	Disagree. The Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy is monitored and regularly reviewed by the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership to ensure it is effective.
Viney, Tracey	9.46	The use of the term 'may' with regards to other types of development (such as new hotels, student accommodation, care homes and camping and caravan sites) is inappropriate and must be stronger to protect the European protected sites.	Disagree. Developments such as new hotels, student accommodation, care homes and camping and caravan sites may not always have impacts or the same level of impact as normal residential development and therefore these developments need to be assessed on a case by case basis to

			ensure there is proportionate mitigation.
Robjohns, Amy		Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy is ineffective and does not satisfactorily mitigate for recreational disturbance impacts on the Solent designated sites. The policy applies to net increases in residential development, however disturbance is happening now due to existing development and therefore more needs to be done to decrease impacts from existing as well as future development.	Disagree. The Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy is monitored and regularly reviewed by the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership to ensure it is effective. The Local Plan can only seek to mitigate the impacts of new development, not existing development.
<b>Representations on policy NE4 - Water Quality Effects on the Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Ramsar Sites of the Solent.</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 7 (This is an unchanged policy and supporting text)</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Gray, Ian		Development in the Local Plan will not be able to be nutrient neutral and will exacerbate the issue affecting the Solent designated sites.	Disagree. Under Policy NE4 development will not be permitted unless it can demonstrate nutrient neutrality. There are numerous mitigation schemes available for development to achieve neutrality.
Ross, William		Development in the Local Plan will not be able to be nutrient neutral and will exacerbate the issue affecting the Solent designated sites.	Disagree. Under Policy NE4 development will not be permitted unless it can demonstrate nutrient neutrality. There are numerous mitigation schemes available for development to achieve neutrality.
Prince-Wright, Russell		Policy NE1 requires designated sites to be "protected and enhanced". However, this Policy states permissions will be granted where the integrity of designated sites be maintained. There is	Both Policy NE4 and NE1 would apply when dealing with protected sites. The Plan and its policies should be read as

		no mention of enhancement. In addition, Para 9.54 indicates that proposals for development should provide a net reduction in eutrophication for designated sites in an unfavourable condition, restoring the condition to favourable. There appears to be an inconsistency between this Policy and Policy NE1 and this contravenes the Habitat Regulations.	a whole and is Habitat Regulations compliant.
Jackson, Andy		Policy NE1 requires designated sites to be “protected and enhanced”. However, this Policy states permissions will be granted where the integrity of designated sites be maintained. There is no mention of enhancement. In addition, Para 9.54 indicates that proposals for development should provide a net reduction in eutrophication for designated sites in an unfavourable condition, restoring the condition to favourable. There appears to be an inconsistency between this Policy and Policy NE1 and this contravenes the Habitat Regulations.	Both Policy NE4 and NE1 would apply when dealing with protected sites. The Plan and its policies should be read as a whole and is Habitat Regulations compliant.
Meggison, Hilary		Policy NE1 requires designated sites to be “protected and enhanced”. However, this Policy states permissions will be granted where the integrity of designated sites be maintained. There is no mention of enhancement. In addition, Para 9.54 indicates that proposals for development should provide a net reduction in eutrophication for designated sites in an unfavourable condition, restoring the condition to favourable. There appears to be an inconsistency between this Policy and Policy NE1 and this contravenes the Habitat Regulations.	Both Policy NE4 and NE1 would apply when dealing with protected sites. The Plan and its policies should be read as a whole and is Habitat Regulations compliant.
Russell, Hazel		Policy NE1 requires designated sites to be “protected and enhanced”. However, this Policy states permissions will be granted where the	Both Policy NE4 and NE1 would apply when dealing with protected sites. The Plan and its policies should be read as

		integrity of designated sites be maintained. There is no mention of enhancement. In addition, Para 9.54 indicates that proposals for development should provide a net reduction in eutrophication for designated sites in an unfavourable condition, restoring the condition to favourable. There appears to be an inconsistency between this Policy and Policy NE1 and this contravenes the Habitat Regulations.	a whole and is Habitat Regulations compliant.
Hawkins, Phillip		Policy NE1 requires designated sites to be "protected and enhanced". However, this Policy states permissions will be granted where the integrity of designated sites be maintained. There is no mention of enhancement. In addition, Para 9.54 indicates that proposals for development should provide a net reduction in eutrophication for designated sites in an unfavourable condition, restoring the condition to favourable. There appears to be an inconsistency between this Policy and Policy NE1 and this contravenes the Habitat Regulations.	Both Policy NE4 and NE1 would apply when dealing with protected sites. The Plan and its policies should be read as a whole and is Habitat Regulations compliant.
<b>Representations on policy - NE5 Solent Wader and Brent Goose Sites</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 5</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Southern Water		Part of the SW&BG designation at Peel Common WwTW (F11 and F12) overlays some operational areas and structures. These should be excluded from designation.	It is not the remit of the Local Plan to amend SWBG designations. This work is undertaken by Natural England and the SWBG Steering group. Any changes to the SWBG network would

			be a material consideration at the planning application stage.
Woolf Bond Planning (Foreman Homes)		The Site, comprising land to the south of Romsey Avenue should be deleted as Primary Support Area and the designation covering it should be removed from the Proposals Map.	It is not the remit of the Local Plan to amend SWBG designations. This work is undertaken by Natural England and the SWBG Steering group. Any changes to the SWBG network would be a material consideration at the planning application stage.
Natural England		The SWBG mapping may be subject to change over the plan period, therefore it is recommended the Policy ensures the latest mapping is sought in advance of determining planning applications.	Noted.
Natural England		Advise that developments affecting SPA supporting habitat should produce a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to address potential impacts to these habitats during the construction phase. In particular, noise disturbance should be addressed.	Noted. The issue would also be covered within a project level HRA accompanying a planning application.
Natural England		It is recommended that the Local Plan identifies some suitable projects to which financial contributions can be directed towards to ensure the protection and enhancement of the wider SWBG network.	Noted. The Council prefers onsite mitigation, or on sites broadly close to the site, for the Local Plan allocations.
Persimmon Homes		<p>Policy requires that '<i>A suitable replacement habitat is provided on a like for like basis broadly close to the site</i>' the Council's evidence for this assertion is absent.</p> <p>Furthermore, legal advice states that it is only necessary for replacement habitat to mitigate the same population of bird species. Redrafting of this Policy is therefore required that takes this into account.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council prefers onsite mitigation, or on sites broadly close to the site, for the Local Plan allocations.</p> <p>Disagree. The policy states "<i>suitable replacement habitat</i>". This would still be required in order to mitigate for the same population of bird species. If the replacement habitat is not a suitable type or in suitable condition it cannot support the bird species in question.</p>

Persimmon Homes		The SWBG mapping may be subject to change over the plan period leading to the Policies map becoming out of date. As a result, it is recommended that the SWBG Sites are deleted from the Policies Map.	Disagree. Paragraph 23 of the NPPF states that land use designations such as the SWBG designations should be identified on a policies map. Any amendments to the SWBG network would be a material consideration at the planning application stage.
Robjohns, Amy		Better management of SWBG sites would likely lead to an increase of target species and the subsequent value of those SWBG sites.	Noted.
<b>Representations on policy NE8 - Air Quality</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 4</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Hampshire County Council		Given the connection between road transport, local plan allocations, air quality and health, County Council recommends that there needs to be cross-referencing on air quality within the Climate, Natural Environment and Transport chapters to reinforce the message.	Noted. References to air quality appear throughout the plan including within the climate change, natural environment, employment/housing allocation chapters.
Terence O'Rourke (Miller Homes)		Policy needs to be more flexible. Instead of providing the charging point for each dwelling with off-street parking, the policy could require developers to enable dwellings to be future proofed to enable its instalment if required in the future. This is compliant with the NPPF 107(e) which requires development to 'enable' charging facilities.	Disagree. The NPPF states that the Planning system 'should help to shape places in ways that contribute to the radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions'. Requiring the provision of EV charging facilities within new development will help promote the shift away from the use of fossil fuels and helps fulfil the objective of 'radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions'.

Terence O'Rourke (Miller Homes)		Fast charging facilities carry a very substantial installation cost. Policy is too unnecessarily onerous by requiring fast charging infrastructure to be provided for parking areas serving 10 or more dwellings. A 'Fast' charge facility delivers 80% charge in 6 hours and is appropriate for residential parking where vehicles will generally be in situ for longer periods of time.	EV charging points are considered within Viability study accompanying the Plan. It includes a breakdown on costs for EV charging points.  Note support for the revised wording of policy from 'rapid' to 'fast' with regards to EV charging points in shared parking areas per 10 residential dwellings or 1,000m2 of commercial or leisure floorspace.
Terence O'Rourke (Miller Homes)	9.117	Paragraph should be specific about those developments that will require a detailed Travel Plan to be produced, it is suggested by referring to the Hampshire County Council thresholds.	The paragraph details the principles of good design stated in the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) Land-use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality. This is what developments shall consider and employ.
Saunders, Ruth		Given the government target for all cars to be electric by 2030, the thresholds for EV charging facilities is wholly inadequate. Policy should be amended so that there is one charging point per dwelling across all development.	Disagree. Fast charge facilities within shared parking enables multiple users to charge their vehicles in the least amount of time (whilst still being financially viable to users) in order to adequately service the expected number of users within that shared space.
Persimmon Homes		Welcome further elaboration in the supporting text or policy regarding the specification of charging points, particularly with regards to expected power output/capacity. The Council should be aware of the potential design implications of this element of the Policy.	Details regarding the specification of charging points and expected power output / capacity would be dealt with at the planning application stage.



Persimmon Homes		As demand for EV charging increases, it will be necessary to provide additional sub-stations as part of development that would otherwise not be required. It is unclear whether this has been factored into the Council Local Plan viability assessment.	EV charging points are considered within Viability study accompanying the Plan. An addendum to the Council's Viability Study includes a breakdown on costs for EV charging points.
<b>Representations on policy NE9 - Green Infrastructure</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 1 (This is an unchanged policy and supportive text)</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Gosport Borough Council		Gosport Borough Council supports the aims of this policy however it considers that the policy and supporting text needs to highlight opportunities to secure strategic green infrastructure improvements across Fareham Borough including within the Fareham, Gosport, Lee-on-the-Solent and Stubbington Strategic Gap. Reference should be made that Fareham Borough Council and Gosport Borough Council will work together to develop a joint strategy for the Strategic Gap between Fareham, Gosport, Lee-on-the-Solent and Stubbington. This is particularly in light of the latest allocations HA54 and HA55.	Support noted.  Disagree. However, the policy requires development where possible to provide GI which connects to the wider GI Network. The policy also ensures that development does not impact upon the delivery of any identified local and strategic GI projects across the subregion. Cross border working on GI is referenced in the Statement of Common Ground with GBC.

Representations on policy NE10 - Open Space			
Number of representations on policy: 3			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Charlwood, Pamela		The Council should work with local organisations and individuals with knowledge and expertise regarding local wildlife so as to ensure a coherent and evidence based approach underpins policies NE1, NE2, NE4, NE5, NE9 and NE10 and links directly to Policy DS2 regarding the future of the Strategic Gaps.	Noted.
Persimmon Homes		The word 'clearly' introduces a significant degree of subjectivity into the policy which is unnecessary and will ultimately make interpretation of the Policy more difficult for the decision-maker and applicants alike. It is recommended that the word 'clearly' be deleted from the policy wording.	Disagree. Additional wording was included into the policy to make it more consistent with paragraph 99a of the NPPF.
Sport England		Notes the proposed amendment. However, It is considered that it could be further strengthened through the inclusion of the following wording 'The open space, or the relevant part, is clearly shown to be surplus to local requirements <i>as evidenced by a robust assessment of need</i> and will not be needed in the long-term...'	Disagree. Paragraph 9.127 of the supporting text clarifies that any proposals for development on all or part of open space should be accompanied by a detailed assessment of that open space.
Sport England	9.129	Paragraph would allow schools to expand onto the playing field and result in the loss of playing field land without having to meet the tests of the Policy. Sport England does not support such an approach and is considered to be contrary to NPPF para 99 as well as our own Playing Fields Policy. We therefore object to para 9.129.	Noted. However, regardless of the wording in 9.129 of the Plan, if the Secretary of State approves the disposal of surplus school playing fields then an exception would still be made to the policy.

Representations on policy TIN1 – Sustainable Transport			
Number of representations on policy: 4			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Robert Marshall for Fareham Society	10.1-10.19	The transport evidence is out of date and incomplete as Plan introduces significant new highway proposals in relation to the site West of Downend Road. Supporting work is not in the public domain.	The Strategic Transport Assessment was undertaken on a presumed scenario which does indeed differ from the Local Plan development strategy. However, the STA is based on a higher housing figure than is included in the Plan and includes a higher number of dwellings at Downend (1,000). The Technical Note published alongside the Local Plan provides an explanation and reflection on the differences between the scenarios. The model loads traffic onto the existing network and so the STA shows that 1,000 dwellings does not create any impacts which cannot be mitigated on the existing network. This is sufficient evidence at the Local Plan level with detailed modelling to take place through the planning application process.
CPRE Hampshire	TIN1	Support the approach taken by Fareham BC and consider Policy TIN1 to be a good starting point but it does not go far enough to secure good growth. The Council should reject development which is not	Noted and welcome support but also disagree. TIN1 will allow the Council to consider sustainable transport measures in the consideration of applications. The Highway Authority

		already located around, or can provide, public mass transit hubs, in particular the rail network.	will be publishing its Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) which will provide the framework for sustainable measures. There are a limited number of mass public transport hubs in the borough and so whilst these should be a focus, a more flexible approach is required. The transport policies in the Plan support the Highway Authority's aspirations for seeking alternatives to capacity improvements as first step.
Hampshire County Council (Highway Authority)	TIN1	The LHA supports the amendments to this policy. In addition, the LHA recommend that the supporting text should add that: new cycle routes within and off-site should comply with the latest DfT cycle design guidance LTN 1/20 and should include improvements to existing cycle routes where the existing provision is substandard.	Noted.
Annie Bevis	TIN1	Not many bus routes accessing employment spaces from housing areas or from Fareham towards Southampton.	Noted. Bus services obviously need to be viable services to run, but policy TIN1 and TIN2 nevertheless provide the framework and policy hook for the highway authority to secure public transport infrastructure where required as well as improved walking and cycling opportunities.

## Representations on policy TIN2 – Highway Safety and Road Network

Number of representations on policy: 14

Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Anne Brierley	10.14	The Strategic Transport Assessment doesn't take account of 830 homes in Warsash	Disagree. HA1 has been included in the transport modelling as can be seen on page 13 of the SRTM modelling report.
John Bolwell	TIN2	All housing development will add to traffic congestion. The idea of adding demand to existing network is fundamentally unsound. The Stubbington bypass will very quickly fill to capacity. Running any traffic infrastructure at or close to its theoretical capacity is of its nature unsound.	Disagree. New housing will add to traffic levels created by existing dwellings/residents but traffic modelling within the Strategic Transport Assessment shows how this can and will be managed which is then required by Policy TIN2. The Stubbington Bypass was modelled to include future levels of growth for both housing and jobs and so will operate within capacity.
D J Fudge	TIN2	Focus on Delme misses the reason for the problems. The A32 cannot handle the traffic. Regardless of any improvement to Delme the problem is the A32.	Disagree. The review of Delme Roundabout is brought about by the queues along Cams Hill road (A27). Alterations to Delme will have an impact to this queuing traffic as shown by the Junction Modelling report accompanying the Local Plan.
Gosport Borough Council	TIN2	Policy is supported.	Noted.
Hampshire County Council (Highway Authority)	TIN2	Support the policy amendment and supporting text to reflect the sequential approach to assessing the mitigation measures required for a development	Noted. The text in the supporting wording (para 10.16) requires mitigation schemes at identified

		<p>site. This should also be applied to the highway mitigation schemes identified in the TA and listed in paragraph 10.15. The LHA supports the amendment to paragraph 10.16 which recognises that the Parkway/Leafy Lane junction identified in the Strategic Transport Assessment does not warrant a mitigation scheme for increased junction capacity but a scheme more in line with its traffic management role in a residential area.</p>	<p>locations to be delivered in line with Policy TIN2, therefore based on the sequential approach, so no further wording is required.</p>
AECOM for Highways England	TIN2	<p>Consider that the text contained within both the IDP and the Local Plan adequately safeguard the Strategic Road Network by clearly stating that any impacts will need to be identified and mitigated.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Joy Hobson	TIN2	<p>To reduce the traffic at the TGI roundabout, create a small roundabout at the eastern end of Park Gate Superstores by the car sales lot</p> <p>There is also an ill placed bus stop just inside Warsash Road off the A27 roundabout (before Kites Croft roundabout). By waiting for the bus to move off, creates a very long tailback to the roundabout and A27.</p>	<p>The Local Plan is required to consider transport impacts derived from new housing contained within the Plan. Existing transport and highway issues and concerns are the responsibility of the Highway Authority (Hampshire County Council)</p>
Robert Marshall for Fareham Society	TIN2	<p>The transport evidence is out of date and incomplete. The Plan introduces a significant new highway proposal in relation to the site West of Downend Road. Supporting work does not appear to be in the public domain. The SRTM (September 2020) included in the evidence base does not include this proposed new link road and junction and there are no references to it in the Strategic Transport Assessment.</p>	<p>The Strategic Transport Assessment was undertaken on a presumed scenario which differs from the Local Plan development strategy. However, the STA is based on a higher housing figure than is included in the Plan and includes a higher number of dwellings at Downend (1,000). The Technical Note published alongside the Local Plan provides an explanation and reflection on the differences between the scenarios. The model loads traffic onto the existing network and so the</p>

			STA shows that 1,000 dwellings does not create any impacts which cannot be mitigated on the existing network. This is sufficient evidence at the Local Plan level with detailed modelling to take place through the planning application process.
Roy Roberts	TIN2	Authorities have duty to improve or maintain quality of life. 1. Ambient traffic noise already blights many people's lives. Electric cars will not significantly reduce this. Road and tyre noise predominate.	The Local Plan is required to consider transport impacts derived from new housing contained within the Plan. Existing transport and highway issues and concerns are the responsibility of the Highway Authority (Hampshire County Council).
Philip Hawkins	10.15	The Strategic Transport Assessment doesn't take account of 830 homes in Warsash.	Disagree. HA1 has been included in the transport modelling as can be seen on page 13 of the SRTM modelling report.
Christopher Moore	10.15	Rookery Avenue should be opened to through traffic, as per the original plans for Whiteley.	There is no requirement to deliver the link through Rookery Avenue as a result of Local Plan growth and no request from the Highway Authority to safeguard the route. The Local Plan is required to consider transport impacts derived from new housing contained within the Plan only. Existing transport and highway issues and concerns are the responsibility of the Highway Authority (Hampshire County Council)
June Ward	10.15	Needs to be more consideration to the Transport Assessment. There is no reference for the mitigation assessment required to reduce congestion by 2037.	Disagree. The Transport Assessment identifies where mitigation is needed, and this is stipulated in Policy TIN2 and para 10.15. The Local Plan also requires localised impacts to be assessed through Transport

			Assessments and any mitigation can then be required/requested by the Highway Authority through Policy TIN2.
Winchester City Council	10.16	The council is supportive of the added text at 10.16 which refers to the Parkway / Leafy Lane junction.	Noted.
Hampshire County Council (Highway Authority)	10.18– 10.19	<p>The LHA acknowledges that the SGAs (totalling 2,150 houses) have been replaced with 3 new housing site allocations on the edge of the built-up areas (totalling 1,980 houses). This development strategy assumes that the new allocations on the edge of town will have easy access to existing facilities with the opportunity to use sustainable and active travel modes. This requires a master-planning approach. This is the opportunity to provide good quality cycle infrastructure which encourages cycling for the short trips which would otherwise be made by car.</p> <p>Site-specific TAs will be required at the planning application stage to fully assess the impact of the edge of town development sites and to apply the sequential approach to assessing the mitigation measures required starting with active travel and public transport options before considering highway capacity options as set out in amended policy TIN2 Highway Safety and road network.</p>	Noted.



Representations on policy TIN3 – Safeguarded Routes			
Number of representations on policy: 2			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Gosport Borough Council	TIN3	Policy TIN3 safeguards land between Delme Roundabout and the Portsmouth Boundary and the Quay Street Roundabout to support the delivery of the South East Hampshire Rapid Transit scheme. The extension will help improve public transport access to Gosport Borough and the Council is a partner organisation to improve the network and consequently the scheme and Policy TIN3 is supported.	Noted.
Hampshire County Council (Highway Authority)	10.24	The LHA supports the new supporting text in paragraph 10.24 which now refers to the future extensions of the SEHRT.	Noted.
Representations on policy TIN4 – Infrastructure Delivery			
Number of representations on policy: 11			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Janet Cooke	10.25	There is no plan for increasing supporting infrastructure. Current infrastructure already over stretched.	Disagree. Policy TIN4 provides policy hook for the delivery of new or improved infrastructure required to mitigate the impact of new development. This policy links to the

			Infrastructure Delivery Plan which identifies known requirements, though these will change, evolve and be added to over time as more detail emerges. Service providers will make representations to both the Local Plan and Planning Applications when the need arises and either provision or financial contributions are required.
Rosemary Petrazzini	TIN4	No accountability in terms of the S106 and CIL funding.	Disagree. Policy TIN4 provides policy hook for the delivery of new or improved infrastructure required to mitigate the impact of new development. Section 106 contributions requested in line with TIN4 must comply with the NPPF as set out in para 10.32 of the Plan. Mechanism for spending CIL is outside the scope of the Local Plan and is a Council Executive decision.
Philip Hawkins	10.26	Education and Health provision considered unsatisfactorily and unsound taking into consideration that HA1 alone will bring an additional 830 dwellings.	Disagree. Policy TIN4 provides policy hook for the delivery of new or improved infrastructure required to mitigate the impact of new development. This policy links to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which identifies known requirements, though these will change, evolve and be added to over time as more detail emerges. Service providers will make representations to both the Local Plan and Planning Applications when the need arises and either provision or financial contributions are required.

			Education projects are known projects in existing pipeline. HCC will continue to seek financial contributions from all new development to provide for additional school places.
Anne Brierly	10.26	Health provision considered unsatisfactorily and unsound taking into consideration that HA1 alone will bring an additional 830 dwellings.	Disagree. Policy TIN4 provides policy hook for the delivery of new or improved infrastructure required to mitigate the impact of new development. This policy links to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which identifies known requirements, though these will change, evolve and be added to over time as more detail emerges. Service providers will make representations to both the Local Plan and Planning Applications when the need arises and either provision or financial contributions are required. Education projects are known projects in existing pipeline.
June Ward	10.26-10.27	Education and Health provision considered unsatisfactorily and unsound taking into consideration that HA1 alone will bring an additional 830 dwellings.	Disagree. Policy TIN4 provides policy hook for the delivery of new or improved infrastructure required to mitigate the impact of new development. This policy links to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which identifies known requirements, though these will change, evolve and be added to over time as more detail emerges. Service providers will make representations to both the Local Plan and Planning Applications when the need arises and either provision or financial contributions are required.

			Education projects are known projects in existing pipeline. HCC will continue to seek financial contributions from all new development to provide for additional school places and early years places where they consider it necessary.
Andy Jackson	10.26-10.27	Education and Health provision considered unsatisfactorily and unsound and does not cover the Plan period.	Disagree. Policy TIN4 provides policy hook for the delivery of new or improved infrastructure required to mitigate the impact of new development. This policy links to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which identifies known requirements, though these will change, evolve and be added to over time as more detail emerges. Service providers will make representations to both the Local Plan and Planning Applications when the need arises and either provision or financial contributions are required. Education projects are known projects in existing pipeline. HCC will continue to seek financial contributions from all new development to provide for additional school places and early years places where they consider it necessary.
Janet Cooke	10.27	Education and Health provision considered unsatisfactorily and unsound taking into consideration that HA1 alone will bring an additional 830 dwellings.	Disagree. Policy TIN4 provides policy hook for the delivery of new or improved infrastructure required to mitigate the impact of new development. This policy links to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which identifies known requirements, though

			these will change, evolve and be added to over time as more detail emerges. Service providers will make representations to both the Local Plan and Planning Applications when the need arises and either provision or financial contributions are required. Education projects are known projects in existing pipeline. HCC will continue to seek financial contributions from all new development to provide for additional school places and early years places where they consider it necessary.
Hazel Russell	10.27	IDP calls for the expansion of health care provision but there is no scope to do this.	Noted but disagree. The IDP identifies requirements as set out by the Clinical Commissioning Group responsible for managing primary care. TIN4 provides the policy hook for seeking developer contributions.
Edward Morell for Funtley Village Society	10.28	Object over concerns on roads, health provision, education, services, impact on significantly impacted communities etc.	Disagree. Policy TIN4 provides policy hook for the delivery of new or improved infrastructure required to mitigate the impact of new development. This policy links to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which identifies known requirements, though these will change, evolve and be added to over time as more detail emerges. Service providers will make representations to both the Local Plan and Planning Applications when the need arises and either provision or financial contributions are required as and when they consider it necessary.

William Ross	10.28	Supporting infrastructure is not fit for purpose. It is all very well for Government to say they will increase this and that but we all know it doesn't happen or if it does, not on a large enough scale.	Disagree. Policy TIN4 provides policy hook for the delivery of new or improved infrastructure required to mitigate the impact of new development. This policy links to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which identifies known requirements, though these will change, evolve and be added to over time as more detail emerges. Service providers will make representations to both the Local Plan and Planning Applications when the need arises and either provision or financial contributions are required as and when they consider it necessary.
Edward Morell for Funtley Village Society	10.40	No accountability in terms of the S106 and CIL funding.	Disagree. All section 106 monies are spent as necessitated by the NPPF repeated in para 10.32 of the Plan. CIL money is collected by the Council and reported on annually, latterly through Infrastructure Funding Statements. Decisions on CIL spending are taken by the Council's Executive and are outside the remit of the Local Plan.
Southern Water	TIN4	Site specific policies should seek to ensure that the timing of the delivery of housing is coordinated so that development is not occupied before the provision of the network reinforcement required to accommodate it.	Noted. It would be expected that this would be addressed through the planning application stage through the use of conditions.

Representations on Policy D1 – High Quality Design and Placemaking			
Number of representations on policy: 7			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
CPRE	Para 11.27 Policy D1 criterion (i)	CPRE Hampshire welcomes the approach in Policy D1 but would like to see the inclusion of the words countryside and landscape into Criterion (i). The omission of these words makes it inconsistent with Strategic Policies DS1 and DS3 and therefore unsound.	Disagree. Addition of 'landscape' is unnecessary as it is part of 'local character' in criterion (i) and is described more fully in the supporting text paras 11.6 -11.8. Addition of 'countryside' is not appropriate as the policy concerns the quality of design and applies throughout the borough including urban areas. 'Countryside' is a reflection of function and other contextual elements that describe its character as covered by (i). 'Countryside' as used in relation to DS1 is a policy constraint to limit / direct the location and nature of new development. Policy DS3 relates to Areas of Special Landscape Quality, which would be considered in relation to D1 where locationally relevant. Landscape in general is covered by criterion (i) and paras 11.6 -11.8. The omission of these words therefore is not inconsistent with Strategic Policies DS1 and DS3 and as such policy D1 is not unsound.

		Submission plan will need to be updated to take account of the National Model Design Codes and Para 132 of the NPPF which states that development that is not well designed should be refused permission, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.	Noted. The criteria of D1 and supporting text are consistent with NMDG and paras 11.32 and 11.33 refer to future codes and guidance.  The Council acknowledges the recent changes to the NPPF with respect to design and 'beauty'.
Edward Gain	Para 11.27 Policy D1	We would also encourage considering more modern and sustainable approaches to construction such as pre-fabricated homes - constructing bespoke bricks and mortar properties in the 21st century just doesn't make sense from an economical or sustainability perspective. Please don't let archaic planning permission around aesthetics take priority over facing the existential crisis of climate change.	Noted. The policy does not restrict the construction method of new development.
Hampshire County Council Property Services	Para 11.27 Policy D1	Hampshire County Council, as landowner, supports Policy D1 as it considers that the density of schemes should be informed by and be sympathetic to the character of the surrounding areas, rather than having a set standard. This allows sufficient flexibility (effective) to support best practice urban design principles particularly with regards to legibility to emphasise the importance of place as well as sensitively manage the transition from an urban to rural settlement edge. In addition, this Policy accords with the current national guidance on design, such as the National Model Design Code.	Welcome support
Phillip Hawkins	Para 11.35	Para 11.35 The Council will support applications where development exceeds Building Regulations: Again no percentage target has been set. The Plan is therefore not sound regarding carbon emissions reduction in the Borough.	Noted, however there is no evidence locally that would support policies that go beyond the requirements of national Building Regulations, which are due to be updated in 2021 and



			again in 2025 that will move design to zero carbon compatibility.
Anne-Marie Burdfield	Para 11.36	Para 11.36 Developers are encouraged to design for natural ventilation and green infrastructure but no standards are set. Just meeting building regulations will not see the country meet the Government promised carbon reductions. The council therefore should set standards to ensure developers are designing for sustainability much like the London boroughs that are using new standards of SAP10 which although not yet within building regulations, should be adhered to.	Noted, however there is no evidence locally that would support policies that go beyond the requirements of national Building Regulations, which are due to be updated in 2021 and again in 2025 that will move design to zero carbon compatibility. FBC will consider standards and design for GI in the future, through adoption of SPD's
Andrew Jackson	Para11.35	Para 11.35 The council will support applications where development exceeds Building Regulations but no percentage target for improvement has been set. The Plan is therefore not a sound and effective approach to carbon emissions reduction in the Borough.	Noted, however there is no evidence locally that would support policies that go beyond the requirements of national Building Regulations, which are due to be updated in 2021 and again in 2025 that will move design to zero carbon compatibility.
Andrew Jackson	Para 11.36	Para 11.36 Developers are encouraged to design for natural ventilation and green infrastructure but no standards are set. Just meeting building regulations will not see the country meet the Government promised carbon reductions. The council therefore should set standards to ensure developers are designing for sustainability much like the London boroughs that are using new standards of SAP10 which although not yet within building regulations, should be adhered to.	Noted, however there is no evidence locally that would support policies that go beyond the requirements of national Building Regulations, which are due to be updated in 2021 and again in 2025 that will move design to zero carbon compatibility. FBC will consider standards and design for GI in the future, through adoption of SPD's.
June Ward	Para 11.36	There are no set standards set for carbon reduction as Developers are encouraged to design for natural ventilation and green infrastructure. Building populations are insufficient and will not enable the country to meet the promised carbon reductions. It	Noted, however there is no evidence locally that would support policies that go beyond the requirements of national Building Regulations, which are due to be updated in 2021 and

		is imperative that the council should set standards so that developers are designing for sustainability.	again in 2025 that will move design to zero carbon compatibility. FBC will consider standards and design for GI in the future, through adoption of SPD's.
<b>Representations on D4 – Water Quality and Resources</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 2</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Hampshire County Council Property Services	Para 11.52 Policy D4	Hampshire County Council in its role, as both a public landowner and service provider, supports the principle of Policies CC1 and D4. Notwithstanding this, the County Council is concerned that the draft policy does not meet the tests of soundness as it is not sufficiently flexible to respond to unexpected changes during the plan period. The County Council would be mindful to overcome its objection if the policy is amended to introduce sufficient flexibility in the wording. This would still seek to achieve a high standard of sustainable development but would not require potentially unattainable standards to be met	The policy covers water quality and efficiency and seeks to ensure new development are not be detrimental to the management and protection of river, coastal and groundwater (including Source Protection Zones). The policy allows and supports methods and systems to enhance resources in line with the Water Framework Directive (WFD) objectives. However it is a requirement to meet Optional Technical Housing Standard for Water efficiency of no more than 110 litres per person per day.
Hampshire County Council Property Services	Para 11.55/56	Hampshire County Council, in its role as a public landowner and service provider, supports the policy aspiration to achieve energy efficiencies in new non-residential development. In particular the County Council notes that paragraph 11.55 considers how	Para 11.55 allows alternative methods to BREEAM. The paragraph indicates that the council will support use of BREEAM for non-residential development. Applicants for development can set out how

		<p>the BREEAM assessment process can influence viability of a proposal and make allowances for this, to ensure the plan will remain effective over the plan period. For example, as landowner, the County Council considers that any forthcoming draft policy should be open to demonstrating meeting this energy efficiency standard by alternative equivalent standards such as those based on an embodied carbon (CO2 / Kg / sqm) metric as advocated by the RIBA 2030 Climate Challenge:</p> <p><a href="https://www.architecture.com/-/media/files/Climate-action/RIBA-2030-ClimateChallenge.pdf">https://www.architecture.com/-/media/files/Climate-action/RIBA-2030-ClimateChallenge.pdf</a></p>	<p>alternative energy efficiency assessments achieve the equivalent sustainability outcome and these will be a material consideration in the determination of a planning application.</p>
<b>Representations on D5 – Internal Space Standards</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 1</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Gladman	Para 11.62 policy D5	<p>The Council will need to provide robust evidence to justify the inclusion of the space standards within a policy. It should be justified by meeting the criteria set out in the PPG, including need, viability and impact on affordability.</p> <p>Gladman's concerns regarding the optional national space standards relates to the additional cost and the implications for affordability</p>	<p>Noted. The council has undertaken robust evidence to demonstrate mandatory requirement. The standard has been subject to viability testing. Further survey work of recently submitted applications support this.</p>

Representations on Appendix B (Housing Trajectory)			
Number of representations on policy: 1			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
Vistry Group (Tetra Tech		<p>Trajectory for Welborne uncertain due to funding issues. Further amendments to the Outline permission are currently awaiting determination.</p> <p>Further amendments to the Outline permission are currently awaiting determination. If approved, further approval of reserved matters will need to be sought for most of the development. The latest 5YHLS Position report also predicts that 30 units will be delivered in 2022, with a further 180 predicted for delivery in 2023. This timescale is considered overly ambitious and highly unlikely, given the scheme's delayed position in the planning system and in the absence of any evidence to suggest a faster delivery than the 'average' identified in the 'Start to Finish' report.</p>	<p>Disagree. Welborne benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, the S106 is well advanced, funding for the J10 improvement works has been secured and HCC have taken on the role as delivery partner. Therefore, FBC have confidence in the trajectory. The latest trajectory for Welborne shows completions starting in 2023/24 as set out in the Housing Delivery Action Plan.</p>

Representations on Evidence Base			
Number of representations on policy: 38			
Name of respondent	Specific paragraph (if any)	Issues Raised	Council Response
John Roughton-Bentley	Settlement Boundary Review	The map for Stubbington does not include No's 16A and 17 Lychgate Green in the settlement boundary as previously requested.	Inaccuracy in Settlement Boundary Review noted.
Prime UK Developments Ltd	Settlement Boundary Review	Considers that it is not clear that any changes made to the settlement boundary review will delivery any quantum of housing.	The purpose of the Settlement Boundary review is to take account of changes that have taken place since the previous boundaries were drawn and to ensure a consistent approach going forward. The methodology is set out in Chapter 4 of the review.
Rosemary Petrazzini	Viability Study	Concern that the viability assessment for the South of Funtley (HA10) and Welborne is inadequate. Concern that the figures for affordable housing have been substantially reduced.	Noted.
Bargate Homes (Pegasus)	Affordable Housing Evidence	Quantum of proposed development will not meet affordable housing needs in the Borough.	The need for affordable housing in the Borough is based on the number of existing and newly formed households who lack their own housing and cannot afford to meet their housing needs in the market. Through calculating the affordable housing provision in line with the proposed policy (Policy HP5), the Council's affordable need will be met.

Burdfield, Anne-Marie	SHELAA	Concerned that combined impact of homes in Warsash has not been assessed	Noted. Site allocations are not required to have obtained planning permission. The SHELAA includes an assessment of the overall site and considers the impact on the highways and ecology. Previous consultations have gathered evidence to ensure the soundness of the allocation.
Hawkins, Phil	SHELAA	Sites are missing from the list of page 74 of the SHELAA in relation to allocation HA1.	Noted. The omission from the list of sites does not affect the overall assessment.
Brierley, Anne	Statement of Consultation	Making representations is difficult and confusing. Too much to read.	Noted, however this stage is a formal, statutory consultation as set out in planning regulation.
Burdfield, Anne-Marie	Statement of Consultation	Consultation is not user-friendly. Difficult and time consuming to navigate and read documents. Bureaucratic, complex time-consuming process. Waste of time and money. Stifles residents' views.	Noted, however this stage is a formal, statutory consultation as set out in planning regulation. Earlier regulation 18 consultations which have also informed the plan provided a less prescriptive opportunity to express views.
Clayforth-Carr, Michael	Statement of Consultation	Plan not legally compliant. Manner of consultation is discriminatory as prevents general public from understanding. General public are not experts in planning, communities not given sufficient time to digest and respond. Method of commenting is too narrow. Statement of Community Involvement is not fit for purpose.	Noted, however this stage is a formal, statutory consultation as set out in planning regulation and was for the required six-week period. Earlier regulation 18 consultations which have also informed the plan provided a less prescriptive opportunity to express views. Methods of consultation used throughout the preparation of the local plan have exceeded minimum requirements.
Cooke, Janet	Statement of Consultation	Previous consultation responses including petitions and marches have not been taken into account. Para 1.5 says representations should focus on the	Noted. The petition has been tabled and noted at each relevant Council meeting. The Statement of

		tests of soundness but Fareham Today refers to additional areas of Legal Compliance and Duty to Cooperate. Misleading and confusing.	Representations Procedure and Fact as well as the Fareham Today magazine and online questionnaire set out the specific questions of the consultation. Paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 explain the test for soundness as set out in the NPPF.
Cunningham, Shaun	Statement of Consultation	Unsound plan, no heed to community. Consultation is paper exercise. Council not willing to talk to residents. Plan has not been subject to proper due process, sites have not been given proper scrutiny.	Noted, however the consultation included exhibitions and meetings in which officers were available to discuss the plan. A telephone line was staffed during office hours to discuss the plan. New sites in the plan have been consulted on in the form of strategic growth areas as part of earlier Regulation 18 consultations, or are proposed as planning applications and will be subject to consultation.
Gustar, Mr & Mrs	Statement of Consultation	Consultation not publicised enough, local residents should have been contacted personally.	Noted, however each household was sent a Fareham Today to publicise the consultation as well as social media posts, letters/emails to all those who joined the consultee database and information on the council's website. Statutory six-week consultation period undertaken.
Hawkins, Alan	Statement of Consultation	Residents feel intimidated by terminology of consultation. Nobody listens to residents.	Noted, however this stage is a formal, statutory consultation as set out in planning regulation. Earlier regulation 18 consultations which have also informed the plan provided a less prescriptive opportunity to express views. All responses are considered in preparing the plan.

Hawkins, Phillip	Statement of Consultation	Para 1.5 state representations should focus on Test for Soundness but Fareham Today guidance includes Legal Compliance and Duty to Cooperate which is misleading and unclear. Public wish to express own opinions.	Noted. The Statement of Representations Procedure and Fact as well as the Fareham Today magazine and online questionnaire set out the specific questions of the consultation. Paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 explain the test for soundness as set out in the NPPF. Earlier regulation 18 consultations which have also informed the plan provided a less prescriptive opportunity to express views.
John, Nicholas	Statement of Consultation	Poor consultation, revised plan not subject to debate, method of consultation too narrow, unable to comment on anything but revisions. Survey system is obstructive. Inspector should ensure public interest is being served.	Noted. this stage is a formal, statutory consultation as set out in planning regulation and was for the required six-week period. Earlier regulation 18 consultations which have also informed the plan provided a less prescriptive opportunity to express views. Methods of consultation used throughout the preparation of the local plan have exceeded minimum requirements. All Regulation 19 consultation responses will be passed on to the inspector
Marshall, Robert	Statement of Consultation	Para 1.5 state representations should focus on Test for Soundness but Fareham Today guidance includes Legal Compliance and Duty to Cooperate which is misleading and unclear. Public wish to express own opinions.	Noted. The Statement of Representations Procedure and Fact as well as the Fareham Today magazine and online questionnaire set out the specific questions of the consultation. Paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 explain the test for soundness as set out in the NPPF. Earlier regulation 18 consultations which have also informed the plan provided a less



			prescriptive opportunity to express views.
Megginson, Hilary	Statement of Consultation	Restricting comments to revisions and additions is unfair. Consultation is complex, inaccurate and discouraging. Petitions not debated.	Noted. The previous regulation 19 consultation gave opportunity for comment on the unrevised sections of the plan. This Regulation 19 consultation focussed on the changes. Each household was sent a Fareham Today to publicise the consultation as well as social media posts, letters/emails to all those who joined the consultee database and information on the council's website. CAT meetings and exhibitions held. Statutory six-week consultation period undertaken. Methods of consultation used throughout the preparation of the local plan have exceeded minimum statutory requirements. Earlier regulation 18 consultations which have also informed the plan provided a less prescriptive opportunity to express views. The petition has been tabled and noted at each relevant Council meeting.
Megginson, Robert	Statement of Consultation	Restricting comments for this consultation is unjust and unfair. The public may wish to comment on the whole plan not just the revisions. The consultation website even restricts drop down options to the revised sections only. No true consultation, tick box exercise. Petitions not debated.	Noted. The previous regulation 19 consultation gave opportunity for comment on the unrevised sections of the plan. This Regulation 19 consultation focussed on the changes. Each household was sent a Fareham Today to publicise the consultation as well as social media posts, letters/emails to all those who joined the consultee database and

			information on the council's website. CAT meetings and exhibitions held. Statutory six-week consultation period undertaken. Methods of consultation used throughout the preparation of the local plan have exceeded minimum statutory requirements. Earlier regulation 18 consultations which have also informed the plan provided a less prescriptive opportunity to express views. The petition has been tabled and noted at each relevant Council meeting.
Murphy, R A K	Statement of Consultation	Revised local plan not notified to all residents, people without internet disenfranchised.	Noted. Fareham Today was sent to all households to ensure community engagement. Officers available to discuss the plan at 5 CAT meetings throughout the Borough and by telephone. Consultation responses could be made online or by post.
Petrazzini, Rosemary	Statement of Consultation	Appalling consultation, lack of real community engagement, no feedback with communities. Community engagement is lacking and given no importance by FBC. Leadership at Council is dictatorial and do not listen or cooperate.	Noted. this stage is a formal, statutory consultation as set out in planning regulation and was for the required six-week period. Earlier regulation 18 consultations which have also informed the plan provided a less prescriptive opportunity to express views. Methods of consultation used throughout the preparation of the local plan have exceeded minimum requirements. All Regulation 19 consultation responses will be passed on to the inspector for consideration.

Rowles, David	Statement of Consultation	Restricted consultation and engagement is unacceptable and undemocratic.	Noted. this stage is a formal, statutory consultation as set out in planning regulation and was for the required six-week period. The specifics of any planning application will be consulted upon at the time of submission/ consideration.
Russel, Hazel	Statement of Consultation	Para 1.5 states representations should focus solely on tests of soundness but Fareham Today also refers to Legal Compliance and Duty to Cooperate. Petitions have not been considered.	Noted. The Statement of Representations Procedure and Fact as well as the Fareham Today magazine and online questionnaire set out the specific questions of the consultation. Paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 explain the test for soundness as set out in the NPPF. Earlier regulation 18 consultations which have also informed the plan provided a less prescriptive opportunity to express views. The petition has been tabled and noted at each relevant Council meeting.
Seymour, Robert	Statement of Consultation	Level of consultation is inadequate.	Noted, however each household was sent a Fareham Today to publicise the consultation as well as social media posts, letters/emails to all those who joined the consultee database and information on the council's website. CAT meetings and exhibitions held. Statutory six-week consultation period undertaken. Methods of consultation used throughout the preparation of the local plan have exceeded minimum statutory requirements.

Sherman, Chris	Statement of Consultation	Residents concerns have not been taken into account despite petitions, marches, objections and deputations. marches, deputations and objections raised. Despite exceeding the prerequisite number of signatures needed to trigger a Full Council meeting debate, debate was refused, even after a challenge was raised to the Council's scrutiny Board.	Noted. Responses to each stage of consultation has been considered. Details can be found in the Statement of Consultation. The petition has been tabled and noted at each relevant Council meeting.
Wilkinson, Shirley	Statement of Consultation	Consultation procedure appears to have been designed to curtail any true comments.	Noted, however this stage is a formal, statutory consultation as set out in planning regulation. Earlier regulation 18 consultations which have also informed the plan provided a less prescriptive opportunity to express views.
Highways England	IDP	IDP and Local Plan policy should include additional schemes where potential or developer-funded mitigation measures may be required. Disappointing that the IDP does not explicitly define this requirement.	Noted but disagree. Local Plan policy identifies scheme highlighted through STA as needing mitigation through that process. Policy however, does state the need the for further detailed TAs for sites and provides policy hook for further schemes to be funded through developer contributions where identified.
Network Rail	IDP	Advice on accessibility of Swanwick Station and likely need for enhancements that would benefit those living and working nearby. Useful to understand if FBC still have aspirations to make Swanwick a Parkway station.	Noted and will consider in future IDP updates. TIN4 provides policy hook for improvements required to mitigate development.
Owen Neale	Playing Pitch Strategy	Sport England considers that the Playing Pitch Strategy is robust and represents an up to date assessment of the borough's quantitative and qualitative needs for playing pitches	Noted and agreed.

Anne Marie Burdfield	Transport Assessment	The TA does not include 830 homes in the area of HA1. There is no provision for pedestrian and cycling linking to HA1.	The TA has considered the full quantum of development for HA1 and other sites in Warsash. Sites with planning permission are included in the baseline. These sites will already have agreed highways mitigation.
Christopher Chowns	Transport Assessment	The TA is out of date as is based on base data more than a couple of years old and a lot has changed in that time with new working practices.	TA is based on a model which is operated to industry standards. Baseline is still considered suitable.
Hampshire County Council	Transport Assessment	Would have preferred to have seen results of an additional strategic model run which accurately assessed the differences between scenarios, though do not contend that this makes TA or Plan invalid. But transport issues and additional mitigation will most likely need to be identified through site specific transport assessments.	Noted. Technical Note provides additional clarification on the differences between development scenario and modelled run and provides confidence that Plan remains sound. Local Plan policy requires Transport Assessments as necessitated by highway authority.
Phil Hawkins	Transport Assessment	The TA does not include 830 homes in the area of HA1.	The TA has considered the full quantum of development for HA1 and other sites in Warsash. Sites with planning permission are included in the baseline. These sites will already have agreed highways mitigation.
Highways England	Transport Assessment	Clarification should be sought with regards to the housing figures used within the SRTM model and the SRTM modelling should be updated to reflect the level of anticipated employment growth identified within the revised PLP.	Noted. Clarification is provided through the Technical Note which provides further confidence to the robustness of the TA.
Andy Jackson	Transport Assessment	The TA does not include 830 homes in the area of HA1.	The TA has considered the full quantum of development for HA1 and other sites in Warsash. Sites with planning permission are included in the baseline. These sites will already have agreed highways mitigation.

Hazel Russell	Transport Assessment	The TA does not include 830 homes in the area of HA1 and doesn't include an analysis of streets where the majority of the houses are proposed.	The TA has considered the full quantum of development for HA1 and other sites in Warsash. Sites with planning permission are included in the baseline. These sites will already have agreed highways mitigation.
Highways England	Technical Transport Note	Agree that the modelling undertaken still offers a robust assessment of the development quantum and the impacts on the SRN, and that further localised impacts should be capable of being identified and mitigated as required through site specific Transport Assessments.	Noted and agreed.
<b>Representations on policy SEA/HRA</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 5</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Gladman	SEA/SA	Fareham Borough Council should ensure that the results of the SA process clearly justify its policy choices. In meeting the development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed, and others have been rejected	We consider that the consideration of reasonable alternatives has been thorough, detailed and well explained, especially in sections 4 and 5 of the SA Report. It is noted that Gladman does not appear to be registering a criticism here.
Natural England	SEA/SA	It is suggested a further monitoring parameter(s) is included to monitor the implementation of new GI/habitat that can seek to alleviate the pressures of climate change on species and the ecological network whilst also providing other benefits as described further in our advice above; e.g. percentage of new GI/ extent of priority habitat	Noted. This is being considered and may be added in the Post Adoption Statement.

		within the ecological network. We note from Appendix B, the Analysis of Consultation Responses, that this is being considered and may be added in the Post Adoption Statement.	
Natural England	SEA/SA	Previously suggested that further monitoring parameters are incorporated to ensure impacts on internationally, nationally and locally designated sites are monitored throughout the Plan period, e.g. via the number, extent and condition of sites designated for nature conservation. Advised that the use of a green infrastructure standard as an indicator, such as Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt). Parameters for measuring the implementation of net gain should be introduced. In response to this, we note that the Analysis of Consultations responses states that this is being considered and maybe added in the Post Adoption Statement.	Noted. This is being considered and may be added in the Post Adoption Statement.
Pegasus for Bargate Homes	SEA/SA	The Fareham Local Plan is not justified because it does not provide an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives. Its strategy should properly plan to contribute towards meeting the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities including Gosport Borough.	We consider that the consideration of reasonable alternatives has been thorough, detailed and well explained, especially in sections 4 and 5 of the SA Report. It is noted that Pegasus appears to be registering a criticism of the development strategy here, rather than of the SA.
Raymond Brown	SEA/SA	There appears to be no sustainability appraisal for the town centre allocation (BL1).	There are several references to BL1 in the SA report, including a detailed assessment matrix at the end of Appendix K.
Natural England	HRA	It is welcomed that consideration of recreational disturbance to the New Forest SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites has been updated, with sections 6.4.18 to 6.4.20 referencing recent analysis of the New Forest 'zone of influence' (Footprint Ecology,	Noted.

		February 2021). The report is based on recent visitor survey reports published in 2020 that conclude that new residential development within a 13.8km buffer zone of the New Forest designated sites is likely to have a significant effect on the sites via recreational disturbance, alone and/or in combination with other plans or projects.	
Natural England	HRA	The report suggests that the borough of Fareham is excluded from the 13.8km zone based on low average visitor rates in comparison to local authorities further west, and relatively low visit rates derived from the onsite survey data. It also recommends that large developments of around 200 or more dwellings within 15km of the New Forest sites should be subject to project HRA and mitigation may be required. The revised local plan HRA reflects this recommendation.	Noted.
Natural England	HRA	Postcode data resulting from the telephone survey from the New Forest 'zone of influence' (Footprint Ecology, February 2021) show visit frequencies in the western parts of Fareham are similar to those in the neighbouring borough of Eastleigh, suggesting the visit rate from these areas are higher than the average visit rate applied to the whole borough. It is Natural England's view that they are likely to contribute to an in-combination effect on the sites. Therefore, to ensure the necessary certainty required under the Habitats Regulations that the Plan will appropriately address the impact, it is advised that the 13.8km zone is applied within the borough of Fareham to ensure all new development coming through in that area provide appropriate mitigation. (Please note that large development	Noted. The Council has agreed to join the New Forest Project Steering Group and work with other affected local authorities within and surrounding the New Forest designated sites to identify appropriate strategic mitigation solutions. The Council will also work with Natural England to agree the scope and nature of an interim mitigation strategy which may be appropriate in advance of a more definitive Strategic solution. This is reflected in the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) the Council has with Natural England.



		<p>within 15km should also still be subject to HRA for this impact pathway.)</p> <p>It is advised that your authority works in close collaboration with other affected local authorities within and surrounding the New Forest designated sites which share a commitment to develop a strategic, cross-boundary approach to habitat mitigation for the New Forest SPA/SAC/Ramsar. It is recommended such a strategy incorporates a package of measures including provision of suitable alternative green spaces and networks, and direct measures such as access management, education and communication, wardening, and importantly, monitoring.</p> <p>It is advised the Council implements a suitable interim strategy that ensures adverse effects from live development coming through the local plan period will be avoided. This may include measures as described above. Financial contributions can be directed towards the New Forest National Park Authority's (NFNPA) Habitat Mitigation Scheme. Suitable levels of contribution are agreed with the NFNPA</p>	
Natural England	HRA	Table 1 of Appendix 3 [nutrient budget] references the 20% precautionary buffer. Please note that this buffer should only be applied to sites with a positive nitrogen budget. The overall budget figure may need updating in light of this.	Disagree. The Natural England Methodology Advice on Achieving Nutrient Neutrality for New Development in the Solent Region states at paragraph 4.67 "It is necessary to recognise that all the figures used in the calculation are based on scientific research, evidence and modelled catchments. These

			<p>figures are the best available evidence but it is important that a precautionary buffer is used that recognises the uncertainty with these figures and in our view ensures the approach prevents, with reasonable certainty, that there will be no adverse effect on site integrity. The Natural England Methodology Advice therefore recommends that a 20% precautionary buffer is built into the calculation. Therefore, regardless of if the budget is positive or negative a 20% buffer should be used to ensure it is precautionary. For negative budgets, this means 20% is subtracted from the final budget and for positive budgets the 20% is added.</p>
Natural England	HRA	<p>Section 4 of the Technical Note on Nutrient Neutrality discusses potential nutrient mitigation schemes. With regards to the number of nitrogen credits likely to be available from these, it is recommended that latest figures are sought in advance of further work involving these schemes. Further information can be found on the PfSH webpages.</p>	Noted.
Natural England	HRA	<p>It appears that site-specific impacts on SPA supporting habitat (as identified on the SWBGS mapping) have not been considered within the Appropriate Assessment for Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar site (i.e. Table 7.8), even though likely significant effects have been identified. This impact should be considered in more detail within the AA with an</p>	<p>Impacts on SPA supporting habitat are considered within the Appropriate Assessment section for the HRA for Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar Site.</p>

		appropriate mitigation strategy outlined, linked to Policy NE5. It is advised that development address impacts in line with the SWBGS Guidance on Mitigation and Off-setting requirements (2018).	
Robjohns, Amy	HRA	The HRA also fails to note that Common Terns, for example, use the SPA when migrating (e.g. once the chicks have fledged) and are thus vulnerable to disturbance in the same way as overwintering birds.	The HRA deals with all the qualifying features of the designated sites.
<b>Representations on Policies Map</b>			
<b>Number of representations on policy: 2</b>			
<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Specific paragraph (if any)</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
Hallam Land Management	Policies map	Challenging the soundness of leaving an allocation for residential development (HA55) in the strategic gap. Suggests there is an inconsistency with HA54.	There is a difference between the two sites and how the Technical Review reviews the land. For HA54 the Technical Review is specific on where the new SG boundary can be drawn, but for HA55 the wording is less conclusive, stating that development could be accommodated in the area but without providing a definitive new boundary. Therefore, keeping the land within the SG allows the policy to inform that development of the masterplan to ensure visual and physical separation of settlements in line with the policy.

Joe Maphosa, Metis Homes	Policies map	Representation suggests Burrridge is identified as a settlement on the policies map, with its own settlement boundary.	<p>This comment relates to an unchanged part of the plan.</p> <p>Burrridge is not considered to require a settlement boundary. Policies relating to housing in the countryside would apply.</p>
--------------------------	--------------	--	---