

## **Fareham BC Development Sites & Policies; Actions Arising from Hearings.**

Thank you for your letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> December 2014 and its attachments. We welcome this opportunity to comment on the 'Actions arising from hearing session' proposed by Fareham Borough Council.

DCD-20. Paragraph 2.3. **Object** to the proposal. If the Borough Council is satisfied that a development proposal would not prejudice the development of a larger site, it should not require the applicant of Site A to advantage the development of Site B by the provision of access and services which are not directly related to the development of Site A.

DCD-21. Paragraph 1.3. **Agree** to the provision for residential infill development.

Paragraph 2.3 **Agree** with the criteria for residential garden use in the countryside.

DCD-25 Paragraph 8.8. **Agree** with the identification of the 'Corner of Station Road and A27 Portchester' as a suitable site for older person's accommodation

We continue to be disappointed at Inspector Hogger's apparent reluctance to require Fareham Borough Council to undertake a full and formal review of Defined Urban Settlement Boundaries(DUSBs), as their detailed alignment is not simply a matter of development need – the *application* of policy is surely unsound if it is unclear whether an area of land should be the subject of rural or urban policies. The absence of a boundary review has, furthermore, meant that the issue has not been addressed as to whether the substantial settlement of Burrige should be formally defined with a DUSB. We believe that the hearing should be re-opened to give attention to these important matters.