

Fareham Borough Council Local Plan Examination Council's Response to Inspector's Matters and Issues

Matter 6 Housing Allocations

Matter 6.6

HA55 Land south of Longfield Avenue

43. Is the development of this site in a Strategic Gap justified? What are the implications in terms of visual amenity and the local character?

- 43.1 DS003 identifies the potential for a future change of Strategic Gap boundary to the south of Longfield Avenue. This is described and justified on page 98, paragraph 9 of DS003 and provides the justification for the allocation within the Strategic Gap of HA55. The Landscape Architects who authored this report consider the development within the Strategic Gap and ultimate removal of Strategic Gap from the future built form of HA55 to be a suitable compromise to meet housing need and that this part of Strategic Gap Study area 7a is the weakest area of the gap in that the sense of physical and visual separation would be least harmed by development in this location, but although it could be argued that the sense of separation is weaker in the gap because of it, the overall integrity of the strategic gap is not harmed and therefore the policy DS2 tests can be overcome. Indeed, the site promoters for the majority of the site have agreed that the development can meet the tests of DS2, despite having a different opinion on the boundary line.
- 43.2 The Policy HA55 Longfield Avenue Statement of Common Ground (FBC041a) between the Council and the site promoters includes as a point of agreement at paragraph 6.1, that the development can meet the tests of Policy DS2, despite there being a difference of opinion on the treatment of the designation boundary line. The site promoters propose that the Strategic Gap designation on the policies map should be drawn to be co-terminus with Tanners Lane and the Policies Map amended accordingly, excluding the allocation from the Strategic Gap. The Council are of the position, for the reason stated previously, that it will continue to extend across the whole allocation as shown on the Policies Map presently, notwithstanding HA55 and be amended in the next review of the Local Plan. Nevertheless, the SoCG agrees that the masterplan contained within it (which will replace the Indicative Framework Plan for Policy HA55 on page 148 of the Plan) arranges development in a layout that maintains separation between Fareham and Stubbington and meets the tests of Policy DS2.

44. On what basis has the indicative yield of 1250 dwellings been determined?

- 44.1 The indicative yield of the site has been determined in line with the SHELAA methodology, Stage 2: Site Assessment, Calculating Development potential (pages 9-10) and through ongoing work and discussions between the Council and the promoters of the allocation. The indicative yield is the subject of agreement (paragraph 2.11) between the Council and promoters as set out in the Statement of Common Ground (FBC041a). The developable area has been set following significant liaison with Natural England over the scale of onsite mitigation relating to recreational disturbance on the SPAs and Solent Waders and Brent Geese. This agreement is evidenced in the updated Statement of Common Ground with Natural England (FBC043).

45. What evidence is there to demonstrate the impact of the development on the local highway network either alone or in combination with other allocations (specifically HA54). If that impact is a negative one, would suitable mitigation measures address the issues?

- 45.1 This question is answered in the response to question 41, which is considered applicable here given the proximity of the two sites (HA54 and HA55).
- 45.2 As stated in the SoCG (FBC041a, paragraphs 2.21 to 2.23), the site promoters continue to work with the Highway Authority to assess the traffic impacts of the proposed development at the local level. Where local junction improvements are required, these will either be delivered as part of the development, or financial contributions paid to the Highway Authority to implement the required changes. This is likely to include alterations to junctions in the immediate vicinity of the site, and the treatment of pedestrian crossings at Longfield Avenue.
- 45.3 Concerns raised from the neighbouring authority in relation to cumulative impact from these two sites (HA54 and HA55) on the wider network into and out of the peninsular are addressed in the updated SoCG with Gosport Borough Council (FBC039). Further explanation of the assessment and modelling inputs was provided to GBC and following consideration and agreement at the 9th February Economic Development Board (FBC040), the Council withdrew its objection to the Plan.

46. In order for the policy to be effective should the site-specific requirements included consideration of the potential impacts from HMS Collingwood on the amenity of future occupants? Conversely what are the implications of residential development on HMS Collingwood, and should the policy requirements address these?

- 46.1 The Council recognises the issues raised by the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) in relation to HMS Collingwood but also notes that no objection was lodged. Instead, the impacts from and to HMS Collingwood on the amenity of future occupants of the allocation, as well as the impact of the site on HMS Collingwood, have been considered through the further design work leading to the Masterplan agreed in the Statement of Common Ground for the site (FBC041b). The design response has been developed in line with Policy D2: Ensuring Good Environmental Conditions and presented to the DIO and representatives from HMS Collingwood.
- 46.2 A meeting was held with representatives of the DIO and HMS Collingwood on the 7 February where the proposed masterplan in the SOCG (FCB041a) was discussed and the differences from the application made clear. HMS Collingwood confirmed that the rifle range is now decommissioned and scheduled for demolition. All parties welcomed the arrangement of the sports hub in that location and reduction in the planned residential area adjacent to the boundary. HMS Collingwood are clear that with permitted development rights associated with an establishment like Collingwood (due to reasons of national defence) that no guarantees can be given to the future land use of all parts of the site, the proposed layout in the masterplan respects the issues raised.
- 46.3 There will be a clear requirement through the application process and particularly the transport assessment to consider some of the specific site requirements such as the access requirements at Liverpool Gate, but representatives from HMS Collingwood and the site promoters are clear that this would be raised and considered through the planning application process.

47. How and when would the proposed Masterplan and Design Code be prepared? Who will prepare it, how will all stakeholders be involved? How would this relate to the Indicative Framework Plan?

- 47.1 The policy requires that a Council-led Masterplan and Design code will be produced to agree the quantity, layout and nature of housing and other land uses for the site. The agreed Statement of Common Ground (FBC041a) sets out an agreed Masterplan (Figure 3, page 14). This will replace Figure 4.4 (page 148) of the Revised Publication Plan (Illustrative Framework Plan). The set of Supporting Masterplanning Principles will be added to the Local Plan as a new Appendix D and form the basis for the high level design principles within the outline application. A more comprehensive Design Code will be required as a condition of any new or amended outline application, approval of which will be required by the Council, prior to the submission of reserved matters applications for both the Hallam and Williams land parcels.
- 47.2 In light of the Statement of Common Ground, the Council proposes the following changes to the Plan:
- 1) An amendment to criteria a) of Policy HA55 of the Revised Publication Local Plan to read:

The quantity, layout and nature of housing and other land uses shall be in accordance with the agreed HA55 Masterplan and Supporting Principles in Appendix D of this Plan. A Design Code shall be submitted and approved by the Council as a condition of Outline Planning Application, prior to any Reserved Matters Applications.
 - 2) Replace the HA55 Indicative Framework Plan (Fig 4.4 page 148) with the new Masterplan as shown in Fig 3 of the HA55 Longfield Avenue SoCG (FBC041a).
 - 3) Addition of a new Appendix D to the Local Plan as contained within Part 2 of the HA55 Longfield Avenue SoCG (FBC041b): *Supporting Masterplanning Principles*.