

Magnolia
40, Ranvilles Lane
Titchfield
Hants.
PO14 3EA

7 October 2017

Head of Development Management
Fareham Borough Council
Civic Offices
Fareham
PO16 7AZ

Re: Planning application P/15/1279/OA

Attention : Mr Mark Wyatt

Dear Sir,

We have strong objections to the above proposal. The main reasons are as follows

1. It is contrary to the FBC policy regarding such developments. The long term plan, which was subject to consultation by the electorate, is that major housing needs, to meet government targets, are to be met, in the main, by a major development at Welborne, north of the M27. This was said to avoid encroachment into the agricultural corridor each side of the river Meon and to reduce “in filling” of open spaces in the borough.
This P/15/1279/OA proposal for so many houses in this corridor is a major challenge to this policy, and, if passed, would certainly lead to further such proposals from, for example, the land owners to the west and south of it – indeed it would mean the end of the corridor. Even I, whose property is in this corridor, would regard acceptance as a precedent and I may well apply to develop my own 1 acre plot, as would others in my position. If passed, it would be contrary to the CS 22 plan and would leave the strategic gap between Fareham and Stubbington in tatters.
2. FBC have stated that they have a well defined plan to meet the “Objectively Assessed Housing Need” with the Welborne and other developments already in the pipeline – even if one of these is delayed by the need to compulsorily purchase the land required. The final phase of the Hallam proposal is 2023 so the delay in Welborne is no reason to grant this application.
3. The traffic situation in the area is already, at peak times, saturated, and subject to long delays, exacerbated by a number of recent and pending housing developments in the area south of the M27, such as Cherque Farm and the proposed housing at Daedelus and Gosport. Indeed, such is the traffic problem that Hampshire CC has agreed a Stubbington by- pass in attempt to alleviate it. An assurance was given, at the time this by-pass was proposed, that it would **not** be used as a reason to allow housing development alongside it. Some believe that even this by- pass will only move the

hold ups to other junctions – the problem lies in that access to the M27 from the south is already a severe problem, so developments such as P/15/1279/OA, which would generate 2000 or more cars **must be north** of that motorway. On a more local level, I myself helped to carry out a traffic survey (as part of objections to a development at the north end of Ranvilles Lane), a couple of years ago, of traffic joining the A27 at the junction of Hollam Drive, and even then the volume of traffic was very high. (over 500 cars /hour) The proposed development would render a difficult local traffic problem impossible.

4. Although a certain amount of infrastructure is included in the plan, it is totally inadequate. The mention of a pub, for example, ignores the fact that one recently closed at the junction of Bishopsfield and Longfield Avenues! For medical issues the numbers are too small to justify a medical centre/ GP practice and in any case there is little chance of being able to recruit staff for it. There would be too many people to be absorbed by local GP's - the waiting times for which locally are already high. There is no mention of secondary education, already in short supply locally; the sewage north of the development has recently been subject to difficulty; local jobs are in short supply so many of the new residents will commute to Southampton or Portsmouth, adding to the problems mentioned above. The lack of secondary education provision will cause a jump in "school run" traffic, and Longfield Avenue – already very busy – will become even more difficult. Sports fields nearby at Mill Lane and others do not seem over used so their provision is probably window dressing.
5. Even if the proposal were to be accepted, the site would be a blight on local wildlife, (the fields are used by migrating and other birds as a resting area) and badgers, deer and foxes are abundant. Oxley's Copse is an ancient landmark, and would come under pressure from over – use.
6. Importantly, the proposed development could well, by adding so much concrete in an area which sometimes floods, strongly increase the flood risk to the surrounding area. Peak and Mays Lanes already often flood at times of heavy rain.
7. During the presentations of the proposed Stubbington by- pass by Hampshire County Council, particularly when some of us received (in error we were told) potential compulsory purchase orders for our property, that any cross link road to the Titchfield Road would under no circumstances be allowed to either cause compulsory purchase orders for residential property, and emphatically, be used as a lever to allow housing developments in the green corridor. This latest proposal would drive a coach and horses through those assurances, and indeed creates an unfortunate suspicion of pressure on planning of a quid pro quo where the developers would pay towards the bypass in return for a favourable outcome.
8. The extra traffic would make the Stubbington by pass come under intolerable pressure so soon after such a major investment.

Yours Faithfully

Peter & Susan Backlog.