

Deposition to clarify the assertion that the listing of sites E4b and E4d as being within 'Existing Employment Areas' is as a result of an historical civil wrong. Our contention is that the two sites should consequently be removed from the classification. While they are 'relatively' insignificant and beyond justifiable need for employment purposes they are irreplaceable for local natural environmental value. It goes some way to explaining how the unusual designation of the nearby roads affected development pressure and traffic growth and why further expansion is unwelcome.

The proposed sites are either side of a location which used to be occupied by a former Royal Naval Victualling Depot.

By 1980 the Depot was virtually dormant, and it was sold off in the early 1980's leaving a site that was, for some time, the cause of some vexatious planning matters involving FBC, HCC, this society and a good deal of distress to local residents.

Three particular 'happenstances' have fogged the issue of development ambitions and permissions:

1. The siting of the old Depot in a countryside location.
2. The curious designation of the nearby roads
3. The advent of two industrial estates close by and the construction of the M27 motorway

Firstly, the Depot was virtually an island in an area long-designated Coast and Countryside in successive Local Plans so that although outline planning permission had been built into the sale for *some* development as a reasonable concession to the historical land use, it also gave recognition to environmental needs by prescribing that the remaining half of the site should be returned to natural land.

The stipulation that the size of the footprint should not exceed that of the old site was robustly defended by FBC, but it was doggedly attacked by the new owners through various unacceptable ideas e.g. extension vertically with mezzanine floors etc.

The main problem which rapidly emerged, however, was the destructive effect that the passage of heavy lorries, cranes, diggers and other heavy machinery was having on the (well recognised) inadequate road structure and its verges together with the damage to quality of life nearby.

The subsequent application was for a waste recycling centre. It was strongly opposed by FBC who offered alternative locations and our local petition returned 760 signatures of people opposed to it. As with all such facilities, however, the final decision rested with HCC – which was adverse, unfortunately, prompting calls for a judicial review. The excessive plans of the then owners, which included widening Pinks Hill were scaled down and the depot's activities were reduced to an operationally acceptable level. Today the Transfer Station could be considered a reasonable neighbour for the most part but its contribution to the heavy use of the road network which half surrounds the village ensures that the issue remains sensitive, even if dormant. Regrettably it is also the case that the site footprint, so carefully prescribed originally, has now virtually doubled.

Secondly there is a curiosity about the local roads which few people are probably aware of today. Pinks Hill road and that part of Military Road which connects with Drift Road are remnants of the old military road system which ran along the top of Portsdown Hill and ended up by the Delme Roundabout and into Wallington Village respectively.

When they ceased to be required by the MOD (probably sometime in the 1960's) they were, we understand, given over to the Borough but could not be adopted as Highways. They were instead designated as Public Open Space. This fact had a lot of bearing in the saving of half of Pinks Hill

woodland from a large scale housing development in the 1980's when planning permission had been achieved but the necessary highway access (usually a formality) was effectively blocked through the technicality. Private road advisory signs are sited at various places.

When the M27 went through in the early 70's Pinks Hill road was to have been closed, however the proposal caused widespread alarm – both from the business occupants of Fort Wallington (then a newish Industrial Estate) whose only decent access was that road and from Wallington residents who realised that the only other route for lorries if it had to be closed would be through the narrow roads of the village. The feeder road for the forthcoming Fareham Industrial Park (originally called the Link Road - now named Wallington Way) was yet to be built and the traffic generated in nearby Broadcut by a newly relocated FBC Depot already gave a foretaste of things to come.

The Department of Transport was reluctant to leave an access in place because it was (and maybe still is) their stated policy not to allow a road like this to impinge on a motorway slip road. But they allowed it as a concession until such time as the promised new roads were built - i.e. Standard Way and the Link road. Any major upgrade, even now, might be problematical to the Highways Agency.

Forty years on and the use of the road has grown significantly, especially so because Wallington has such a high density of industrial premises within its boundaries and immediate vicinity. Hence there is a lot of sensitivity about the risk of more development, both housing and industrial, which the continued existence of this road increases. The road from the Industrial Park up to Fort Wallington is steeply graded with a bend near these proposed new employment sites and it suffers fast-moving traffic going to and from the motorway approach road via Pinks Hill. It is now an established, convenient short-cut, commuter route.

A question mark must hang over the legality of setting aside the original conditions that presumably applied when the roads were transferred to FBC. Similarly, there might be a concern about whether the hard-won restrictions on the use of Pinks Hill by heavy vehicles travelling to or from the Waste Transfer Station could still be enforced and/or extended to more general (increased) traffic use.

Conclusion:

There can be few areas in the Borough so interwoven with industrial activity as Wallington, both past and present, and it has been assimilated fairly peacefully. Above us we have Fort Wallington, the SUEZ recycling depot and nearby offices, Fareham Industrial Park encircles our western flank and the FBC Depot plus a retail park are across the river from us. Our long history (probably longer than that of Fareham) embraced the workshop of the town, notably the Tannery and the Brewery.

Despite this the village has retained a character and appeal that is well known. Together with a long-established pattern of care by its residents it has managed this partly because of the retention of cherished fragments of rural landscape at its fringes, like narrow lanes where horses are still not uncommon. The two sites now threatened (E4b and E4d) are typical small fragments.

This is a crowded corner of what we now know from a BBC report is a disproportionately crowded part of the country – see <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-41901294> . An aerial view of Wallington shows very few green areas remaining. These have been fiercely guarded in the past and some of them once believed to be secure for all time. This appears no longer to be the case.

Our dwindling small, green places should remain green yet, ironically, they are now jeopardised by Nitrate Mitigation Schemes, sacrificed by trumpeted 'Rewilding' projects. From the aerial view of our little patch the only piece of green which is not currently threatened by various development aspirations is the Water Meadow towards the top left. We think we would be justified, on this occasion, for saying "Enough is enough".