

# **Response to the Main Modifications to the Development Sites and Policies Plan Submission Version - Jan 2015**

**DMM1:** The council may well be committed to reviewing the development of sites and policies plan however I have no confidence that the council has sufficient resources to monitor the plan throughout its life. The given timetable is in my opinion unlikely to be achieved.

**DMM2:** The phrase “the council expects all new development to adhere to the principles of CS17” is to my mind a wishy-washy phrase that is not nearly prescriptive enough. Perhaps a new phrase along the lines of, “all new development will adhere to principles of CS17” might be substituted here.

**DMM3:** Here again I fear that the use of the word “shall” is not strong enough and that perhaps the word “must” could replace it.

**DMM4:** I have no particular problem with this modification.

**DMM5:** No issues

**DMM6 & 7:** I believe it to be likely that developers will attempt whenever possible, to push the boundaries of planning rules. I believe it's unlikely that Fareham Borough Council Will be able to resist the resources of determined developers in each and every case. We have seen several cases in the past in the local area where developers have seemingly ridden roughshod over planning rules.

**DMM8:** Affordable housing is one of the major concerns over the development of any housing within Fareham's boundaries. Provision of affordable housing by developers in almost every situation, including within Welborne, seems to depend almost entirely on the much overused word “viability”. Viability to a developer appears to mean simply profit and has little to do with the sustainability, quality, environmental or other aspects of a development. Once again it seems to me that there are many instances of developers using the viability weapon to ensure that they do not have to build affordable homes.

Despite assurances, I believe that many developments throughout the country which initially had a reasonable percentage of affordable homes have suffered from the fact that once initially purchased the purchaser then sells it on at an inflated profit. I remain to be convinced that any legal agreement to ensure that units will be retained as affordable housing in perpetuity, will in fact achieve that aim.

**DMM9:** No issues.

**DMM10:** No issues.

**DMM11:** No issues.

**DMM12:** I do not believe that Welborne Will necessarily deliver all of employment floor space promised.

**DMM13:** Here again we have the lovely phrase “financially unviable”. What does this mean in real terms also who is to decide whether or not economic development is appropriate?

**DMM14:** How will it be decided that the built character and historic significance of the area will be affected?

**DMM15, 16, 17:** No issues.

**DMM18:** A recent application for a foodstore in the Portchester area is hitting headlines. Residents are adamant that parking in the District centre must not be reduced but the council appear to be against the food store development a short distance from the centre. How will this policy help to resolve issues such as this, despite the assurance given in DMM19 and 20 ?

**DMM21:** The rather throwaway phrase in paragraph 4 of this DMM, "Protecting the character and beauty of the countryside is an important objective and so the careful design of any proposal will be a key consideration" holds absolutely no water when we know that the council in concert with PUSH will destroy several hundred acres of prime agricultural land and beautiful countryside by building Wellborn.

**DMM22 - 26:** Involves discussion of individual development sites with which I have no issues:

**DMM27:** There has been much speculation over many years as to the future improvements to roads in the Fareham / Stubbington area. Apart from actual work now in progress on the Northern section of Newgate lane there is no real guarantee that any of the schemes will actually come to fruition nor that they will achieve the improvements to traffic flow envisioned.

**DMM28:** Access to Whiteley is currently only possible from the M27 or via Yew Tree Drive, which has bollard control and has only been open for general traffic for about 1 year. There is no firm guarantee that Whiteley Way will ever be completed and yet I understand that Winchester CC is proposing a huge extension to the north of Whiteley. The newly opened shopping centre can only be accessed by car as there is no regular bus service and unlikely ever to be one.

**DMM29:** No issues.

**DMM30:** The history of provision of cycle and walkways throughout the borough is not good. Many cycleways are not fit for purpose and to my mind are often simply unsafe. What chance is there that any future provision will be any better and how ill they be maintained through-life ?

**DMM31:** Housing completions may have been updated to fulfil the requirement of this MM but I still believe the PUSH estimates of housing need to be based on an expected influx of residents from other parts of the country, not just to service the needs of Fareham. Taken together with Welborne, and the many other local plans there are far too many dwellings proposed for this already overcrowded region.

**DMM32-34:** No issues.

**Peter Trott**