INTRODUCTION

1. A public consultation on the Issues and Options draft of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) was undertaken for a period of six weeks between 28th January and 7th March 2008.

2. Fareham Borough Council consulted the following on the Issues and Options draft of the Site Allocations DPD:

   Officers within Fareham Borough Council and Hampshire County Council, Government bodies, adjoining Local Authorities, key local businesses, business associations, Hampshire Police, Fareham Youth Council, Residents Associations, civic, community and voluntary organisations, environmental groups, transport operators, education authority, public service providers, utility providers, and local residents.

3. The consultation comprised of:

   - Six days of public exhibitions with Council Officers in attendance providing the opportunity for discussion. A questionnaire was available to be completed
   - Individual letters distributed to specific consultees, interested parties and organisations with notification of the consultation and exhibitions
   - The exhibition material available locally and advertised by a notice in the local press and posters on public notice boards
   - A Press Release detailing the exhibition events and material
   - A page containing the draft document, exhibition material and questionnaire published on the Council’s website
   - A draft document and questionnaire made available in public libraries and at the Civic Offices for public inspection
BACKGROUND

4. The Local Development Framework (LDF) will replace the current Fareham Borough Local Plan Review (2000) and will be the basis for all future land use planning decisions in the Borough. The LDF is made up of a number of different documents.

5. The Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) seeks to allocate land for new development such as housing, retail, economic development, recreation and community uses, and will identify the characteristics and requirements of such development.

6. The Site Allocations DPD deals with the use and development of specific sites within the Borough up to 2026. The identification of sites is based upon site assessments regarding the suitability and availability of land.

7. It is extremely important to note that the Core Strategy is the key document within the Local Development Framework. It sets out the key elements that will form the planning framework throughout the Borough. In particular, the Core Strategy establishes the objectives and requirements for the Borough dealing with housing, employment, retail, leisure, community facilities, transport and environmental enhancement.

8. It is the Core Strategy that establishes future development required throughout the Borough, where the purpose of the Site Allocations DPD is to identify where the opportunities exist to meet the requirements.

9. This Issues and Options consultation is the first stage in the preparation of the Development Plan Document. Not all the sites identified at this initial stage will be allocated for future development because the Core Strategy only requires a number of these to meet requirements.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSES

10. 706 people attended the exhibitions throughout the consultation. In conjunction with the Issues and Options paper, a questionnaire was made available. 829 responses were received in either paper or electronic format. The responses to the options and concerns raised have been presented in the following tables which have been set out in accordance with the options contained within the questionnaire.

11. A number of sites have since been submitted to the Council, these are listed in a table at the end of the report. These sites will also be considered as part of the sustainability appraisal assessment.

CONCLUSION

12. Following analysis of the Issues and Options consultation, a process of thorough assessment will begin for the sites identified to meet the requirements set out in the Core Strategy.
13. A further public consultation period will be held once a series of preferred sites have been identified following the principles being established within the Core Strategy.
Site Allocations Issues and Options Development Plan Document: Summary of Questionnaire Responses

Vitality of District and Local Centres

**Option 1a: Do you support or object to any of the possible options for expansions of district centres?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 1a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Land to east of Locks Heath District Centre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Viability is associated with availability of parking. Loss of parking results in loss of shops. Result in abandonment of centres unless car parking replaced.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Land to South of Portchester District Centre</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Viability is associated with availability of parking. Loss of parking results in loss of shops. Result in abandonment of centres unless car parking replaced. Need for expanding boundaries is unexplained. Adequate parking space essential to vitality of centre.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Locks Heath Centre west</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Viability is associated with availability of parking. Loss of parking results in loss of shops. Result in abandonment of centres unless car parking replaced.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Locks Heath Centre north</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inadequate public transport to reach facilities. Car parking required. Misuse of open space. Regarding appropriateness of future development.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Portchester Centre east extension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Need for expanding boundaries is unexplained.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Locks Heath District Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OPTION 1a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portchester District Centre</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>Vacant premises in centre. Car park well used. Adequate parking space essential to vitality of centre.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Option 1b: Subject to the expansion of district centre boundaries, do you support or object to any of the possible options for retail development options?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locks Heath Centre car parks</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Could be developed for small-scale indoor sporting activities (although Community Centre should remain focus)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portchester Centre car parks</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Adequate parking space essential to vitality of centre.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land to north of Portchester District Centre</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Could be developed for small-scale indoor sporting activities (although Community Centre should remain focus). Adequate parking space essential to vitality of centre.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Economy and Skills**

**Options 2a: Which of the following options for potential warehousing development do you support or object to which would contribute towards providing 9,500 sq.m of additional warehousing?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 2A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Park Farm</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Loss of countryside. Brownfield land outside the Borough. Alter character of Fareham. Existing traffic problems. Concerned about potential size and location</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solent Business Park – Phase 2</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Inadequate road infrastructure. Require substantial road improvements. Loss of countryside. Existing traffic problems. Close proximity to SRN junctions with greatest potential to generate traffic impacts.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daedalus</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Should remain as Strategic Gap. Within 100m of SPA and Ramsar.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land north of A27 and south-east of Segensworth roundabout</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>Loss of countryside. Brownfield land outside the Borough. Alter character of Fareham. Existing traffic problems. Rural and semi-rural locations.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION 2A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>would be a marked improvement. Highway issues may pose a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Grazing land north of St Margaret's roundabout</td>
<td>Adequate trading and leisure facilities. Too many along A27. Retain as countryside. Erosion of green space. Loss of Rural Gap. Loss of open space would damage rural nature of the landscape. Traffic/road infrastructure. Extend boundary of Titchfield. Site appropriate for employment but not warehousing in such a prominent location.</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Land east of Pinks Hill</td>
<td>Loss of countryside. Brownfield land outside the Borough. Alter character of Fareham. Greenfield site. Suggest detailed examination of sustainable transport initiatives and essential infrastructure options developed for deliver through appropriate mechanism funded (in part) by relevant developers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Military Road depot</td>
<td>Loss of countryside. Brownfield land outside the Borough. Alter character of Fareham.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Capable to accommodate warehousing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Accessible and related area. Close to M27.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Options 2b: What mix of uses should be developed alongside retail development within district and local centres?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 2B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 2c: Do you support or object to the options for potential mixed use development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 2C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Locks Heath Centre car parks</td>
<td>3 More pressure on roads. Uses limited to retail, community and sports facilities. Car parking should not be lost to built development.</td>
<td>2 Only if an alternative can be provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Portchester Centre car parks</td>
<td>3 More pressure on roads. Car parking should be lost to built development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 2d: Do you agree with the recommendations for employment allocations regarding existing employment sites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 2D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Fort Wallington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Fareham Heights</td>
<td>1 Concerned about potential size and location.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Fareham Industrial Park (1&amp;2) &amp; Pennant Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 2D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Broadcut (excluding Sainsburys)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Close proximity to strategic road network junctions with greatest potential to generate traffic impacts. Flooding area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 Bridge Industries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Effects in solution or combination may lead to material safety and/or capacity concerns on already congested strategic road network</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Kiln Acre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Suggest detailed examination of sustainable transport initiatives and essential infrastructure options developed for delivery through appropriate mechanism funded (in part) by relevant developers.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>But no B2 uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Parkway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Change in land use class may affect trips associated with sites due to close proximity to strategic road network.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Furzehall Farm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 Eaton Aerospace Office for National Statistics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 Segensworth east Industrial Estate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Segensworth west Industrial Estate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 Duncan Road &amp; Talisman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Including B2 uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Park Gate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 2D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 West of Fareham Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 Lower Quay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 Hammonds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present use provides local employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 Start Centre, Segensworth</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116 Kites Croft</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 Segensworth south</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 Merjen Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change of use to open space would be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 Lathkill House</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>preferable. Tiny industrial sites and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 The Wokrs opposite Parkway, Wickham Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>overall employment terms insignificant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 Waterside House Wallington</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 Parker Foods</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Quayside</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Within 100m of SPA and Ramsar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165 Cams Estate</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Within 100m of SPA and Ramsar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 The Keep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tiny industrial sites and overall employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173 National Air Traffic Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>terms insignificant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option 2e: Do you support or object to any of the recommendations for countryside employment areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land at Greenaway Lane</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Retain as countryside. Concerned about potential size and location.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Site surrounded by urban development suitable for residential or mix with B1/B2 uses. Derelict land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cams Estate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldeast site submission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Derelict land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cams Estate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Suitable for countryside employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing Land north of St Margaret’s roundabout</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site appropriate for employment but not warehousing in such a prominent location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Fareham grazing land</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Object to the failure to allocate land at Fort Fareham for retail, employment or mixed use development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land at Fort Fareham is suitable for employment and mixed use development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldeast grounds and mansion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reuse of mansion for industrial or employment use. Derelict land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Transport and Travel

### Option 3: Do you support or object to any of the options for potential safeguarding of transport routes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1157 Old Fareham to Gosport railway line</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No proposals for cycle paths.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Important routes for public transport. Potential positive impact upon relieving road congestion. Provide safe and alternative cycle routes. Will ease traffic congestion from Delme roundabout to Gosport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1158 Warsash distributor road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Only safeguard to improve public transport. Unsuitable.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Required for completion of the distributor road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1160 Land at Rookery Avenue</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Whiteley does not require additional bus route. Very poor bus service in place. Should be open to all traffic.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bus routes should not be a priority but rather improved cycle links. Will help deliver aspirations in Core Strategy. Potential positive impact upon relieving road congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1161 Newgate Lane to Peel Common</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Direct traffic onto A27 at Titchfield. Negative environmental impact. Increase traffic congestion problems. Only safeguard to improve public transport.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Important routes for public transport. Necessary for movement in and out of Gosport. Important arterial route. Should be safeguarded for potential transport schemes until further studies completed. Potential positive impact upon relieving road congestion. Provide safe and alternative cycle routes. Will ease traffic congestion from Delme roundabout to Gosport.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Housing Needs

**Option 4a: Do you support or object to any of the options for potential housing development?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 4A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Land north of Park Gate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Edge of urban area boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Land at 337 Southampton Road</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Environmentally sensitive area. Impact character of Titchfield Village. Proximity to ancient monument and conservation area. Maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc. Proximity to valley and Abbey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Fareham Common</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Should contribute towards SDA. Natural boundary to urban area. Link road would be necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Land at The Spinnaker/Swanwick Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brownfield land in a sustainable and accessible location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Land at Cranleigh Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Land at Cranleigh Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maintain countryside, open areas, allotments, rural gap etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 West of Wicor Mill Lane</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc. Traffic. Wooded area for recreational purposes. Allotments privately owned.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deliverable, available and suitable site. Contribute towards flexible housing delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Land east of Posbrook Lane and south of Bellfield</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Damage the identity of Titchfield. Maintain countryside, open areas, allotments, recreation etc. Proximity to valley. All sites adjacent to Titchfield village Conservation Area should not be developed but remain as open space. Alter the character of the rural area irrevocably. Areas rich in wildlife which should be protected. Separates urban and rural areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Land at Posbrook Lane (allotments)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Maintain countryside, open areas, allotments around Titchfield. Erode boundary of Titchfield. All sites adjacent to Titchfield village Conservation Area should</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Posbrook Lane</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Strategic Gap. Countryside contributes to Titchfield’s Character. Maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc. All sites adjacent to Titchfield village Conservation Area should not be developed but remain as open space. Alter the character of the rural area irrevocably. Areas rich in wildlife which should be protected. Allotment land. Helps reduce food miles. Increases health through exercise and diet. Demand for allotments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Warsash (r/o Fleet end Road)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc. Traffic. Wooded area for recreational purposes. Allotments privately owned. Important for nature conservation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Rookery Avenue</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Insufficient infrastructure to support future development in Whiteley. Allocation remains undeveloped. Primary school needed for any further development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Woverleigh, Brook Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rural character supports range of wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land owned by and adjacent to 15 Shellcroft</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sites within the existing Hamble River valley. Maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catisfield Lane paddocks</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Destroy views, countryside &amp; village atmosphere of Catisfield. Disturb existing wildlife. Should maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc. Development is within the Meon Gap, Titchfield Conservation area and Area of Special Landscape Character. Traffic &amp; Amenities. Damage integrity Meon Valley. Allocation remains undeveloped. Built development wholly inappropriate. Support redevelopment of existing site</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crucial existing buildings are removed. Paddocks would make valuable contribution to housing supply. Modest urban extension.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPTION 4A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>but not fields to the North of the site. Should be preserved as an area of special landscape quality. Area of countryside. Important for wildlife. Increase traffic volumes and noise. Devalue properties. Prone to flooding. Limited road access.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Land at Greenaway Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prevent development of large areas of open space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Readily developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Military Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Should maintain countryside/ greenfield sites, open areas, allotments etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Land at Bridge Street</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Within River Meon flood plain this floods every winter. Countryside helps form distinctive settlements. Inadequate infrastructure. Infilling and development would result in loss of character of the Conservation Area. Should maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc. Damage identity of Titchfield.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Land off Woodcote Lane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Permissive bridleways currently used. Should maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Land off Old Street</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Damage nature/wildlife and high quality of life. Within habitat network (ID1114). Essential wide buffer maintained adjoining the nature reserve. Increase burden on existing local amenities. Noise and light pollution. Sites should remain as open countryside. Unsuitable for residential development based upon existing Local Plan policies. Protected as part of Meon Valley. Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are. Retain agricultural field at rear of property as open space. Need for strategic gaps to counter urban sprawl. Adjacent to Titchfield Have. Inadequate infrastructure. Devalue existing properties. Prone to flooding. Affect character of the area.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Development transferring land result in opportunity for improvements in nature conservation and public access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Land north of Stubbington</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Loss of countryside and wildlife. Merge Fareham with Stubbington and Titchfield. Should maintain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Part of the Stubbington bypass could be delivered alongside housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 4A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>countryside, open areas, allotments, footpaths, recreation areas etc. Inadequate infrastructure - schools, dentists, hospitals. Reduce quality of life. Local Plan Policies do not support residential development. Size and scale of development inappropriate. Traffic congestion. Need for strategic gaps to counter urban sprawl. Destroy open countryside that gives the area character. Preference should be Brownfield land. Soaks up rain water. Increase carbon dioxide emissions. Impact on Oxley's Coppice.</td>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Land at Oakcroft Lane</td>
<td>Should maintain countryside, open areas, farmland, allotments etc. Road congestion. Ambulance access will be worsened through increasing volumes of traffic. Maintain rural gap. Need strategic gaps to counter urban sprawl. Inadequate infrastructure - schools, dentists, hospitals. Recreational open space used for walking. Village too overcrowded. Services and roads cannot cope. Gap between Stubbington and Fareham.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Part of the Stubbington bypass could be delivered alongside housing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>New Road, Warsash</td>
<td>Sites of importance for nature conservation. Retain as countryside.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Fareham ParkFarm</td>
<td>River valley must remain as a strategic gap. Should maintain countryside, open areas, farmland, allotments etc. Support redevelopment of existing site but not fields to the North of the site. Should be preserved as an area of special landscape quality.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Land at Brook Lane</td>
<td>Increase risk of flooding.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Cams Estate</td>
<td>Should maintain countryside, open areas, farmland, allotments, Conservation Areas etc. Within 100m of SPA and Ramsar. Conservation Area. Important historic buildings.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Form natural extension to the urban area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Bus Depot, Gosport Road</td>
<td>Access must be provided for a variety of recreational activities. Immediately adjoins Portsmouth Harbour</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 4A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters Road</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>SPA and RAMSAR. Loss of commercial.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Satisfies criteria in PPS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 246-248 Botley Road</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Should maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc. Concerned about potential size and location of development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Titchfield Road</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Erosion of boundaries between Fareham and Stubbington. Increase pressure on infrastructure. Protected for wildlife. Should maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc. Destroy open countryside that gives the area character. Vital for recreational use. Village too over crowded. Services cannot cope.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 246-248 Botley Road</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Should maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Fleet End Bottom</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Should maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc. Important for nature conservation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land rear of 134-138 Botley Road</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Should maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fonley House Farm</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Should maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc. Unsuitable road infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Raley Road</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Close proximity to SRN junctions with greatest potential to generate traffic impacts. Should maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brownfield land within urban area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Grove</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Immediately adjoins Portsmouth Harbour SPA and RAMSAR. Loss of employment.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Subject to development set back from shore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Quay</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Should maintain countryside, open areas, allotments etc. Immediately adjoins Portsmouth Harbour SPA and RAMSAR. Loss of commercial.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Redevelopment not proposed only inclusion of an element of housing in retained boatyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldeast</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Encompasses Lord Wilson Special School continuing education need for foreseeable future. Limit amount of residential development to permissions. Maintain remainder of site as open space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Lane</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Employment use not to become residential unless viability proven.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daedalus</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Within 100m of SPA and Ramsar. Road Congestion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 4A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204 104 Swanwick Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 Grazing land north of M27 roundabout</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are. Destroy rural setting of Titchfield. Inconsistent with existing land use.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land owned by HCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207 Site at Portchester</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are. Protected area. Forms part of rural gap needs to be preserved to maintain distinctive identity of communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 Former Air Training Buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inconsistent with existing land use. Access from main road extremely difficult.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes HCC land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322 Land east of Pinks Hill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Readily developable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land west of St Margaret's Lane</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are. Pressure on infrastructure. Flooding. Traffic &amp; Pollution. Loss of Rural Gap. Effect landscape. Areas rich in wildlife which should be protected. Destroy rural setting of Titchfield. Damage identity of Titchfield.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Good use of vacant scrub land. Suitable &amp; sustainable location for housing development. Unused derelict site. Surrounded by residential and light industrial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space North of Portchester Centre</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Priority to the reuse of previously developed land. Communal site for recreational purposes. Currently allocated green space. Enjoyed by local residents. Retain as open space.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Retain as open space gateway to Portchester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Site, Heath Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Too little school land safeguarded for future flexibility. Community, recreation or sports facilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agree with allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Lodge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are. Included land owned by HCC. Sites of importance for nature conservation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abshot Hall Hotel and Country Club</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Large Area. Development will ruin rural character of the area. Traffic. Maintain Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments, agricultural land etc. Loss of elderly accommodation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Potential provision for elderly persons and extra care facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land in Holly Hill Lane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maintain Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Proposed use as a retirement village should be represented as such in the Site Allocations DPD. Part lies within urban area with outline planning consent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land in Brook Avenue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Countryside/Greenfield sites. Inappropriate density.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land north of Whiteley</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Maintain Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments etc. Effects in isolation or combination may lead to material safety and/or capacity concerns on already congested SRN. Requires transport infrastructure improvements. Highway constraints. No further development until primary school provided.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinton Hall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Boundary includes land for completion of Warsash Distributor Road owned by HCC. Loss of commercial.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-74 Warsash Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Cuckoo Lane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Remain as open space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at East House Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Well used area of open space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Condor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fulfils recreational open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>requirement within densely developed estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Plymouth Drive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Much needed open space. Traffic. Devalue property. Health and dental centres already very busy, schools are almost empty. Village too overcrowded. Services cannot cope. Remain as open space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land to the rear of 41-47 Portchester Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Object to continual infilling development on residential private gardens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at High View</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239 Swanwick Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22 Dibles Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back gardens provide essential green space.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Abshot Farm</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Damage rural character of the land. Lack of infrastructure. Maintain Greenfield sites, countryside, open areas and allotments etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northern boundary abuts Warsash urban area providing logical area for urban area extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land south of A27 roundabout and land east of St Margaret’s Avenue</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Traffic &amp; Pollution. Sites become enveloped by surrounding development. Too close to roundabout. Sites should remain as open countryside. Development would erode boundaries of Titchfield. Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are. Destroy rural setting &amp; identity of Titchfield. Retain as countryside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Hunts Pond Road</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>7 Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are. Open space not be lost for residential development. Prejudice commercial uses. Too little school land safeguarded for future flexibility. Community, recreation or sports facilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HCC no requirement for site for educational purposes only small area as playing field for primary school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Rule Road</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land east of Meoncross School</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>10 Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are. Structure Plan supports provision of Strategic Gaps. Village too overcrowded. Services cannot cope. Part of strategic gap.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Part of the Stubbington bypass could be delivered alongside housing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Upper Swanwick</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>3 Site is adjacent to Swanwick Nature reserve and therefore used/inhabited by variety of wildlife. Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are. Countryside providing gap between A27 and Whiteley.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Acres, Mays Lane</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>7 Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are. Village too overcrowded. Services cannot cope. Safe recreational area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden of 303 Titchfield Road</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>3 Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are. Countryside and strategic gap locations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-60 Southampton Road</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>1 Number of units should be increased to at least 40 to be commercially viable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-77 Southampton Road</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>1 Number of units should be increased to at least 40 to be commercially viable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-104 Portchester Road</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>1 Already given planning consent despite objections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hampshire Rose</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>1 Extremely busy roads already exist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citroen Garage</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>1 Loss of employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynton Way</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>1 Loss of employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Located within residential area benefiting from local services and amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION 4A</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1064</td>
<td>21-25 Bridge Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Loss of employment.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1065</td>
<td>29-45 Lower Church Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Important green gap should be protected. Supports wildlife and birds. Already traffic congestion problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1066</td>
<td>34-36 Portchester Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Already given planning consent despite objections.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1067</td>
<td>52 White Hart Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Already given planning consent despite objections.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1068</td>
<td>Fleet End Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ownership and viability constraints.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1069</td>
<td>239-241 Hunts Pond Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Previously identified but remains undeveloped.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1070</td>
<td>East of Church Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1072</td>
<td>Land rear of 347-411 Hunts Pond Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are. Site remains undeveloped. Suggest detailed examination of sustainable transport initiatives and essential infrastructure options developed for deliver through appropriate mechanism funded (in part) by relevant developers.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1074</td>
<td>Seafield Park</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are. Allocation remains undeveloped.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1075</td>
<td>South of Laurel Close</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Access to the site must be limited. Allocation remains undeveloped.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1076</td>
<td>335-357 Gosport Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Land used for dog walking and cycling. Currently allocated green space. Should be retained as open space.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1077</td>
<td>East of Northway, Southway and Westway</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Currently allocated green space. Should be retained as open space.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1078</td>
<td>Stubbington Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1087</td>
<td>113-121 Stubbington Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Development already permitted.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1091</td>
<td>29 Catisfield Road</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Density of development proposed out of character with</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION 4A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1096</td>
<td>2-8 Ranvilles Lane</td>
<td>Road infrastructure. Hazard of increased traffic. Density of development proposed out of character with existing housing. Invade gap between Titchfield and Fareham. Congested roads. Impact on rural character. Low density development. Protected birds and species. Traffic and highway concerns. Road and water system unable to cope.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1168</td>
<td>Land at Rookery Avenue</td>
<td>Greenfield sites, open areas and allotments must remain as they are. Environmental loss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Health and Community Facilities**

**Options 5a: Do you support or object to the option for altering the boundary for the community hospital?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPTION 5A</td>
<td>1164 Community Hospital Boundary</td>
<td>Reallocation of further parts of the site for non-community based uses is short sighted.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extend existing. Provide adequate space for community hospital.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option 5b: Are there any potential locations, such as district and local centres, that may be identified for doctor or dentist surgeries?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPTION 5B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>District and local centres. Part of mixed use urban extensions. Warsash local centre where facilities are lacking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option 5c: Do you support or object to any of the options for educational establishments surplus to requirements?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPTION 5C</td>
<td>1165 Heath Road/Centre Way, Locks Heath</td>
<td>Not enough primary school places. Schools located within walking distance to be sustainable. Contributions should be made to provide additional places. Not enough educational land safeguarded. Community, sports and recreation facilities. Location for swimming pool.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION 5C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hunts Pond Road, Titchfield Common</td>
<td>Not enough primary school places. Schools located within walking distance to be sustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributions should be made to provide additional places. Not enough educational land safeguarded. Community, sports and recreation facilities. Location for swimming pool.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1166</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No longer required for educational purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 5d: Do you support or object to any of the options for potential provision of churches?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPTION 5D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church west of Portchester, land at Dore Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Development of church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land at Hunts Pond Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 5e: Do you support or object to any of the options for potential cemetery provision?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPTION 5E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Close to existing centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION 5E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldeast – East</td>
<td></td>
<td>not essential to serve Western Wards - alternative sites should be sought.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1163</td>
<td>Land at Coldeast - West</td>
<td>Reuse existing. Site within Coldeast is not essential to serve Western Wards - alternative sites should be sought.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Required for growing population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open Space, Indoor Sport and Recreation

Option 6a: Do you agree or disagree with the protection of existing open spaces from inappropriate development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 6A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Provide open space and leisure facilities. Protect all open spaces for personal use and enjoyment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 6b: Do you support or object to any of the options for potential development of existing identified open space for other uses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 6B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Locks Heath Centre North</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Policies established within Brent Goose Strategy (July 2002) must be adhered to in preparation of LDFs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Locks Heath Centre North</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Many open spaces important feeding/roosting sites for Brent geese. Locks Heath Centre is Broadleafed woodland of possible ancient origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917</td>
<td>Howerts Close Play Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>South East Plan Appropriate Assessment identifies open space creation as mitigation to offset increased recreational disturbance on Natura 2000 sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>982</td>
<td>Land East of Northways, Southways and Westways</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Where open spaces are limited cross-boundary working may be necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Option 6b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land East of Northways, Southways and Westways</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Access management to limit impact of new and existing users of coastal areas plays important role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Option 6c: Do you support or object to any of the options for new open space allocations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coldeast Site Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assess current nature conservation value of a potential site in designating new open spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrews Place</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Question suitability for public open space. Refer to Birds Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhall Way West Open Space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallington Bridge Bankside</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Question suitability for public open space. Recommend consulting Hampshire Wildlife Trust regarding mapping of sites for Brent geese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furzehall Farm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tips Copse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Managed as woodland with reasonable access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroud Green Lane Open Space</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provides recreation area for the Marks Tey development. Important for well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks Tey Road</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION 6C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>954</td>
<td>Quaveys Copse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>967</td>
<td>Cams Eastside Plantation</td>
<td>Immediately adjoins Portsmouth Harbour SPA and RAMSAR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>968</td>
<td>Oxleys Coppice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>Downend Chalkpit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>976</td>
<td>St Margaret’s Coppice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>977</td>
<td>Vicarage Meadow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>985</td>
<td>Meon Valley SINC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>987</td>
<td>Red Barns</td>
<td>Careful regard to sites outside designated areas when identifying suitable areas for increased recreational value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>993</td>
<td>Hookhouse Coppice (E&amp;W)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>996</td>
<td>Coldeast Hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>997</td>
<td>Land West of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Options 6d: Do you support or object to any of the allocation options either as specific allocations for indoor sport or for indoor sport included as part of mixed use development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 6C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanwick Lane Play Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 6D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Locks Heath Centre Car Parks</td>
<td>Lead to demise of Portchester shopping centre. Where will cars and lorries park if sites are developed?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Portchester Centre Car Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Locks Heath Centre North</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Coldeast Site Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Daedalus</td>
<td>Within 100m of SPA and Ramsar. Tranportation access into and out of Daedalus is inappropriate for any major use by significant numbers of people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Land at Hunts Pond Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1047</td>
<td>Portchester Lorry &amp; Car Park</td>
<td>Lead to demise of Portchester shopping centre.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 6D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Cams Aiders</td>
<td>Where will cars and lorries park if sites are developed?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1169</td>
<td>Coldeast Grounds &amp; Mansion</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Potential to locate an indoor sports hall/barn within the Coldeast site. Utilise parts of a largely redundant land area for a variety of open space uses. Brookfield School underprovided in playing fields.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Renewable Sustainable Energy

Option 7: Are there any sites that should be considered for providing large-scale renewable and sustainable energy sources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire Waste Recycling Centre, Segensworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Suitable and convenient location. Rivers Meon &amp; Wallington could generate electricity with little environmental impact. No objection providing allocation in addition to existing permitted uses on adjacent site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Park Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rivers Meon &amp; Wallington could generate electricity with little environmental impact. Potential to be allocated for variety of uses including renewable and sustainable energy generation. Near M27.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enhancing Environmental Quality

Option 8b: Do you support or object to any of the options for potential habitat networks and river valleys?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION 8B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fareham Creek mudflats</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SINC designation must not prevent continued use and expansion of moorings, marinas and slipways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldeast &amp; Sarisbury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site should be protected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>heathland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maintain variety of habitats and quality of life. Site should be protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111 North of Bridge Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SINC designation must not prevent continued use and expansion of existing boatyards, marinas, moorings and slipways.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Site should be protected. Unclear boundary clarification sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1112 Portchester &amp; Fareham north calcareous grassland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SINC designation must not prevent continued use and expansion of existing boatyards, marinas, moorings and slipways.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Site should be protected. Maintain variety of habitats and quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1113 Warsash Common</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SINC designation must not prevent continued use and expansion of existing boatyards, marinas, moorings and slipways.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Site should be protected. Maintain variety of habitats and quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1114 River Meon Valley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Must not prevent access for sailing. SINC designation must not prevent continued use and expansion of existing boatyards, marinas, moorings and slipways.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Enhance and preserve the historic river valley. Site should be protected. Meon Valley pleasant area of countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115 River Hamble Valley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SINC designation must not prevent continued use and expansion of existing boatyards, marinas, moorings and slipways.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Suggested amendments. Site should be protected. Maintain variety of habitats and quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1116 River Wallington Valley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SINC designation must not prevent continued use and expansion of existing boatyards, marinas, moorings and slipways.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Site should be protected. Maintain variety of habitats and quality of life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Additional Site Submissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1170</td>
<td>Land at 171 Ranvilles Lane</td>
<td>Ranvilles Lane, Stubbington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1171</td>
<td>Land at Junction 10</td>
<td>Fareham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1172</td>
<td>Crofton House Site</td>
<td>Titchfield Road, Stubbington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1173</td>
<td>Land at Common Lane</td>
<td>Common Lane, Titchfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1174</td>
<td>Land at Backacre</td>
<td>Brook Avenue, Warsash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1175</td>
<td>Land to the West of 70</td>
<td>Southampton Hill, Titchfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southampton Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1176</td>
<td>St Columba Site</td>
<td>Hillson Drive, Fareham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1177</td>
<td>Hope Lodge</td>
<td>Fareham Park Road, Fareham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1178</td>
<td>40 Glen Road</td>
<td>Glen Road, Sarisbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1179</td>
<td>Daisy Villa</td>
<td>Brook Avenue, Sarisbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1180</td>
<td>Holly Cottage</td>
<td>St Margarets Lane, Titchfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1181</td>
<td>201-211 Newgate Lane</td>
<td>Newgate Lane, Fareham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1182</td>
<td>Land at Cherry Tree</td>
<td>Botley Road, Burridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>