

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 December 2017 16:04
To: Consultation
Subject: [REDACTED] Comments on the Fareham Draft Plan 2036
Attachments: RESPONSE TO FAREHAM DRAFT LOCAL PLAN 2036.doc

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[REDACTED]

Here are [REDACTED] comments which we'd love you to confirm HAVE actually arrived this time!

Many thanks

[REDACTED]



FAO: Consultation Team at Fareham Borough Council

RESPONSE TO FAREHAM DRAFT LOCAL PLAN 2036

~~I have struggled with the format of the online comment form and also the hard copy I printed off to scribble on. Having discussed this with a member of the Consultation Team today, I am sending in my response by email to: consultation@fareham.gov.uk at her suggestion.~~

~~The main issues that made this difficult for me were the overlapping nature of the headings one could select on which to comment. I am assured FBC's Consultation team will extract the key points from my and others responses. Good luck – and thank you!~~

~~I have struggled with the sheer volume and complexities of planning procedure and detail so will not address this with any masterly skill.~~

I am **alarmed** having attended various meetings including the CAT meeting at the Victory Hall on Friday 10th November 2017 that **systems do not appear to join up** and I feel unless there is massive communication, consultation and collaboration at all levels between the various authorities and bodies with power and decision-making duties and responsibilities; complete honesty and transparency for the common good and a genuine commitment to work together to preserve our quality of life - irreparable damage will be done that can never be reversed.

Hampshire County Council (specifically **highways** and **education, police and fire service**), **Fareham and Gosport Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)** and **Fareham Borough Council** must **liaise and work as one** as far as this is possible. We cannot simply be statistics and formulae-led in decision making of this magnitude but that is how it can feel.

I also feel **communication** between all the other **district** and **borough councils** in **Southern Hampshire** is vital – as we already experience the same problems which will be exacerbated. In my opinion our elected representatives who are **County Councillors** have a particular responsibility to **collaborate** to share the problems in their respective borough and district councils with each other and try to find **common solutions**:

1. These problems are principally a loss in the **organic nature** of our communities in an unregulated, unsupported sprawl where **basic services** and amenities we have always taken for granted are lost and quality of life, especially for young and old, is compromised too much: libraries; local clinics; easy access to doctors and dentists; local school places; further education specially access to A level study; decent public transport; access to real police officers not just cyber and telephone communication, a local pub, post offices and banks etc. Many are gone or are massively reduced – just

Chapter or Policy in DLP
Infrastructure
INF

swept away. Low level crime is on the increase, police have low morale and do not routinely attend burglaries. Criminals know the deterrent has gone and this will worsen. Police numbers must increase. **This is impacting adversely on the quality of life.**

As an older member of the population and in receipt of my bus pass and pension, I should like to put in a plea for the **increasingly disempowered elderly inhabitants** of our borough. And there are a lot of us – 6% above the national average? Talking to people who are not fluent with IT or do not have the internet and are not especially mobile, many had little idea of FBC's Draft Local Plan, where to get forms and how to respond. One elderly lady who is a lifelong resident of Locks Heath burst into tears when I told her the woods at HA9 were being built on. She had no knowledge of this and she remembered when part of it was a strawberry grower's place. Many are becoming more and more isolated in the sprawls of housing estates that have grown around them **without the infrastructure and social opportunities** that were once taken for granted.

2. The other is the increasing vulnerability to **Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease, (COPD)** a growing disease and **asthma** from increasing levels of **pollution** from a massive increase in vehicles going nowhere fast. **Pollution does not respect ward and council boundaries.** One of the reasons we moved here from the city – a relatively short distance from our children - was because of a semi rural aspect nearby and better quality air. My asthma has been much better here but the traffic increases apace and air quality deteriorates.

I would like to see a **joint body of county, district and borough councils, police, commissioning groups et al** that will stand up to central govt. with honesty and a bit of muscle to say this **WILL NOT WORK! You have cut us to the bone and we cannot do this.** A reliance on developers' funding to provide infrastructure is not satisfactory or adequate. Current building requirement figures will cause irreparable damage to the fabric of our boroughs and districts, threaten the health of our people, despoil the natural landscape sweeping away trees and wildlife. Enough is enough! Will this happen? Of course not sadly but I would hope there will be a coordinated and honest response of the likely negative outcomes to people's health and well being and to the flora and fauna that depend on us. Does this happen already? Am I being naïve?

What I find incredulous is that **Hampshire Highways** appears to find little fault with existing highway provision in too many areas when planning proposals go in or in response to the draft plan locations. The A27 in the Western Wards with feeder roads at Park Gate and Sarisbury Green and burgeoning new developments in Eastleigh feeding onto it in the Southampton direction, especially at the Windover Roundabout/Hamble Lane (with many more dwellings planned at the strategic gaps between Eastleigh and Southampton) make a mockery of this view. And peak travel times expand in duration. 'Rush hour' has long been a misnomer.

As for **Heath Rd (HA9)**, the traffic survey that finds little problem with increases in traffic from 70 new units build on woodland, has not taken account of HA1 (N&S of Greenaway 700 units). **Increasingly Heath Rd is a rat-run with speed restrictions flouted.**

- Site proposed for development
- Western Wards
- HA9

I am realistic: we need more homes and I appreciate FBC has included brown field site locations wherever possible. **I am not convinced by formulae used to calculate the number of new homes required (Please can the Consultation Group let me know how the figures were arrived at – I understood it was imposed by central government but think it may have been generated in Southern Hampshire)**

I believe all wards would accept some share of new builds but I question the total numbers and I question the allocation of sites. **Western Wards has absorbed over 60% of new housing in the borough over the last 5 years.**

Although not a fan of **Wellborne** at the outset, I am disappointed Wellborne is now delayed by the actions of intransigent landowners and as a result land within the borough we were assured by all our councillors was 'safe' because of Wellborne is now under threat. Wellborne was undeniably the tradeoff for keeping our countryside, woods and strategic gaps. **And now we will have both.**

I am also concerned at the **proliferation of building applications** for sites that do not form part of the council's new draft local plan to 2036. I hope the council will reject these applications robustly (and can defend their rejections in the context of the draft Fareham local plan 2036) otherwise I fear even more piecemeal development and the possibility designated numbers will be exceeded further with zealous government inspectors rubber stamping applications at the government's behest.

Solution? Reluctantly, because it contradicts what I have just written, my favoured site is one where one of these planning applications has gone in from **Hallam on Newlands Farm**. It has some inclusive infrastructure and access to the Stubbington by-pass (in which the MP was involved apparently), as well as employment opportunities at Daedalus. A strategic gap would be maintained despite the volume of circa 1000 dwellings and its development would relieve pressure on many other sensitive sites. But I am always unhappy at the loss of green field land. **However this is the best compromise for me.**

Suella Fernandes MP: I am a little confused about the role of the Fareham MP in the planned changes to the borough of Fareham. I understand her former expertise as a barrister was in planning but I am informed she has no part to play in influencing or informing decisions made at local government level. She has expressed her sympathy at development proposals in letters to residents and we hope that will be extended to effective lobbying on our behalf with the relevant government departments and ministers. I should like to see her meeting with concerned groups of residents to help them with **generic advice** on how to put an **effective objection** forward. **That should not compromise her 'neutrality'.**

- Site not proposed for development that you think would be suitable
- Newlands Farm

I do not understand if certain types of houses are required and in what proportions overall to meet housing needs. **Can you update me?** My impression is developers will want to maximize profits particularly in areas where the same amount of materials will generate a far higher return. Hence the pressure on HA1.

HA1 →

• A Site proposed for development

• Western Wards

• H1

Comments on individual Development Allocations:

I am not familiar with many of these sites so my comments are general for most. However for all these sites the impact on the quality of life for existing nearby residents must be prioritized to ensure there is **no further fall in standards in quality of life**. All **TPOs should be retained**, along with screening and **building designs** that are in sympathy with the local areas architecture to maintain character. **Environmentally and ecologically friendly building methods and materials should be used**. There should be planting of trees and plants to support wildlife. **Wildlife corridors** should be incorporated and in the Porchester green field areas, wading birds and other migrating birds needs should be protected as a priority. I am concerned at the **Fareham Open Space Provision Report** stats. as they stand and the impact in Locks Heath (in deficit already) and Titchfield Common.

HA1

Far too large at a minimum of 700 units, Warsash's status as a village is compromised. **Pressure on every aspect of infrastructure and wildlife is untenable**. Applications in from developers are a patchwork of unattractive, unmatching building sites. **Any building undertaken here MUST form part of a coordinated whole that is hugely reduced in size and prioritises the needs of wildlife**. Open space for residents on a large scale must be part of this provision. The aim should be for a landscape that exceeds the current one visually and dwellings that are in sympathy with the character of the area and all who inhabit it. **At best it could be an exciting environmentally and eco-friendly project that could set a precedent for other sites across the country**. Ideally it will remain essentially unchanged. Existing infrastructure is inadequate and not easily changed without a huge impact on existing residents' lives and the character of the area. Traffic density problems and the increase in air pollution exist already.

I have responded online to specific planning applications.

HA2 Newgate/475	greenfield
HA3 Southampton Rd/400	greenfield/ significant impact % open space/ pollution
HA4 Downend Rd East/350	greenfield
HA5 Romsey Avenue/ 225	greenfield
HA6 Cranleigh Avenue/120	greenfield
HA7 Warsash Academy/100	extra traffic in Newtown Rd adding to overall congestion/ heritage site
HA8 Pinks Hill/80	
HA9 Heath Rd/ 71 (see below)	loss of remaining woodland in ward

I think realistically this development will go ahead in some form so my opposition is to the number of proposed dwellings and their layout with the consequent impact on the wildlife that uses this woodland as a haven. There will be an impact on local residents in Heath Rd, especially those close to the proposed exit onto Heath Rd with the additional noise of a relatively large number of additional vehicles adding to the increased traffic Heath Rd has already experienced over the last two/three years with Strawberry Fields and Cold East traffic. This together with the loss of trees will impact not simply visually but also to deterioration in air quality.

I should like to make the following points

- Our local councillor furnished us with the information just over 11% of Locks Heath accessible to the public is open space and woodland. This is low. We think it is important to increase this
- A reduction in dwellings to no more than 50 units to enable more of the existing woodland can be preserved as habitat and allow for a small park area that local residents can use.
- All dwellings built will be to an environmentally friendly standard and blend in with the wooded landscape
- An undertaking to preserve any trees with TPOs and to restore and increase the number of other trees that are lost ensuring they are replaced with native specimens that will encourage deciduous woodland wildlife and birds, insects and invertebrates
- The area of the woodland where ownership has not been established, is retained as a fenced off protected wildlife haven and not built on even if such ownership is discovered.
- There will be no play area within the site (as recommended by your Open Spaces Report) since there is one locally at the centre which could be extended in scope for younger children.
- Consider an exit for vehicles onto Centre Way to alleviate traffic onto Heath Rd
- There is a badger sett and although this does not appear to be regularly used as a breeding burrow there are visiting badgers evidenced by numerous snuffle holes who make temp use. We should like this retained.
- Traffic calming measures should be introduced in Heath Rd that is experiencing high levels of traffic as well as speeding. Traffic needs to be kept to a 30mph max. The traffic report undertaken does not take account of additional cars from the Greenaway proposals.

HA10 Funtley Rd South/55 massive increase in village size / greenfield

HA11 Raley Rd/ 49 teems with wildlife/ access to Raley Rd compromised

HA12 Moraunt Drive /49 open space/ bird habitat

HA13 Hunts Pond Rd/38 significant impact on % open space/ green field

HA14 Genesis Centre/35

HA15 Beacon Bottom West/30

HA16 Military Rd/26

HA17 Botley Rd/ 24

HA18 Funtley Rd North/23

HA19 Hunts Pond Rd/ 22 significant impact on % open space

HA20 North Wallington/Standard Way/21

HA21 Hampshire Rose/18

HA22 Wynton Way/13

HA23 Stubbington Lane/12

HA24 Gosport Rd/ 8

HA25 Sea Lane/8 Possible contamination

HA26 Beacon Bottom East/5

Western Wards specifically:

Locks Heath is a small ward in area, the smallest of all Fareham's wards I believe but the population density is high relatively and, additional houses are still going into the gardens where they can be levered in and there is a deficit on recommended open

space that is alarming. **Fareham Open Space Provision (Restricted and unrestricted access)** In fact it is in deficit for minimum ideal provision in an area of its size.

www.fareham.gov.uk/PDF/planning/localplan/DraftLocalPlanEvidenceBase/EV39-OpenSpaceStudy/2017.pdf

Green Spaces and Nature Conservation in Western Wards

So many of the areas in the Draft Fareham Local Plan are green space. They are often designated 'Countryside' and outside the Defined Urban Boundaries (DUBs). In the case of the Greenaway lane proposals north and south (HA1) this keeps a green space between Warsash and Locks Heath. **We have always been led to believe by members of the local council this was protected 'open countryside'.** We need our green lungs and the wildlife does too, endangered or otherwise. **Protecting and preserving the plant and animal habitats runs parallel to protecting our future. Everything connects.** A balance must be maintained: that balance is threatened in Western Wards that have absorbed much of the brunt of recent developments over the last 20+ years, most recently with over 800 homes at Coldeast in Sarisbury Green and Strawberry Fields in Park Gate. In the 5 years we have lived in Western Wards there is a large visible decline in wildlife habitat and sightings.

Infrastructure in Western Wards:

Traffic

We are not an island in Western Wards. FBC, EBC and WBC – all deluged with planning applications, must communicate and coordinate with HCC Highways. Traffic, noise and pollution increases with every new development. Locals and visitors note the worsening density of traffic at peak times and the increase at all times on the local network. A choked A27 with unacceptable tailbacks along Brook Lane and Barnes Lane and lengthening peak times is the norm. In addition, busier and faster local roads in the Western Wards compromise the safety of drivers and pedestrians, especially children and the elderly.

Schools and Safety

Considering HCC's formula for 'guestimating' the number of school places required, current capacity levels cannot meet need in the Western Wards. Without additional schools, children will have to travel further afield which adds to congestion and safety. There is a limit to the number of additional, temporary classrooms that should be added without damaging the quality of the educational environment and the impact on learning itself.

Health Provision

Local GP services are over-stretched and despite innovations by some surgeries, appointment systems are not meeting patient needs. With an increased population, comes even greater pressure on a system that already does not meet top quality provision. **Traffic conditions getting to the Q.A. and Southampton General are often heavy: there has to be a significant impact on survival rates if emergency services are fighting the traffic.**

Today my husband queued up at Brook Lane Surgery before midday to try to get an appointment for me (specifically with our GP who knows my condition) when the next batch of appointments were released at midday. In the meantime I logged on to the online system that releases the appointments at 12:00 on Fridays. Staff were very apologetic to him but there was no appointment available. In the meantime, I remained logged on until 12:10 and no appointments were put up on the online booking system at all by this time. This is the reality. How can this system, struggling already, cope with another huge influx of dwellings? What do my husband and I do next? We have to return to the surgery at 08:00 on Monday morning to see if there is anything available then. Raffle type tickets are issued as people queue in an attempt at fairness. I am not blaming our surgery in the least because they are trying so hard, merely making the point that the system is breaking and cannot sustain more pressure. The standard of provision is already impacting on people's health and for old people without transport, mobility and the internet it is unacceptably difficult to see a doctor.

In conclusion

In short, quality of life for residents in Fareham will continue to diminish on many key levels if more and more developments are permitted that will further erode 'the character and aesthetic of the local areas with the consequent increase in dwellings, population and vehicles. Without the required and appropriate degree and type of new infrastructure: accessibility to doctors, dentists, quality education provision, etc and freedom of the highways, etc., the system will fail. Fareham has one of the highest levels of car users in the country and creative thinking of a possibly unpopular nature may have to be considered both here and elsewhere to reduce levels and numbers in the interests of mobility and health. Adjacent boroughs and districts that have the same problems to solve, must communicate.

I believe there is one alternative to the draft Fareham Local Plan which is development of the site at **Newlands** (which is not part of the draft Fareham Local Plan 2036). There is a planning application in for circa 1000 homes with supporting infrastructure. And I would support this with a heavy heart because it is another green field site that will be lost forever.

I do not envy the decision makers but I hope they will truly represent the needs of the local people, the wildlife and our shared environment.

Than you



