

[REDACTED]

From: Consultation
Subject: FW: LOCAL PLAN 2 - VILLAGE SITES
Attachments: VILLAGE SITES.docx

[REDACTED]
Engagement Officer
Fareham Borough Council

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 December 2017 21:44
To: Development Management <devcontrol@fareham.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: LOCAL PLAN 2 - VILLAGE SITES

Pse find attached my Ltr of Objection regarding the inclusion of Wallington Sites in the Draft LP2.

Pse acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Thank you

[REDACTED]
Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 1 December 2017 at 19:33:36 GMT
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: LOCAL PLAN 2 - VILLAGE SITES

Fareham Borough Council

Civic Offices

Fareham

Hants



1 Dec 2017

FBC LOCAL PLAN (2036) – WALLINGTON SITES

1. I wish to object most strongly to the following sites being included within the draft Plan that has recently been forwarded by FBC for consultation:

PINKS HILL (HA 8) , MILITARY ROAD (HA 16) NORTH WALLINGTON & STANDARD WAY (HA20)

o A chapter or policy in the DLP

o Infrastructure (including transport)

2. General Points:

o INF 1

- It is clear from both the SHLAA and the draft Local Plan itself, that very significant challenges to development of any sort, exist on all 3 sites, not least of which is both access and the proximity of the M27 and M27/J11.
- All 3 Wallington sites are Greenfield sites with a relatively high Land Quality Assessment, their inclusion in the draft plan is but a further example of FBC's complete disregard for the Govt. directive on retaining Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land. (NPPF para 112 refers)
- All Sites will require an upgrade to the Village sewerage system, which currently has no spare capacity (SHLAA page 49 refers)
(It should be noted that parts of the sewerage system in the village date back to Victorian times, are poorly documented and generally require a disproportionate amount of effort/expense to work on)

- FBC's Local Plan's 2 and 3 have clearly been written in splendid isolation and indeed there is not a shred of evidence in either Plan, to suggest that the cumulative effects have been properly considered. This is entirely and utterly unsatisfactory and renders both PLANS "Unfit for Purpose".
- Additionally and given the proposed allocation of housing within LP2 to Portchester/Wallington and the Town Centre itself, I would contend that the Housing Allocation has NOT been shared equitably across the Borough at large and furthermore, takes no account of the huge impact that 6,000 houses @ Welborne will have on the Fareham East/North Wards in particular.

3. Specific Points:

- a) PINKS HILL (HA8) – 80 Houses
- A Site proposed for development
 - Fareham
 - HA8
- Access to this site is a particularly difficult issue:
 - Pinks Hill is a Sub - Standard Private Rd (Owned by FBC), whose width is restricted at the mid -point by a listed WW2 Pill Box. The road was built to facilitate HGV's from the nearby Industrial Estates and those in Standard Way, North Wallington, to access the M27. The road is currently very heavily used by HGV's; It is a dangerous road that Local Residents tend not to use if they can avoid it!.
 - Exit **down** Pinks is via a very sharp (Sub Standard) bend, which provides access to the M27/J11 Slip Rd. (NB: Current Highways legislation does not allow ANY such access to Motorway Junction Slip Roads. Accordingly, it is **highly unlikely** that Highways England would countenance any changes/so called "improvements" to the present access.

- An Exit Left from the Site **down** Pinks Hill ONLY leads to x 1 destination (M27/J11) – there are NO other options.

- An Exit Right from the Site, towards Standard Way, leads to a 1.5 mile access road through the Standard Way Industrial Site.

- According to the FBC proposal for this Site, a Pedestrian Crossing across Pinks Hill is of particular importance; an intriguing proposition and one which demonstrates a complete lack of understanding as to the site itself. Specifically:
 - There are NO pavements on Pinks Hill, nor on the adjoining part of Standard Way. In similar vein, both Military Rd @ Drift Rd are narrow Country Lanes/Drifts and neither of which have any pavements, with pedestrians perforce having to walk on the road itself.

 - Accordingly, it is interesting to surmise as to exactly where the so called “Pinks Hill Pedestrian Crossing” will terminate, let alone what purpose it would serve!!

- The sloping site enjoys views of x 6 lanes of J11 Slip Road, with perhaps occasional glimpses of the increasingly congested J11 and Delme roundabouts.

- More worrying however, is FBC’s proposal to site housing in such close proximity to a Carbon Monoxide blackspot (J11), despite having recently received a Govt directive to address this precise issue.

- In summary, Pinks Hill is an entirely unsuitable location for Housing; it is an isolated site with absolutely no facilities, no access to Public transport and particularly difficult access.

- A Site proposed for development
- Fareham
- HA16

b) **MILITARY ROAD (GAUNTLETT'S FIELD) (HA 16)** – 26 houses

- It is understood that a Legal Covenant applies to this Site, which prevents the building of houses for 10 years. Were this to prove the case, then clearly the Site is “Non – Deliverable” (SHLAA para 3.17 refers) and it ought be removed immediately, from the Local Plan.
- Military Road is a narrow and Private Road (owned by FBC) without any pavements; it provides a “single track” access to Drift Road, which is similarly narrow and is also without pavements.
- There is significant Planning history/precedent associated with the Site, which has been the subject of 2 Public Inquiry’s over the years, both of which resulted in Development being refused. Nothing has changed to alter those judgements.
- The SHLAA recognizes that the site has significant ecological benefit and the need for protective measures. It goes on to say, that Drift Rd is unsuitable for providing any access to/from the proposed site; I would entirely endorse that view.
- A number of natural springs exist on the site, which have in recent years caused flooding to local properties and indeed the land has several geological complications. In addition to the randomly appearing natural springs, there are pockets of “Blue Slipper Clay”; a further indication as to the sites unsuitability I would suggest.
- In summary, this is a small piece of “Open Space” that is cherished by Village Residents, which we are not prepared to loose in order to satisfy an ill- conceived and grossly inflated PUSH derived housing requirement.

- A Site proposed for development
- Fareham
- HA20

c) NORTH WALLINGTON & STANDARD WAY (HA 20) – 21 Houses

- This ill – conceived Housing Site, is level with and a mere 150 metres from, the M27; the resultant Noise Levels and Carbon Monoxide levels (Previous J11 comments refer) make the Site **entirely unsuitable** for Housing. (The Daytime @ Nighttime Db requirements for Residential development close to Motorway Noise are perfectly clear (PPG 24 refers)

(WORTHY OF NOTE – is the fact that in their Proposals for Welborne, Buckland Development Ltd, decided not to build any Housing **within several THOUSAND Metres of the M27.**)

- The Main Aquifer Supply pipes to the Portsmouth Water Pumping Station @ Maindell, North Wallington run diagonally across the Site and provide the main water supply to Fareham!.
- **Access to the Site** – It is very difficult to see how access could be constructed for this Site; other perhaps than a direct access to Standard Way at the very top of the site. Given that the section of North Wallington leading to the existing junction with Standard Way is a country lane with no pavements, then additional traffic from this site onto this junction, would be highly unwelcome.
- The site, which is 100% ALC Grade 2 quality, is relatively isolated and without amenities. There is no public transport and car usage is therefore likely to be high.
- A sloping and prominent Greenfield site at the edge of the Village, any development would dominate existing dwellings that have been there for hundreds of years (ie: Riverdale Cottages)



