



I strongly object to the above Plan for many, many reasons. You have doubtless received a plethora of technical reasons, a few of which I attach. You won't want to read through them again here but please note I fully endorse the arguments and investigations carried out by the Romsey Action Group.

It beggars belief that Portchester is even being considered for further expansion. The roads are already a nightmare. Indeed, Fareham was voted the most car-dependent town in the country in 2014, with 538.7 cars per 1000 people, equating then to 59,795.7 cars (assuming a population of 11,000). This has impacted greatly on Portchester traffic, with queues often exceeding 0.8km at rush hour times. Getting into Fareham can take 50 minutes!

The schools situation is dire. Waiting lists are already long. The Healthcare situation is dire. Routine appointments take up to 3 weeks. Air pollution is dire. Fareham has the unenviable distinction of being one of the most polluted places in the country.

Extra housing in Portchester will tip the balance and turn the quality of living here from the present inconvenient to a living Hell.

Whilst I am sad and concerned about the extra air pollution in Fareham, I am also angry that FBC didn't get its act together by ensuring Welbourne would deliver on time, thus avoiding unnecessary disruption and destruction of smaller communities round about.

At best, the whole concept is misjudged; at worst, it is asinine.

## Fareham Local Plan 2036.

### Housing Site HA5. (SHLAA ref:207).

**OBJECTION** is raised to Housing Site HA5 because:

1. The loss of 'best and most versatile' agricultural land (grades 1 and 2 in this case) would be contrary to para.112 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Poorer quality land in Swanwick (Site 3017), Sarisbury (Site 3109), Locks Heath (Site 3036), Titchfield (Site 3060) and Stubbington (Site 1341) should have been allocated but has been passed over. The Local Plan fails to demonstrate that sites have been subjected to a robust sequential test.
2. The loss of feeding grounds for Brent Geese and waders close to the Portsmouth Harbour SPA would be contrary to para.113 of the NPPF. Land with relatively little ecological value in Swanwick (Site 3017), Sarisbury (Site 3109), Locks Heath (Site 3036), Titchfield (Site 3060) and Stubbington (Site 1341) should have been allocated but has been passed over. The Local Plan fails to demonstrate that sites have been subjected to a robust sequential test.
3. Increased traffic on A27 junctions with significant capacity issues and repeated road safety incidents (west from Delme Roundabout and at the Portchester Road/Dore Avenue Roundabout) and residential streets (Romsey Avenue, Hatherley Crescent, Beaulieu Avenue) with kerb-side parking that restricts two-way movement for much of their lengths.
4. The lack of recreation facilities in Portchester, contrary to para.73 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In 2011, para.5.17 of the Fareham Core Strategy recognised the shortage of public open space in Portchester and recorded assurance that the village would consequently not be expected to play a significant role in housing provision before 2026.
5. Reduction in the choice of school places (contrary to para.72 National Planning Policy Framework) and pressure on local medical facilities.

### **SUBMISSION**

The inclusion of Site HA5 as a residential allocation is unjustified and inconsistent with national policy (especially paragraphs 7, 72, 73, 112 and 113 of the NPPF), so the draft plan is unsound.