

**Minutes of the  
Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel  
(to be confirmed at the next meeting)**

**Date:** Tuesday, 14 September 2021

**Venue:** Council Chamber - Civic Offices

**PRESENT:**

**Councillor** M R Daniells (Chairman)

**Councillor** P J Davies (Vice-Chairman)

**Councillors:** T Davies, J S Forrest, N R Gregory, L Keeble and N J Walker

**Also  
Present:**



**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies of absence received at this meeting.

**2. MINUTES**

It was AGREED that the Minutes of the Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel held on the 25 May 2021 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

**3. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements made by the Chairman.

**4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISCLOSURES OF ADVICE OR DIRECTIONS**

There were no declarations of interest received from Members of the Panel.

**5. DEPUTATIONS**

There were no deputations received at this meeting.

**6. PLANNING STRATEGY UPDATE**

The Panel considered a presentation from the Head of Planning Strategy and Economic Development on prevailing Planning Strategy Matters. The presentation included a summary of the responses received on the Revised Publication Local Plan Consultation, which ran from June-July 2021.

The Head of Planning Strategy and Economic Development ran through each site in turn, for which comments had been received and concluded with information on the next steps for the Council's Local Plan. Members asked questions and commented as appropriate throughout the presentation. A copy of the presentation is appended to these Minutes.

The Head of Planning Strategy and Economic Development concluded by providing Members with a brief overview of a new Government scheme for affordable housing, First Homes. Although this is a housing initiative it will have an impact on the Council's Planning process, therefore Members were reminded that an item will be presented at the Housing Scrutiny Panel on the 16 September 2021 which will provide more details on the scheme.

RESOLVED that the Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel note the contents of the presentation.

**7. COUNCIL TREES SERVICE REVIEW**

The Panel considered a report by the Director of Planning and Regeneration on the Council's Tree Service Review. The report provided an opportunity for the Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel to scrutinise the report prior to the Executive meeting on the 21 September 2021.

The Head of Development Management presented the report highlighting the key areas of the review and how these in turn have influenced the recommendations put to the Executive for decision. The Panel expressed their support for the proposals and asked questions for clarification throughout the discussions.

Members of the Panel provided details of possible funding opportunities for tree planting and discussed the importance of tapping into as much available funding as possible. Officers explained that a lot of work has already been carried out to investigate funding opportunities for tree. It is expected that this work will increase once the proposals from the review have been agreed.

Members also enquired about the link to the proposed revisions to Council's Tree Planting programme and the Council's Climate Change Action Plan, asking for reassurance that these changes wouldn't have a detrimental impact on the number of trees planted each year. Officers explained that with a re-organisation of the proactive tree planting towards strategic sites it was not anticipated that there would be an overall reduction in the number of trees planted and that this will be monitored by officers.

Members enquired as to which trees types capture the most carbon and if consideration could be given to this as part of the Council's Tree Planting programme. Officers agreed to investigate this matter and notify Members of the Panel accordingly.

RESOLVED that the Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel: -

- a) note the contents of the Executive report at Appendix 1; and
- b) recommends to the Executive at its meeting on 21 September 2021, that it endorses the recommendations as set out in Appendix 1.

## **8. EXECUTIVE BUSINESS**

### **(1) Approval of Revised Charging Schedule for CIL**

No comments received.

### **(2) Coastal Partnership - Chichester District Council request to join Coastal Partners**

No comments received.

### **(3) Housing Delivery Test Action Plan**

No comments received.

### **(4) Local Development Scheme**

No comments received.

### **(5) Revised Publication Local Plan Consultation**

Members asked if the Revised Publication Local Plan will be used to determine planning applications. Officers explained that it will certainly be a material consideration in determining planning applications.

## **9. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SCRUTINY PANEL PRIORITIES**

The Chairman asked Members of the Panel to consider the priorities for the Panel.

RESOLVED that the Planning and Development Scrutiny panel considered the priorities for the Panel.

(The meeting started at 6.00 pm  
and ended at 8.17 pm).

# **Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel**

## **14th September 2021**

### **Revised Regulation 19 Local Plan Consultation Summary of Responses**

**FAREHAM**  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

# Background

- The Council undertook a Regulation 19 consultation on its Revised Publication Local Plan in June/July this year.
- The consultation lasted 6 weeks, ended 30<sup>th</sup> July.
- Responders were invited to comment on 'new' additions to the Plan highlighted in the document.
- Special Edition Fareham Today, Virtual Exhibition, five CAT exhibitions and four CAT meetings.
- Received over 500 individual comments on the Plan.
- Relatively low turn out at CAT meetings and exhibitions

# HA54 – Land east of Crofton Cemetery

## Summary of comments – 41 comments

- Site will diminish the strategic gap.
- Not a sustainable location.
- Site will exacerbate issues with lack of local infrastructure.
- Development should focus on Welborne & brownfield sites rather than green space and use strategic gap for environmental/climate change mitigation.
- Planning application previously rejected – strong objections.
- Will overlook and impact on amenity of church and cemetery.
- Request for clarification from Gosport Borough Council on transport assessment.
- Requirement from highway authority for cycle and pedestrian links and reassurance of no impact on local highway network through site specific Transport Assessment as part of planning application process.
- Environment Agency welcomes the specific criteria added to policy to specify that development should avoid part of site in flood zone 2 and 3 – and retain it as open space.

# HA55 – Land south of Longfield Avenue

## Summary of comments – 70 comments

- Impact on strategic gap and loss of settlement identity.
- Site will exacerbate issues with lack of local infrastructure.
- Concern on impact on new bypasses and increase traffic and air pollution.
- Loss of open countryside, farmland, wildlife habitat and hedgerows.
- Concern of encroachment due to flexible development edge.
- Housing numbers should not include 900 unmet need making sites like this required.
- Number of homes too many.
- Unsustainable location.
- Need to consider impact on and from HMS Collingwood.
- Development should focus on Welborne & brownfield sites rather than green space.
- Request for clarification from Gosport Borough Council on transport assessment.
- Highways Authority remove previous objection to site on transport grounds
- Requirement from highway authority for reassurance of no impact on local highway network through site specific Transport Assessment as part of planning application process.



# HA56 - Land west of Downend Road

## Summary of responses – 34 responses

- Area already heavily congested – allocation will increase traffic and pollution.
- Disappointed being progressed after being told not in the Plan.
- Transport modelling is flawed - absurd that it suggests improvements to traffic conditions.
- Rail bridge is inadequate and site will result in more accidents.
- Concern of overhead power lines.
- Development should focus on Welborne & brownfield sites rather than green space.
- Site is on Portsdown Hill which plan protects – should be removed. Significant landscape impacts.
- Too much infill on remaining green space around Wallington and Portchester.
- Uncertainty and distrust of localised access arrangements and potential rat-run effect of link road.
- Support from Portsmouth City Council for site to meet unmet need and developer support for 650 not 550.
- Site will require reinforcement of local wastewater network (Southern Water).

# BL1 – Broad Location for Housing Growth (Fareham Town Centre)

## Summary of comments – 18 comments

- Allocation is too vague – difficult to comment when so little is known.
- Uncertainties exist around the delivery and viability and impact on neighbouring areas.
- No supporting evidence base – too aspirational.
- Site will require reinforcement of local wastewater network.
- Site will exacerbate issues with lack of local infrastructure.
- No details on future of car parks or Ferneham Hall.
- Good idea to redevelop the town centre and dwelling numbers could be increased to 5-6 storey buildings.
- Allocation will cause severe traffic congestion.
- Allocation will negatively impact the shopping centre.
- Historic England object to allocation on basis that there is no evidence that it will not negatively impact local historic assets.
- Support on basis of sustainable location, including HCC.

# Fareham Housing Sites

## Menin House – 2 responses

- Site will require reinforcement of local wastewater network (Southern Water).
- Fareham Society –support site allocation.

## Land north of Henry Cort Drive – 7 responses

- Concerns over traffic and parking in the area and loss of open space
- Impact on strategic gap
- Suggestion that a recycling facility should be incorporated
- Site will require reinforcement of local wastewater network (Southern Water).

# Fareham Housing Sites

## Redoubt Court – 4 responses

- Concerns over loss of open space, and impact on wildlife habitats.
- Historic England expressed concerns that allocation is not sound as site is within the setting of Fort Fareham and development should be restricted to 2 storeys.
- Support from Fareham Society, but concerned over loss of open space

## Land west of Dore Avenue – 14 responses

- Concerns over loss of wildlife habitat, open space and impact of accesses onto Dore Avenue/Linden Lea.
- Concerns over proximity of the allocation to the crematorium.

# Unmet need

## **Eastleigh Borough Council**

- Support the overall approach to housing provision and the contribution to unmet need
- Significant PfSH wide unmet need will remain – suggest FBC commit to reviewing Plan should this be necessary following completion of the PfSH work.

## **Winchester City Council**

- Support housing provision – though highlight uncertainty of unmet need following PfSH work and need to be flexible.

## **Portsmouth City Council**

- Welcome contribution to unmet need and additional allocations

## **Southampton City Council**

- Support the overall approach to housing provision and contribution to unmet need
- Significant PfSH wide unmet need will remain

## **Development industry**

- Consider the unmet need to be too low given the published figures
- Suggest that a range of additional sites should be allocated to make a larger contribution

# Other comments from neighbouring authorities

## **Eastleigh Borough Council**

- Welcome recognition of importance of Solent Enterprise Zone and Plan's approach to employment floorspace.

## **Portsmouth City Council**

- Support approach to employment provision.

## **Gosport Borough Council**

- Support DS2 on Strategic Gaps and would like to work together on a GI strategy for the strategic gap.
- Reiterates their view that policies DS1: Development in the Countryside, HP4: Five Year Housing Land Supply, and HP6: Exception Sites are unsound, due to potential implications for Fareham-Stubbington Strategic Gap.



# Other Local Authorities

## **Southampton City Council**

- Welcome contribution towards employment floorspace – request reference to ‘cities first’ approach in relation to office space.

## **No responses received from**

- New Forest National Park Authority
- New Forest District Council
- Test Valley Borough Council
- Havant Borough Council

# Highways Authorities

## Hampshire County Council

- Transport Assessment is suitable, but would have preferred an additional model run.
- Request extra wording to prioritise cycling and walking in allocations and general transport approach.

## Highways England

- No critical issues raised.
- Recommend further modelling with anticipated employment growth.



# Statutory environmental agencies (1)

## Environment Agency

- No issues with legal compliance, soundness identified

## Historic England

- Welcome changes made to the plan since last consultation - HA7 (Warsash Maritime Academy) and HA42 (Land south of Cams Alders) now considered to be sound.

# Statutory environmental agencies (2)

## Natural England

- Welcome that many policies have been updated to incorporate previous advice.
- Welcome revised CC2 (Flood risk) in relation to drainage and treatment.
- Recommend that policy in NE2 (Biodiversity Net Gain) aligns as closely as possible with the Environment Bill – and SPD be developed to provide further detail.
- Recommend that latest mapping be used in relation to SWBG sites and that Plan identifies suitable projects to which SPA financial contributions can be directed towards.
- Specific comment on E4 (Solent 2) in relation to habitat management.

# Other statutory bodies

## Marine Management Organisation

- Welcome specific reference on how potential developers should take into account the South Marine Plan.

## No responses received from:

- Solent LEP
- Local Nature Partnership
- Mayor of London
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Homes England
- Clinical Commissioning Group
- Office of Road and Rail Regulation
- Transport for London

# Other Organisations

## **Southern Water**

- Comments on specific allocations needing wastewater network reinforcement.
- Part of WWTW wrongly identified as BGSW sites on policies map.

## **National Grid**

- Comment regarding national grid assets in close proximity to three allocations.

## **Network Rail**

- Comment regarding accessibility of Swanwick Station and the need to consider this for nearby developments.

# Next steps

- The Council's Local Development Scheme references Autumn 2021 for submission.
- Officers are preparing the documents to submit, including a summary of the responses from this consultation and the first Regulation 19 Publication Local Plan, 2020.
- No requirement to make changes or modifications before submission.
- However, some minor changes may be proposed through the examination process, either at the hearings or beforehand. Delegated authority to Officers from Council in June 2021 to propose minor changes to improve legal compliance and/or soundness.
- The Council has appointed a Programme Officer to act as a liaison officer for residents/respondents during the examination.
- PINS to appoint Inspector within 3 weeks of submission
- Examination expected winter/spring 2021/22
- Examination pages on our website – with a 'news' section

