

## **WRITTEN DEPUTATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE**

These written deputations are to be considered in line with the Council's deputation scheme.

### **5. Deputations**

To receive any deputations of which notice has been lodged.

(1) **WRITTEN DEPUTATIONS** (Pages 1 - 6)

**For further information please contact:  
Democratic Services, Civic Offices, Fareham, PO16 7AZ  
Tel:01329 236100  
[democraticservices@fareham.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@fareham.gov.uk)**

## Written Deputations to Planning Committee – 11 September 2024

### Jayne Keepence 6(1) – Land South of Bellfield

As a resident of some 20 years in Titchfield I am aware that the present infrastructure just cannot cope with its existing population and allowing an increase of some possible 200 (allowing 4 per new home) extra residents will cause further strain.

Traffic congestion will increase and the area between the roundabout at Coach Hill through South Street/West Street will suffer even more frustrated drivers/minor accidents and hold ups. Children/parents crossing the road from Lower Bellfield to Garstons Road for school will be an increased risk (school patrol removed years ago). We do not need another possible 114 cars in the village (allowing 2 per new home).

Removing a much loved and well used 'Horse Field' will prevent walkers/dog owners/children/wildlife to continue to enjoy the area. This area is part of Titchfield, it's been so many years. This small part of Titchfield is a much loved field. Taking it away from residents is cruel, unnecessary and will just cause grief for those who live in the village.

Titchfield has just two small shops which support those in the village who do not have the means to get to larger supermarkets. These shops may well suffer from increased usage and therefore reduced stock for those who need it. Both One Stop and the Co-op have just one delivery per day with a small storage area for any excess stock they may need. We already have huge delivery lorries arriving early in the morning in square and cannot accommodate further deliveries during the day due to traffic congestion. This is something which could possibly start to happen if additional housing is allowed.

The GPs surgery cannot cope with its present patient load, heaven knows what will happen should they be expected to take on more.

Foreman Homes do not have a good reputation having recently been fined for not adhering to building policies/procedures in another local venture.

I am vehemently opposed to the build and believe that this should not be allowed to go ahead. As a very small fish in a somewhat large ocean I doubt that my opinions will be taken into consideration but feel strongly enough to take up this deputation.

## **Robert Marshall (The Fareham Society) 6(1) – Land South of Bellfield**

The Fareham Society is pleased to note the improvements made to this application in the amended amended plans submitted in August this year.

They address two of our previous objections. First, by the additional extent of land made over for tree planting on the southern and eastern boundaries of the site. Second, by the deletion of the unattractive gable end properties facing the road and by a generally improved housing layout. On the first point we added the caveat that the tree planting should be of a suitable size and native species. However, the Committee Report indicates that this will be so and thus allays our concern on this.

That said, the Society retains one substantial objection to this application. The proposed houses fronting Posbrook Lane remain too close to the road. As such they would be overly visible, notwithstanding the roadside hedge, from this well-used road. Although the hedge along Posbrook Lane is to be retained it would be too low to provide an effective screen. A satisfactory development would require a further setback of houses from the road combined with a strengthening of the hedgerow and some tree planting along its length. As things stand even the existing hedge may be in danger in the future given its proximity to the housing facing onto it.

It is necessary to limit the visual impact of the proposed development on Posbrook Lane to minimize its impact on this attractive valley setting. The necessity for this is highlighted by the Fareham Landscape Assessment of 2017, a document relied upon in producing the Local Plan. It says of this valley area that it is of high overall sensitivity, particularly in respect of the character and quality of the landscape resource and the abundance of valued landscape features across. It has a role in containing the outward sprawl of urban development. Given this it says that it is necessary to maintain the essentially quiet, rural and unspoilt countryside character of the landscape, and the local lanes and access routes within the area and avoid encroachment beyond the existing urban edges, as around Titchfield, especially where this may intrude upon the unspoilt, rural character and high quality of their landscape settings.

The proposed development, given the proximity of houses to Posbrook Lane, would harm the character and appearance of the area in ways that the Landscape Assessment says should be avoided.

**Simon Lampkin 6(3) – 35 Holly Hill Lane**

My overarching concern is the impact that 3 dwellings and its additional; residents will have to the adjacent area as this is currently a single property. More than two properties seem excessive in my view and a cause for concern.

I would therefore like the following points to be addressed please: -

1. Assurance that adequate off-road parking for each of the properties is correctly sized for at least 2 cars plus a visitor's spaces. Please beware that:
  - a. My fence has been damaged and repaired twice this year due to vehicles mounting the pavement and smashing into fence. On both occasions the drivers blamed parked cars obstructing view.
2. Privacy to my garden and property both now and in the future. Adequate provision of screening and use of frosted glazing.
3. Impingement of natural sunlight resulting in inability to grow grassed lawn and plants already planted and a general reduction to our wellness. I would strongly object further, unless there is an assurance that there would be a limit to height/growth of any tree or shrubs that would affect our property in this way.

## **Robert Marshall (The Fareham Society) 6(8) – Conifer Rise**

The proposed development would be a substantial incursion beyond the development boundary of the Local Plan. It would be on land comprising a Strategic Gap, designated as an Area of Special Landscape Quality and within the Titchfield Abbey Conservation Area.

Referring to the landscape within the Conservation Area the Titchfield Abbey Conservation Appraisal and Management Strategy states: *The rural character of the landscape has been protected from inappropriate development through conservation area, countryside and strategic gap designation. This has maintained the separate identity of settlements and preserved the open and rural character of the valley and the setting of the historic buildings. However, the rural character of the valley is vulnerable to change and urban encroachment, urbanisation ...would harm its integrity and the setting of the historic buildings.*

The proposed development of tall three storey houses on the western slopes of the river valley would be just the kind of development that the Council's planning policies have sought to avoid. Although a reasonably well screened site in summer months the reduction of leaf cover at other times would almost inevitably lead to the proposed houses appearing unacceptably intrusive. Moreover, even in the summer the houses would be seen through the existing access point and, if the access was improved in line with the County Council's highway engineer's understandable concerns, views into the site would be more pronounced.

Taken in isolation, the impact of the proposed development on the Strategic Gap aim of maintaining the separation of settlements would, given its scale, be limited. However, such arguments could be used all too frequently and if accepted in this case would make it difficult to prevent the cumulative harm of such development on the Gap.

The benefits of removing some existing structures on site, as set out in the Committee report, are noted. However, it is considered that they would be outweighed by the degree of intrusion of the proposed development.

It is considered that the proposed development be harmful to the character and appearance of Meon Valley landscape, would be contrary to statutory requirements on the protection of Conservation Areas and would be harmful to the objectives of the Strategic Gap.

The Society urges that permission be refused.

## **Robert Marshall (The Fareham Society) 6(9) – Land to the South of Funtley Road**

The Fareham Society's concerns on this application relate to the following points:

- a) The extensive use of white render, timber boarding and grey brick for the proposed houses. These materials are out of keeping in this setting. Although there may be some white render in the village centre and on the village pub by far the predominant building material west of the railway bridge in the vicinity of the site is red/yellow brick.
- b) It is essential that development on the site accords with an overall design approach, especially where fronting Funtley Road. This may be difficult to achieve given the location of land for self-build houses fronting this road.
- c) The retention of roadside screening is welcomed. But some additional strengthening of this would be welcomed.
- d) It is noted that details of drainage have been provided. Given local residents' concerns on flooding in the area it is essential that these details are closely scrutinized before permission is granted.
- e) In the interests of a more sustainable development the proposed houses should be fitted with solar panels.

## **Robert Marshall (The Fareham Society) 6(10) – Land East of North Wallington**

Application P/0894/Oa, for an almost identical proposal, was dismissed on appeal on the grounds that “the site represents an inappropriate location for the proposed dwellings, having regard to access to services and facilities on foot...”. This decision was based on the Inspector’s finding that North Wallington Road would be the only route providing access to services and facilities within reasonable reach on foot. However, this route, he found, “...is not safe, secure or attractive nor does it minimize the scope for conflict between users.....Occupiers of the proposed development would therefore be more likely to opt for the convenience of the private motor car.”

The Society notes the Highway Authority’s advice on an improvement scheme for pedestrian access along North Wallington Road as set out in the Committee report. However, it is considered that this would not give pedestrians the necessary sense of security that only a footpath separated from the road by a kerb would provide. As such it would not provide the necessary safe or attractive route to encourage walking to local facilities as opposed to use of the private car. The site would thus, on sustainability grounds, remain an inappropriate location for houses.

It is noted that that the applicant is proposing parking restrictions on North Wallington Road to facilitate the proposed options. However, they would require a Road Traffic Order (RTA) and this cannot be guaranteed. And in any event, there would remain the need for pedestrians to share the road with passing vehicles.

The Society recognises that the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies given that housing delivery falls below the 75% target over the previous 3 years. However, as outlined above this proposal would not be sustainable development and the harm of permitting the application would demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Given the Society urges that permission be refused.