

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/A1720/W/21/3272188

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/A1720/W/21/3272188

Appeal By MILLER HOMES

Site Address
Land to the east of Downend Road, Portchester
Porchester Fareham
PO16 8TS
Grid Ref Easting: 459881
Grid Ref Northing: 106317

SENDER DETAILS

Name MRS ANNE BRIERLEY

Address
21 the causeway
Fareham
Hampshire
PO16 8RN

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

P/20/0912/OA

App/A1720/W/21/327188

Land East of Downend Road

I have found it extremely difficult and frustrating to do this online and it may well of put others off from commenting if like myself they find it incredibly difficult because they have very little knowledge on modern technology.

Object.

Firstly the development site IS on the southern slopes of Portsdown Hill and is completely seperated from any other housing with the railway line to the south, the crematorium and gardens of remembrance to its eastern side, although there are some static homes to the northeast. To the north is the M27 motorway which has now divided Portsdown Hill. Downend Road runs down from the top of Portsdown Hill on the west of the site with farm land to the west of that. Downend Road runs south crossing over a very narrow railway bridge and ends were it meets The A27. The site its self is boxed in and is not well joined to other areas. Its Green space / Farmland.

This forms a gap between Portchester/ Fareham.

Portsdown Hill was considered an area which should be preserved when the local plan was being consulted on. Because the site is tucked away some may think it now doesn't count as part of the hill. The site location is not in the current housing plan, with the new one not yet been adopted and signed off due to another change in housing numbers that are not yet known.

The proposed plans for the developement seem to fails on some points. It attempts to design out the vehicals hoping to reduce cars and parking. Is hoping that people will walk and cycle, they may well do for leisure. From the time the development was first planned many changes have happened. Many shops and business have closed. There is NO POST OFFICE or BANK in Portchester precinct or close to the development site. There is a post office that is now relocated and has been combined with a small Co-op much further away, along White Hart Lane so not where it was originally when plans began.

The preference to us a car, given the distance from the site to shops will i believe still be there.

Buses are not what were reported at the last appeal. There is NO sign as to when the bus rapid transit system, BRT will arrive or when the extra lanes will happen ,If at all. (I feel the BRT was used to sway the last inspector when he looked at walking distances to bus stops.) I did attend at that appeal and although I can't say for sure what he was thinking , he did ponder a while , when this was mentioned.

We have just had letters from Hampshire County Council regarding investigation works as part of the Transforming Cities Fund with Public consultations later this year. Again when will it arrive arrive.

Cars cycles and parking on the development.

Fareham has the Residenential Car and cycle parking standards document. Adopted November 2009 It reads that Fareham has an above national average of car ownership per household by ward and project a rise of 19% of ownership by 2026.

Parking is to be decided by bedroom numbers and dwelling type with more emphasis on cycling and walking.

With car ownership projected to rise, will we find ourselves in a situation as in Portsmouth where residents then park in near by streets. If parking is limited and a dwelling such as a flat, is not provided with a parking space, just a cycle space, no one will be able to stop the resident from having a car and parking else where, on a grass area within the development or even in a near by street. It wont take much to walk over Cams Bridge

Nitrogen mitigation. Waste water.

I have asked this before, How are the developers going to limit the use of water to 110 ltrs or less per person per household given that water can not be cut or turned off. The usage and the bill for payment are private matters for the resident a lone. Is this just an idea thought up with to yet again get more

money.

I hope the inspector will review the last appeal report and all the comments and deputations leading to the new appeal. If the inspector visits the site please be mindful that the senior exam years at schools are finished end of May as there are no exams this year. Also as the appeal is in August, all schools would of finished so the traffic could be reduced.

Last appeal number. APP/A1720/W/19/3230015

In the Appeal Decision under Preliminary Matters the inspector had adjourned rather than closing the appeal, to give the appellant time to submit a certified copy of an executed Section (S106) agreement. Should a S106 of been executed and payments made, given that the planning application had not yet been granted.

Is there a limit to the number of contributions, (S106s and S278s) that can be used , given that a S106 is used in planning to make acceptable that which would otherwise be unacceptable, such as loss of green space and to mitigate the problems that will arise from the development.

Is this not money paid by the developer to get what he wants.

Downend Road Bridge.

At the last appeal much was said about the crossing of this bridge by both the pedestrians and vehicles. The appellant relied on the fact that Hampshire County Council had already agreed to either of two options. Known as options 2 and option 3. It is written in the inspectors report, that in a meeting prior to the appeal HCC had discussed option 4 with TRAFFIC SIGNALS, and said it WOULD delay the traffic. Its strange how after the inspector had been so dismissive of both the options 2 and 3 in the inspectors report, it is now option 4 that they are using, which WILL cause queuing, traffic delays and affect the operation of Downend Road and the implications for users and residents.

There is very little difference between option 3 and that of option 4, just that signs are replaced by the traffic signals/traffic lights on option 4. Both have shuttle working and a single lane for vehicals, with a 2mtr wide footway over the bridge. Although the 2mtr footway will be raised creating a channel. The bridge width can not change and the parapet shape won't either unless they are being rebuilt. They both will delay the traffic and cause queuing which will effect the residents that live near by.

At the Last appeal the inspector wrote. Quote.

To accommodate additional pedestrians crossing of the rail bridge in Downend Road there is no dispute that alterations would need to be made to the bridge. That is because the existing bridge only provides a very rudimentary refuge for pedestrians, in the form of a very narrow margin, that comprises a strip of tarmac. The rail bridge provides poor facilities for pedestrians crossing it.

Based on the evidence before me, I consider that the introduction of option 3 would result in unacceptable queuing and delay for vehical users of Downend Road.

Much has been made of HCC, being accepting of both options 2 and 3, but as I have said above. I consider those options have pedestrian safty and capacity shot comings. I am not persuaded, on the evidence available to me, that I should accept that because HCC has not objected to options 2 and 3 that either would be acceptable.

There would also be a conflict with policy DS40 of the Fareham Local Plan. Part2; Development Sites and Policies of 2015 (DSP) because of the implementation of option 3 queuing, would have an unacceptable traffic implication.

I am of the veiw that the unaccetable harm to pedestrians safety and the operation of the public highway that I have identified could not be addressed through reasonable planning conditions. I have assessed all of the other material considerations in this case, including the benifits i have identified by the Appellant, but in the overall planning balance i consider that the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably out weigh the benifits when assessed against the pilicies of the framework taken as a whole.

Quote ended.

So if that is what he believes how can traffic lights be any better.

Will anyone take on board the sizes of the trucks and the coaches which use this bridge. I have repeatedly sent in pictures of lorries and buses which cross this bridge. Some i hope are in the comments that i have already previously sent in.

The coach company changed ownership just before the beginning of the out break of Covid, and is now owned by National Express.

They are seen running regularly both mornings and afternoons, and were running yet again through The Causeway at the beginning of this year.

Some have the sign Fareham DSTL on the front of them. They go up hill over the bridge and later return back down.

The over sized lorries should also not going over the bridge. There is a 7.5ton limit, except for loading, from the A27 to the bridge, and from the bridge to the A27 junction . There are signs near to Fort Nelson on the way down which read,.. Weight Limit 1/2 mile ahead. No Access to A27 for HGVs. But they keep crossing.

January this year I saw an articulated lorry turning from the Fareham direction, trying to turn into Downend Road.

He hit the curbs at the railings and only just made it. He then went straight up the hill and over the bridge.

On Downend Road at the The Ridgeway how are they going to add another lane ?

How is the resident in the first house as you turn into Downend Road supposed to get in and out of their drive if the extra lane is added ?

The danger on the the bridge at Downend Road is real. With extra pedestrians now using the bridge since Covid for exercise and dog walking , add to this the everyday traffic, deliveries, driving instructors cars from the test centre and everyone who uses the hill as a short cut to avoid the motorway with the increased numbers of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers to and from the Winnham Farm development, if planning is granted may well turn out to be Fareham Councils biggest nightmare. Who will take responsibility if the concerns of the residents and road users should we be proved right ? We have now unfortunately experianced a death of a poor young girl at the bridge last year and no one would won't to see that happen again. The developers won't worry as they will just take the money and be gone.

Portsmouth council recently refused planning for access for 27 flats on Portsdown Hill Road / James Callaghan Drive because of the numbers of accidents and deaths that had occured on it. This road is a contiuation from Downend Road across the hill.

Anne Brierley. 21 The Causeway, Downend, Fareham, Hants. PO16 8RN.