

Draft Letter of Objection by Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum

LAND AT POSBROOK LANE TITCHFIELD

APPLICATION NO. P/17/0681/OA

Fareham Borough Council (FBC) approved the Titchfield Village Forum earlier this year. The Forum is now in the process of working with FBC in preparing a Neighbourhood Plan for Titchfield which will be embedded within the new Local Plan.

The Forum comprises a representative cross section of the community and has a duty to consult with the community as a whole. The plan is ongoing and the points below are made as they have largely come out of this consultation process.

Titchfield Village Forum objects strongly to the above application following a unanimous vote at a Forum meeting on 20th June 2017, for the following reasons:

1. The Forum accepts the principle of development to meet local needs. Responses to consultations have highlighted the need for smaller (2/3 bedroomed houses) which are affordable; these houses to be on brownfield or small sites in locations accessible to the village. FBC has shared with the Sites Group of the Forum SHLAA (Call for Sites) information. We are aware of a number of sites capable of meeting the housing needs that meet the criteria without developing a very large single site. We are also aware of large areas of land in suitable locations on the outskirts of the village in the ownership of Hampshire County Council.
2. The Forum has commissioned an independent Housing Needs Assessment. This is in a final draft form and has been prepared by planning consultants (AECOM). This report will be published when available. However, it indicates that the projected need can be more than met by available sites. The consultants also advise that the 82 homes to be developed at the site adjacent to the Holiday Inn will count towards meeting the Housing Needs when they are completed. The Forum strongly believe FBC should take this into consideration.
3. The Forum notes that the Planning Statement submitted with the application acknowledges that the current FBC local plan is out of date and that no specific local policy is cited as justification for the development. Whilst we acknowledge the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) suggests that planning permission should be granted under normal circumstances in the absence of any adverse impacts, there are, in reality, many problems created by this development. We therefore object to the planning justification given in the planning statement.

4. The quantum of development illustrated on the application represents a significant increase in size to the urban form of Titchfield. We assume the proposed development is to be built in one build phase (over several years)? This form of implementation goes against the urban village morphology of villages throughout the UK. Historically villages develop incrementally using small step changes in scale (or grassroot development) rather than one large all-embracing development.
5. The connectivity of the proposed development appears to not properly consider pedestrian movement patterns between natural assets or the village centre. This oversight would encourage vehicle traffic for short commutes to the village core which should in our view be discouraged. In order to encourage walkable communities, greater emphasis should be placed on the public realm and foot movement across the development. This highlights the disconnected nature of the development which does not connect well with infrastructure of the village.
6. The scale of development shown will visually increase the urban form of Titchfield and will increase the visual impact of new development upon the southern portion of the Meon Valley. We question whether a credible visual impact assessment has been carried out on the impact of view both into and out of the proposed development site.
7. We have concerns regarding the accuracy and independence of some of the supporting reports and the process of the Community Consultation. The Scout Hut appears to be a recent addition and was not included in the Community Consultation.
8. Other areas of concern include the effect on village amenities, traffic in the village, impact on the historic village and conservation area together with environmental considerations.
9. This proposal is considered to be premature due to both the New Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan being in the process of preparation by FBC and the Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum

We would be grateful if you would note these objections and also permit a representative of the Forum to speak at the time the application is considered.