



Clerk: Mrs A Collins  
Homefield, Kytes Lane, Durley, Southampton, SO32 2AE  
Phone/Fax: 01489 – 860236  
Email: uphampc@homecall.co.uk

24<sup>th</sup> January, 2017

Dear Councillors,

Upham Parish Council wish to re-iterate our objection to the application to be discussed tomorrow evening. Our original objection letter expressed grave concerns about the impact of this development on the traffic in the narrow lanes of the National Park, and these objections remain unaddressed by either the applicant or any of the other work by the promoters of options B and C.

Those of you who spoke at the Council Meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> December talked eloquently of the need to see all of the facts before deciding on which option to pursue, and this was confirmed (despite the immediate press coverage) by the Council's press statement following the meeting which stated:

*The Council would like to clarify the decisions that were made at the Full Council Meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> December, 2016. The aim of the Council Meeting was not to give the go-ahead to the building of 6,000 homes north of Bishopstoke and east of Fair Oak (identified as options B and C in the Local Plan consultation).*

*Rather, it was to agree further investigation of identified sites and initiate a feasibility study into strategic growth options in the Borough. This is made explicit in the recommendations to Councillors contained in the Council Report.*

The Report to Committee on the 15<sup>th</sup> December identified considerable risks to the delivery of the North Bishopstoke link road, and these remain.

The case for option B and C therefore relies on a road which is unproven in its deliverability (conversations with Winchester only started on Friday), cost (dialogue with network rail reveals a potential ransom strip of unknown but very large cost) or effectiveness (no traffic studies have been done apart from the very high level initial studies).

The arguments put forward for approval of this very opportunistic application, by both the applicant and your own officers' report, rely heavily on the suggestion that a decision has already been taken to progress with B and C as the preferred option. This is not so, and we attach a planning consultant's opinion which demonstrates that to rely on the motion passed in the light of the concerns embedded in the report, flies in the face of guidance in the NPPF.



Clerk: Mrs A Collins  
Homefield, Kytes Lane, Durley, Southampton, SO32 2AE  
Phone/Fax: 01489 – 860236  
Email: uphampc@homecall.co.uk

As a separate issue, you are being asked to approve a scheme for 250 houses for which your landscape officers recommend rejection on grounds of over dense development and visual impact. One of the country's foremost experts on hydrology has condemned it, as it relies on obsolete methodology to justify the amount of attenuation proposed. Professor Sear's clear concerns can only be met by more land being given over to attenuation, whilst the landscape officers call for more public open space. Something has to give, and it is the number of dwellings being applied for. An application for 250 houses on this site is therefore clearly unsustainable and threatens severe flooding to the centre of Fair Oak.

The applicant suggests that to approve this application will be "held to the council's credit" by the inspector. What will really be "held to the council's credit" will be a sound local plan development process, one that establishes a clear evidence base before taking any decision on B and C.

You have previously taken the very sensible view that this application should be deferred pending a decision on the Local Plan. Why should you change that opinion?

We would therefore urge you to further defer this application, if you do not refuse it on the grounds of unsustainability/flood risk as set out above.

Wait until you are presented with firm evidence that the North Bishopstoke link road is deliverable, affordable and effective. Only then, if your final choice is to proceed with B and C despite the environmental objections, proceed to approve development on this site as part of a properly worked out masterplan.

There is no need or justification for doing otherwise.

Kind regards,

Cllr David Ashe  
Chairman of Upham Parish Council