

# FUNTLEY VILLAGE SOCIETY / FAREHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

## MEETING MINUTES

**Date/Time:** Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> July 2015, 19.30 hrs

**Venue:** Funtley Social Club (Function Room), Funtley Rd, Funtley.

---

### 1.1 Invited:

**Funtley Village Society:** Mr Edward Morell (Chair), Mrs Rosemary Petrazzini, Mr Stuart Tennant, Mr Andy Tower, Mrs Elaine Tower, Mr Clive Percival, Mrs Barbara Percival, Mr Adrian Saunders, Mrs Ruth Saunders

**Fareham Borough Council:** Councillor Seán Woodward (Executive Leader), Cllr Keith Evans, (Executive Member for Planning and Development), Richard Jolley (Director of Planning and Development)

**1.2 Apologies received:** Mr Kevin Day, Mrs Helen Hallett, Mr Jason Mudge

### 1.3 Agenda Items

ED welcomed all to the meeting and introductions were made.

Ed stated the reasons for the meeting were that Funtley Village Society (FVS) wish to engage with Fareham Borough Council (FBC) and the Welborne landowner/developers and that some of our concerns have already been raised in the past, but not addressed. FVS is prepared to listen and work constructively with the council.

Cllr Woodward stated that he had asked for the meeting 13 mths ago. FVS delayed this until the decision re Welborne was made. He is happy to listen and engage. Interested in what we have to say. He stated that he does not expect to see any development near Funtley until 2026.

#### 1.3.1 Conditions of meeting (Ed)

Previously agreed by email. The agenda and minutes to be recorded and agreed by Cllr Woodward and FVS.

#### 1.3.2 How can FBC help the residents of Funtley in the future regarding the Welborne Development

Cllr Woodward stated that they are happy to be engaged as they have been over the years. He is more than happy to engage and wants to move the debate forward past the argument about not having Welborne. He appreciates our wishes to want the best for our community.

Ed stated a FVS Committee meeting was held yesterday and we are looking to working constructively moving forward.

### **1.3.3 FVS Representation - Welborne Plan (Ruth)**

Ruth referred all to the FVS representation to the Welborne Plan. She stated that although SW has been asking for a 'shopping list', it is all actually stated within our representation, which took the members of the Society hundreds of hours to complete. She expressed disappointment that not one of our concerns raised or ideas ('shopping list') were taken forward by FBC, but were just 'noted' in the follow up documentation by FBC. She hoped this part explained why the FVS were so disillusioned. Ruth asked whether or not the recommendations made in the FVS representation would be looked at and ideas taken forward by FBC.

Cllr Woodward explained that the representation was for the Inspector to address not FBC. He went on to say how he knew the length of the document FVS submitted, but nothing can be agreed until the developers' applications start to come in. Richard Jolley agreed and stated that FBC can't be exact about development until detailed applications come in and we need to engage with the developers at that point. Issues such as the extent treatment of the buffer are still to be worked through.

Ruth stated she felt the question hadn't been answered and asked again whether or not the recommendations made in the FVS representation would be looked at and ideas taken forward by FBC.

Adrian stated as an example of one of our ideas, that there is an ideal opportunity for developers to plant trees in the buffer zone and would make a lot of people in the village happy – but only if these are planted early – i.e. a community woodland. Cllr Woodward strongly supported the concept of early planting if the woodland idea was to be pursued. There would need to be careful thought given to the amount and location of any public access to the buffer zone/community woodland. This is to allow it to flourish. Ruth reminded FBC that this was one idea in our Welborne representation submitted over a year ago. It was also mentioned that access through a community woodland would be via existing pathways.

Cllr Evans stated that there would be low density housing next to buffer zone north of village.

Cllr Evans stated developers have indicated that planning applications will be submitted at the end of this year 2015 or the beginning of next year 2016.

Richard Jolley stated there is a clear obligation on the developers to have pre application community engagement. This means they should have meaningful dialogue with community residents. It would be considered poor practice not to have community engagement. Ruth asked if FBC would support residents if they felt this engagement had not been 'meaningful' and Cllr Woodward stated this would be the case and FBC would monitor the effective of the engagement. Council will facilitate the engagement and will press for this as well.

### **1.3.4 Buffer zone (map illustration to include community woodland) (Adrian)**

Cllr Woodward stated that the Inspector and FBC felt that 50m was adequate to enable community separation and that he is aware that FVS does not agree, but these are the same buffer zones applied to other developments such as Whiteley. He explained that the site promoters control 90%

of the land for Welborne. They will have to come forward with technical documents to explain how they wish to take the development forward. Cllr Evans stated that in some cases the buffer zone may be up to 75 metres. Ruth stated that FVS were aware of this, but did still not agree it was adequate.

Ed stated that FVS want engagement with the landowner/developers. This had been offered 18 months ago but meeting was cancelled by the landowner/developers and no further date offered. A Standing Conference meeting was hosted at Dean Farm last year by the landowner/developers (Jason Mudge attended on behalf of FVS) and whilst this was useful it didn't contain much detail. All agreed that a meeting between FBC, the landowner/ developers and FVS is an immediate priority.

**Action:** Cllr Woodward to progress meeting with FVS and the landowner/developers.

### **1.3.5 Measures FBC are to put in place to reduce impact of development work (e.g. noise, dust, pollution, traffic etc.) on residents and village (FBC)**

Ed asked about traffic throughput in Funtley and how developer traffic will use this as a rat run. Richard Jolley stated that FVS will have the opportunity to look at and will be consulted on application plans with this regard. If the measures in the plan are disregarded, then there are safe guards in place which construction traffic has to follow. FBC will monitor this. Planning authorities have been shown in the past to have some success in managing traffic. It is up to vigilant residents to tell the FBC if they go against these agreements.

Clive asked if it is envisaged that there would be designated traffic routes for construction traffic? Cllr Woodward answered yes, and these would be enforced by the FBC, but is up to the residents to tell them if breached.

Cllr Evans felt that most traffic would come into the construction site another way and not through Funtley. Ruth explained that west to east traffic would come off the motorway at Whiteley junction and come through Funtley as this the quickest route. All agreed.

Clive stated that there is a 7.5 Tonne limit on the bridge but this is ignored and a few years ago it had to be repaired. Also explained that the 30mph signage only applies after the bridge and that speeding is a problem up to that point. Ed explained that during his conversations with residents, many are concerned about traffic speeding. The recent speed monitors placed in the village were discussed – these had been placed twice (the first being in place when the road was resurfaced, so cars were unable to speed and the second ones presently in place are only warning signs and do not collect any data on speed). Cllr Woodward explained that FBC has 6 monitors and only 2 of these collect data, so we did not have the 'deluxe' versions. He asked if we had the rubber strips across the road - Andy explained we did and that these were double strips so would be able to collect speed data.

Ruth stated FVS would like the 30mph limit to be applied to the whole length of the village, starting from the Funtley sign in River Lane.

Cllr Woodward stated that if we write to him about Funtley and better signage, he will put this request in motion.

**Action:** FVS to put concerns in writing to Cllr Woodward to progress.

Ruth raised the concern about dust and pollution bearing in mind when the motorway junction work is progressed there is a South Westerly prevailing wind so noise, dust and pollution affecting Funtley will be increased. Cllr Evans stated that dust, noise etc will be conditions of the developers' application and this will be monitored. Adrian stated that the nearest pollution monitor is at the Quay Street roundabout, so how would this be able to monitor levels in Funtley? Cllr Evans stated that there will be monitors nearer the site. If needed, FBC will place monitors in Funtley.

Ruth asked if noise reduction surfacing would be included in the M27 motorway to reduce noise in Funtley. Cllr Woodward answered that he was unaware of plans to do this at present, but this was managed by Highways England. Elaine asked why the noise reduction measures have been included in the plan for the new Welborne residents, but Funtley have no similar measures taken place? All agreed.

**Action:** Cllr Woodward to take to noise reduction surfacing on M27 near Funtley up with Highways England.

### **1.3.6 Density of housing adjacent to buffer zone/strategic gap or allotments, play areas, green spaces etc. (Ed)**

Cllr Woodward stated that low density housing is planned to be next to Funtley, but will depend on the applications.

### **1.3.7 Adequacy of flood mitigation measures i.e. sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) and FBC response to increased flooding risk in Funtley (Elaine)**

Ed explained our concerns about the increased risk of flooding in Funtley and recent flooding events. Cllr Woodward stated that the SUDS were a matter for the detail in the developers' applications. SUDS must be built to the standards of the local County Council regulations. Cllr Woodward stated that the flooding risk after development must be better or no worse than the existing flood risk. Richard Jolley explained that FBC has engagement with the Environment Agency, as they are the statutory consultation body. This detail should come through with the planning applications. Cllr Woodward explained he has a concern as Hampshire County Council no longer has a responsibility to adopt flooding mitigation measures. He felt the planning authority should consider them needing to be at a proper standard as if the County Council would adopt the measures. Stuart asked if there was any evidence of SUDS working successfully elsewhere. Cllr Woodward cited Whiteley.

Richard Jolley reassured FVS that there have been large sites around the country where SUD systems have been very effective. They can have a positive environment impact as well, if laid out as ponds etc.

Elaine mentioned the Flood and Water Mgt Act of 2010. Under this Act if the SUDs get blocked or not maintained, the persons responsible are legally liable. She asked who will be responsible for the on-going maintenance of SUDS? Where do we stand as we don't know who manages them? Richard Jolley confirmed that developers do have to state who will be responsible for managing SUDS in their plans. Cllr Woodward stated that the Council have no responsibility to maintain them.

Ruth mentioned that the flooding assessment document put forward with the Welborne Plan for the Inspector shows Funtley as low risk. Why is this? Elaine explained that there used to be a big lake behind the offices at Funtley Court, which was a natural SUD. This no longer exists therefore our risk is increased.

The existing Funtley Lake is fed underground by a spring from Funtley Common. Junction 10 is potentially going to be built at Funtley Common – where will the water go and how will this impact on Funtley Lake?

Richard Jolley stated that this is why engagement with the local community important as they have local knowledge. He felt it is very important to understand these issues.

Elaine felt that SUDS in Welborne will be ineffective in preventing flooding in Funtley, as Funtley is at the bottom of a slope. She asked if shallow drainage channels will be included. Richard Jolley stated that no yet details have been received from the site developers. As technology is advancing they are becoming more discrete however.

Cllr Woodward reiterated that flooding must not be any worse, if not the same following development.

Elaine expressed concern that the Welborne development and the resultant foul water shouldn't pollute the SUDS. Will this be in the planning applications? Cllr Woodward stated that this must be included in the planning applications. Cllr Evans confirmed that this must be included in the outline applications.

### **1.3.8 Planning applications with landowner/developers with regard to all land bordering on Funtley e.g. location of revised junction 10, future development applications in village (RS)**

Ed explained about the recent local enquiry to the west of the village for development. Now that the Welborne Plan has been approved, if this application is proposed again, would FBC support this?

Cllr Woodward explained that 21 new sites proposed by developers were rejected in the Sites and Policies Plan report at the time that the Welborne Plan was approved.

FBC is committed (as a result of the Inspector's report) to an early review of the Local Plan. This will include a call for available development sites. Ruth asked if Cllr Woodward thought it was fair on Funtley residents to expect them to bear Welborne, as well as other potential development on their doorstep. Cllr Woodward stated that FBC would not look at a site in a strategic gap, but may look at all other available land (*NB land to the west of Funtley is not in a strategic gap*). Local Plan review will take at least 3 years. Site to west of Funtley is outside of FBC current need and is contrary to the present Plan but as stated the Plan is being reviewed. Ruth expressed concern that this does not reassure us that this additional land will not be built on.

Cllr Woodward also stated that additional housing number required to be built, depend on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which is what determines housing need. FBC must meet a duty to cooperate with other councils. Housing development is in following order: 1<sup>st</sup>: cities, 2<sup>nd</sup>: urban extensions, 3<sup>rd</sup>: greenfield. The land west of Funtley would be classified as rural and therefore not a priority for development. PUSH will publish data this autumn, showing number of additional housing needed in Fareham.

AS asked if this means that more houses could be built on Welborne site? Cllr Woodward answered that environmental constraints have already shrunk housing numbers at Welborne from 10,000 to 6,000.

Stuart asked that with the PUSH figures being published soon, what happens when Gosport is full? Where will the houses go? Will there be possible development south of Newgate Lane as a result? Cllr Woodward – there would have to be more evidence produced by Gosport Council to show they don't have enough land to build on outside of Newgate Lane.

### **1.3.9 Proposal for Funtley CAT meeting (Cllr Woodward)**

All agreed that a CAT meeting should follow the FVS meeting with landowner/developers and FBC.

## **1.4 AOB**

**1.4.1** Stuart asked about the cycle track, which stops at Mayes Lane. Is an extension going to be built into the Welborne development?

Cllr Woodward answered yes, he hoped so. FBC will encourage this. The Duty to Cooperate will duty bound Winchester City Council to do this. Cllr Woodward would like FVS feedback on this aspect to be included in the strategy going forward.

**1.4.2** Stuart asked about Knowle Holt – will there be space for a car park, if the Holt is progressed? Cllr Evans stated that land around the Holt will be reserved, until the end of the entire development, in case Network Rail and the Train Companies decide to reopen the station and expand the train line. Richard Jolley stated that FBC did some detailed master planning to test the proposition and the scale of development and what could be achieved. This showed that land could be reserved for the Holt and parking. This is why land will be reserved – but unlikely that this will happen because of the huge resources required to fund this. The Bus Rapid Transport system and the funding needed for this will be the main focus for transport in Welborne, not rail.

Cllr Woodward stated that with regards to infrastructure funding, FBC are chasing the Government for £30 million to complete the funding target of £300 million, £200 million of which will be provided by the landowner/developers.

**1.4.3** Elaine asked about the work needed for M27 Jct 10. Will there be any compulsory purchase for any housing in Funtley?

Cllr Woodward stated 'no'.

### **1.4.4 Recycling Centre**

Elaine asked about the recycling centre proposed at Welborne and expressed concern that that all Welborne traffic will come through Funtley until this is built. Cllr Woodward answered that until there is the demand for a centre, by having a certain number of residents in Welborne, it would not be built.

Richard Jolley stated it is a facility to be provided not just for Welborne residents, but also for other residents of the surrounding areas.

#### **1.4.5 What will happen to existing footpaths**

Cllr Woodward stated that there is a statement in the Welborne plan that footpaths must be diverted or kept but cannot be lost. Footpaths can be made into roads however. Cllr Woodward - there will be interchanges between facilities, which will be available to all Fareham residents. Cllr Evans said there was references on the Welborne plan to provide inter connectivity between Funtley and Welborne.

#### **1.4.6 Community facility – upgrade**

Ed – in negotiating with the developers, would it be reasonable to ask for a pavilion in the play area field or other community facility? Cllr Evans stated that FVS should put this to the developers, as this would be an ideal suggestion to ask them to pay for. Also asked if FBC would support us, if we asked the developers to refurbish the Social Club.

Cllr Woodward – yes he would support us. Would have to be considered alongside what is provided within Welborne Plan.

#### **1.4.7 Ruth explained that the expansion of village to the west in recent years, has not seen an expansion of facilities: e.g. litter bins, maintenance of verges and overhanging branches**

Cllr Woodward stated that we should talk to our County Councillors as this is their responsibility.

Barbara mentioned about the overgrown road verges over the bridge. Cllr Woodward stated that urban areas get 10 cuts a year, whereas rural areas only get 2 cuts a year.

Cllr Woodward asked for a ‘housekeeping list’ of items such as these that are not being addressed.

Ed mentioned meeting with our local ward councillors, who are taking some of these issues forward.

**Action:** FVS to provide Cllr Woodward with a housekeeping list of neglected areas e.g. lack of bins, overgrown verges, overhanging branches in village etc.

**1.4.8** Adrian asked if extending the speed limit to the outer limits of village would encourage more development? Cllr Woodward answered no, it doesn't. It solely depends on how built up the area is.

**1.4.9** Adrian stated that there is a 60mph limit, exactly where the road floods in River Lane.

**Action:** FVS to write to Cllr Woodward to extend speed limit of 30mph to other side of bridge. Need data gathered for speed of traffic other side of bridge.

#### **1.4.10 Cost of Welborne £2.2 million to date (2010-2015) – FBC comments?**

Cllr Woodward stated that not a penny comes out of our council tax. It has come from central government.

Ruth stated that this is still taxpayer's money. All agreed.

Cllr Woodward thanked us for our hospitality. He felt it was a positive meeting and fulfilled the need to move forward. All agreed it had been a constructive meeting.

Ruth stated that minutes will be shared and agreed with FBC, prior to sharing with other community groups.

**21.30hrs – Close of meeting.**

*Post meeting note: Cllr Woodward forwarded a short briefing note on SUDS which are attached as an addendum to the minutes.*

