

**Title of meeting:** Cabinet Member for Planning, Regeneration & Economic Development

**Date of meeting:** 2 December 2014

**Subject:** Milton Site Allocations 2014 - Consultation Responses

**Report by:** City Development Manager

**Wards affected:** Milton, Baffins

**Key decision:** No

**Full Council decision:** No

---

**1. Purpose of report**

1.1 To report on the responses to the consultation on the proposed site allocations at Locksway Road, Milton and to set out the next steps

**2. Recommendations**

**2.1 It is recommended that PRED**

**(a) notes the consultation responses received, and in the light of these, (b) agrees that further work be undertaken to demonstrate whether the proposed level of development is deliverable.**

**3. Background**

**The Consultation**

3.1 On 14 August 2014 the Cabinet approved for consultation draft site allocations for St James's Hospital and the University of Portsmouth's Langstone Campus. The owners of the sites had indicated that they intend to dispose of these sites for development, and consequently the city council wanted to put in place a policy framework for these sites.

3.2 Consultation took place between 15 August and 30 September 2014. Letters were sent to around 2300 homes surrounding the sites, and the consultation was available on the council's website, as well as in hard copy at the Beddow Library in Milton and the City Helpdesk.

3.3 In addition, the city council held a drop-in session at Beddow Library on 28 August and a question & answer session at St James's Church on 4 September, and attended the Milton Neighbourhood Forum on 17 September and Eastney

Meets on 22 September. All meetings were well attended, in particular the Milton Neighbourhood Forum, which attracted around 150 people.

- 3.4 The consultation generated a significant number of responses. 235 responses were received from residents - some of these were from couples, families or groups of neighbours. One included a petition with 65 signatures as well as facebook comments. In addition, 15 responses were received from statutory consultees and interest groups.
- 3.5 The appendix to the report summarises the responses received. The first section sets out responses from residents. Some lines show direct quotes from respondents, others have been paraphrased and summarised in the interest of brevity, and where many respondents made similar comments. The original responses are available to members.

**Main Issues raised by residents:**

- 3.6 By far the most strongly expressed view is **sadness / anger at the potential loss of the St James's site**. It is highly valued in the local area as a recreational resource, an escape from city life and for its wildlife value. Many of the consultation responses end in an appeal to the council to see the value of the site as a resource to residents from across the city into the future, and for the council to do everything in their power to save the site from development.
- 3.7 **Impact on wildlife** from the loss of trees and open spaces is mentioned by many. These are valuable in their own right, but also for the enjoyment they bring to people.
- 3.8 **Impacts of the development on infrastructure are a big concern** - a long list of services is mentioned, but the most common concerns are:
- Traffic on residential streets as well as the wider network
  - Education
  - Doctors
  - Sewage capacity / drainage

Residents feel that these services are already under significant strain in this area of the city and that this amount of development would make matters a lot worse. Many call for **independent assessments** of the infrastructure impacts (traffic and wildlife in particular), to help review any data submitted by future applicants and to determine whether an allocation can be justified.

- 3.9 **The character of Milton would be altered significantly**. The area is seen as one of the few remaining areas in the city offering a good quality of life, which would be lost.
- 3.10 Residents object to the **driver for development** of the site being the maximisation of the receipt for the NHS. If this land is becoming available it **should be put to best use for local people**.

- 3.11 While **many object to any development at all**, oppose the sale of the site(s) and question the need for more homes, others accept that this may be unrealistic. They **seek a reduced quantum, or a form of development which could have fewer impacts on the site itself and on infrastructure demands**. Social / Care uses are favoured, with a retirement village, dementia and other care homes, as well as educational uses being suggested most frequently.
- 3.12 Many more issues and suggestions are raised by residents. These can be found in the summary tables in the Appendix and in the individual responses. Members are asked to note all the responses and consider them in deciding how to move forward with the proposals for the sites.
- 3.13 The second part of the Appendix sets out the responses submitted on behalf of organisations and interest groups. These are much fewer in number (15) and reflect the particular interests of each group, such as nature conservation bodies, infrastructure providers, the landowners and the Milton Neighbourhood Forum. They are therefore shown organised by respondent in the table.

#### **Next Steps**

- 3.14 If development is to be supported on the St James's Hospital and the Langstone Campus sites, one of the chief concerns of local residents is the impact that these developments would have on local infrastructure. Of particular interest is the road network, based on the perception that this is already overstretched. It is therefore suggested that further work be undertaken to review the current situation on the road network, and make an assessment of the position should the volume of development (480 homes) suggested in the draft site allocations document come forward.
- 3.15 Officers in Education are working on an assessment of the impact of the additional development on school place provision and how this could be addressed.
- 3.16 Further, it is recommended that the number of dwellings suggested for the sites is reviewed. The draft figure was based on an assessment of the land area / floor space available on the sites. While this is common practice at the draft stage of a site allocation, in light of the comments received, it is suggested that further work is undertaken to take into account local policy provisions such as local car parking standards and required open space provision, to refine this figure.
- 3.17 It is also noted that a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) must accompany the final version of any Site Allocations Plan. Therefore, if the sites are to be included in such a plan, an HRA will be required to demonstrate that the site can be delivered in the light of European level nature conservation regulations.

#### **4. Reasons for recommendations**

- 4.1 If an allocation is to be progressed, the city council will have to demonstrate that the proposed level of development is deliverable.

#### **5. Equality impact assessment (EIA)**

- 5.1 An EIA is not required, as this report is largely for information, reporting back on the consultation responses. A full EIA will, however, be required for the full Site Allocations plan.

#### **6. Legal Implications**

- 6.1 Preparation of the site allocations document, is regulated in accordance with Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (the Local Planning Regulations). When a site allocations document is being prepared the Council is required by the Local Planning Regulations invite the statutory consultees, and other bodies, together with local residents and businesses, to make representations regarding the subject matter of the allocations proposal. The report confirms the Council's compliance with the requirement that the Council must take into account the representations that have been made, and allows the Council a further opportunity to consider the proposals before more formal processes for preparation of the development plan document begin.

#### **7. Head of Finance Comments**

- 7.1 As a result of the approval of the recommendations of this report further work will need to be undertaken. In any case it would be expected that further work would be needed to progress an allocations plan through an examination. The costs and resources required to carry out this additional work can be met from existing cash limited budgets and resources available.

.....  
Signed by:

### **Appendix: Summary of Consultation Responses to 2014 Milton Sites Consultation**

**Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972**

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

| Title of document                 | Location  |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Individual Consultation Responses | City Development & Culture  |
| Draft Site Allocations for Milton | <a href="https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/dev-consultation-doc-2014-milton-sites.pdf">https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/dev-consultation-doc-2014-milton-sites.pdf</a> |

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by ..... on .....

.....  
Signed by: