

# A report to PUSH outlining the current concerns of BPAG and DCPAG relating to the SDA N/NE of Hedge End.

Submitted by David Simmons on behalf of the Botley Parish Action Group and the Durley & Curdridge Parishes Action Group  
14 January 2009

## OBJECTIVES

- **To express the concerns of local communities.**
  - **To encourage openness and involvement between PUSH, Eastleigh Borough Council and the community.**
- 

## PAST CONCERNS OF LOCAL COMMUNITIES

June 2004	PUSH was promoting a “world class city region” which sucked in both market towns and countryside.
July 2005	The Hedge End SDA was conceived “in secret”, without any democratic public exposure. <i>Ref: Minutes of 19 July 2005 PUSH meeting</i>
October 2005	The single SDA option put to the consultation did not supply an indicative area even though it was known by officers that, for practical purposes, the potential area was very closely constrained.

The site capacity (9000) appears to have been rather speculative in the October 2005 consultation, falling to 6000 for the feasibility study and questioned further by potential developers in the David Lock report who suggest the need to expand further into Winchester District and/or to merge settlements even to achieve this figure.

### Concerns over pre-requisite technical background work

- Landscape sensitivity work still incomplete and possibly misused in 2004/5
- No evidence that a map of potential areas resulting from a geographical analysis of constraints and opportunities was published or communicated.
- Landscape/ community impact / visibility /ecology was not assessed.
- Major pipelines risk not recognised as a threat.

- No evidence of the implications of critical M27 links between junctions 5 and 7 ever having been examined in the context of the SDA and neighbouring development proposals.
- Concerns over South Hants environmental capacity in the Sustainability Appraisal of the South East Plan and elsewhere not taken seriously enough.

## Concerns over Sustainable Development

What long term consideration, post 2026, has been given to the following issues:

- An ever increasing population?
- A continuous need for new housing?
- Pushing the environment to its limits – to be saved by evolving technology and increased energy use?
- Ever more constraints on movement and quality of life?
- Ever more cost – born by citizens and consumers?
- Increasing countryside encroachment and destroying the character of communities?

***What happened to "meeting the needs of our future generations"?***

**Where did "the precautionary principle" go?**

**LEGITIMATE PUBLIC MISTRUST & ANGER!**

**Action Groups continue their strong opposition.**

**Resolutions by Eastleigh, Winchester, Hedge End & Local Parish Councils oppose the development in its stated form.**

## CURRENT CONCERNS OF LOCAL COMMUNITIES

### **PUSH is making the following basic assumptions:**

- Comprehensive PUSH “deal” involving housing allocation
- Imbedded into the South East Plan (subject to final approval)
- Government support and encouragement
- Recent statements by the chairman of PUSH
  - “Matters relating to South Hants are now concluded”  
*18 July 2008*
  - Hedge End SDA “will be built”  
*Daily Echo 11 December 2008*

### **PUSH should consider revising its assumptions due to:**

- The unprecedented economic downturn
- Concerns set out in the Sustainability Appraisal of the South East Plan over the environmental capacity of South Hampshire to absorb the development

### **Problems facing our communities**

- “Done deal”
- PUSH is driving the “deal” forward
- Consultants are not being encouraged to challenge the assumptions
- Public are being given scant opportunity or time to respond to proposals
- Reports and funding are all biased towards proving that the plan is achievable
- Timely access to reports and studies is still inadequate
- Insufficient focus on clear and consistent mapping. A more useful approach to mapping is shown below

---

## SUGGESTIONS TO ENCOURAGE OPENNESS AND INVOLVEMENT BETWEEN PUSH, EBC AND THE COMMUNITY

### **In order to build trust, engagement, commitment and a constructive relationship:**

- Project or Study briefs should be published at the time of initiation or tender.
- Citizen groups directly affected should be included as “key stakeholders” during studies like the David Lock Report

- Where Studies are deemed “too technical” for direct participation (eg. IWMS) there should be an opportunity for “citizen observers” throughout the process.
- Consultants should be encouraged to “challenge” the assumptions
- There is a need for a consistent PUSH GIS-based information management strategy. Consultants and participating authorities should, wherever it is relevant, be encouraged to provide output in a consistent, mapped format to allow integration, overlay, analysis, presentation and communication with the results of other work. The one-off initiative for SFRA [www.push.atkinsgeospatial.com](http://www.push.atkinsgeospatial.com) should become a minimum PUSH standard
- Eastleigh’s stated plans for feasibility work on the SDA during their LDF process to see *IF it is feasible* alongside *HOW* it might be delivered should be welcomed by PUSH and applied to other projects.

### Mapping the area of the SDA

Below is an example of how mapping should be used to explain SDA location options and inter-dependencies in a consistent manner. It shows the relationship between search areas and proposals.

