

EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF CHANDLERS FORD PARISH COUNCIL

MONDAY 30 JULY 2018 AT 7.30PM FRYERN PAVILION

COUNCILLORS PRESENT: Councillor Duguid (Chairman), Councillors: Allen, Atkinson, Aubry, Bourne, Broadhurst, Cox, Dolbear, Evans, Holden-Brown, Hughes, Irish, Johnson, Kyrle, Newcombe, Pragnell and Ricketts.

Public Participation: There were thirteen members of the public present.

Members of the public spoke about traffic congestion, the need for a by-pass and that Test Valley Borough Council's Local Plan had contributed to traffic problems in the Parish. Particular comment was made about the effect on the M3 around Junction 12, and that the motorway would be a nightmare going northbound. Other members of the public mentioned the loss of green space, dissecting two woodlands and the provision of 71 tunnels for animals to pass underneath the road. Another person mentioned that there was a need for 3,500 dwellings not 5,300, which was countered by a comment of the larger number enabling infrastructure to be put in.

812. APOLOGIES

These were received from Cllr Bicknell

813. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were none.

814. TO MOTION (CLLR RICKETTS): HAVING HAD SIGHT OF THE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN IT IS NOTICEABLE THAT CHANDLERS FORD WOULD BE SUBJECTED TO INCREASED TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND POLLUTION, AS THE PLAN INCLUDES A MAJOR NEW LINK ROAD FROM THE LARGE DEVELOPMENT NORTH OF BISHOPSTOKE TO JUNCTION 12 OF THE M3 (CF AND EASTLEIGH). THIS ROAD IS EXPECTED TO CARRY 26,000 VEHICLES A DAY. THE KNOCK-ON EFFECT WOULD BE MUCH INCREASED QUEUEING ON THE APPROACHES TO THE MOTORWAY IN CF (WINCHESTER ROAD, HOCOMBE ROAD, HILTINGBURY ROAD) AND THESE ROADS ARE ALREADY EXPERIENCING ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC PRESSURE FROM MAJOR HOUSEBUILDING PROJECTS IN ROMSEY, FUNNELLING EXTRA VEHICLES TO THE M3. THEREFORE, SHOULDN'T CHANDLER'S FORD PARISH COUNCIL BE JOINING TEN OTHER LOCAL PARISH COUNCILS IN OBJECTING TO THE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN?

Following seconding by Cllr Atkinson, Cllr Ricketts introduced her motion concentrating on the impact of traffic congestion and pollution from the vehicles associated with the 5,00 dwellings at Bishopstoke. The impact on the M3/M27 corridor was mentioned along with the direct impacts on Junction 12. That the Parish Council should join the ten other parish councils in objecting to the Local Plan.

At this point a point of order was raised about Albrook not having objected to the Local Plan.

Cllr Kyrle moved to Make and amendment to the motion so that it read as follows: -

Having had sight of the Draft Local Plan it is noticeable that Chandlers Ford would be subjected to increased traffic, as the Plan includes a major new link road from the large development north of Bishopstoke to Junction 12 of the M3 (CF and Eastleigh). This road is expected to carry 26,000 vehicles a day. The knock-on effect would be increased queueing on the approaches to the motorway in CF (Winchester Road, Hocombe Road, Hiltingbury Road) and these roads are already experiencing additional traffic pressure from major housebuilding projects in Romsey, funnelling extra vehicles to the M3. Therefore Chandler's Ford Parish Council notes that Hampshire County Council is already undertaking a separate study to examine increased capacity of this junction and at neighbouring roundabouts. Chandler's Ford parish Council requests Hampshire County Council and Highways England, as the highway authorities responsible, to work with the local MPs and with Eastleigh Borough Council to take these studies forward in a timely manner and ensure M3 Junction 12 and neighbouring junctions are satisfactory so as to avoid worsening traffic congestion. The Parish Council also notes the impact that the Test Valley Borough Local Plan will have directly on our parish, with more traffic using roads in Chandler's Ford to access the motorway network. We request that Hampshire County Council and Highways England be required to mitigate this impact as part of any proposals.

This was seconded by Cllr Johnson.

Cllr Kyrle introduced the amendment, itemising that the changes were minimal and that asked members to allow the additions. He also commented that Test Valley Borough Council had imposed Valley Park on the fringes of the parish.

Cllr Johnson reserved his right to comment.

Members debated the amendment to the original motion, with comments being made about the original and amended motions both being acceptable, but the amendment being preferred. Concerns about increased traffic and pollution were made, and the need to concentrate the argument. The need for new houses was accepted, but concern voiced over the effect on the parish including financial and health costs arising from congestion.

Cllr Johnson in exerting his right to comment mentioned the increase in electric cars eradicating pollution concerns, and that the speed of uptake and the accuracy of government figures were guesswork.

Cllr Kyrle as the proposer concluded his amendment by commenting that it was about getting HCC and Highways England to do their jobs properly, that if they did then congestion should not be a problem.

The debate on the amendment being concluded the Chairman asked for a vote on acceptance of the amendment. **On a show of hands this was unanimous. The amendment therefore became the substantive motion on which further debate took place.**

EXTRAORDINARY MEETING of FULL COUNCIL 30th JULY 2018

Members debated the Substantive Motion as proposed by Cllr Kyrle with further comment about the Transport Assessment and the anticipated delays from Local plans on the motorway network, with for the M27 a 6% increase at both Hedge End and junction 5 but a 140% increase at Junction 12 for Chandler's Ford. Another Member commented that there was the long-term objective of managing the trends and objectives and keeping an eye on HCC Highways as well as Highways England. As the debate was coming to a close it was requested that the Clerk could also, in conjunction with the Chairman, include concerns made during public participation that were relevant to the Local Plan. The mover of the original motion closed the debate by commenting that the duty of the council was that those that had elected them trusted them to put them first.

The debate concluded Cllr Kyrle asked for a recorded vote. The Clerk asked each Member in turn whether they were for or against. All Councillors were **for** the motion and the Clerk was asked to write to the Borough Council in the terms of the RESOLVED motion and to include a precis of public participation comments.

That being all the business, the meeting closed at 8.25pm

Chairman.....