

## Issues for MDA West of Waterlooville Forum.

Havant open space adoption on MDA – I am aware that efforts and communications are being put forward by the Chair of Newlands Parish for Newlands to take over all areas of open space rather than Havant adopting them. However there are serious concerns from residents who are against this for the following reasons:

- 1) Newlands is a Parish and when the shared ownership properties were built there was no Parish. For affordable housing residents in shared ownership in this area they were sold with the right to staircase to owning 100% of their homes and the freehold in time or sell with this right to others. However there are several secretary of state conditions which would prevent this. One of which is being in a Parish area. Havant need to continue to be responsible for the areas surrounding the shared ownership affordable housing in Havant as promised when homes were purchased. The boundaries lines need to be maintained clearly and without confusion.
- 2) Residents of the new development pay new income to councils in the form of Council Tax and expenditure for the services to also cover the areas newly developed in which they live. These should be carried out and received in return.
- 3) Newlands do not have the resources, skills and equipment to carry out the maintenance of these public open areas. Likely be contracted out and this reduces the accountability of standards of work done further for residents with issues to report from Havant to Newlands to contractor, and this has consequences for expenses over and above council tax for the relatively small number of Newlands residents who would pay these costs via increased precepts for work carried out in Havant areas.
- 4) It is for similar reasons that Newlands Walk should remain as adopted land by Winchester city council and not transferred over to the Parish Council. There are drainage issues which require ongoing maintenance, there are sites of scientific interest and ecology including rare species which need specialist expertise and range of equipment to manage the area correctly. There are many trees that require arborist maintenance, balancing ponds and pathways which are in a desperate state not to mention the children's park and surrounding benches that have often required attention if not replacement. Newlands do not have the expertise, resources or equipment for this and this would need to be bought in or contracted out. I understand there is funding also transferring, estimated to last 20 years, but there is no way of knowing how long this will last without specific costings for yearly work needed and the unknown expense for contingencies such as replacements due to vandalism, broken equipment etc. It does not resolve the issue for Newlands residents that once these transferred funds expire, yet again it is the residents of Newlands that will cover these costs in their increased precepts. This is currently diluted across the whole of Winchester but in comparison if adopted by Newlands this would be shared across a small number of families, despite being used by a much wider population and may be an untenable burden per household.
- 5) As a matter of democratic process as an aside to this I do feel it is a concern that two Winchester District Councillors also sit as Newlands Parish Councillors and also sit on the

West of Waterloo Forum as the Winchester Representatives and Newlands Parish surgeries are being carried out by Winchester Cllrs. One Winchester councillor acts as Chair of the Amenities Committee for Newlands when considering and dealing with the above issue for Newlands. I am not sure how it could be said when deciding to take on Newlands Walk from Winchester this is in the best interests of Newlands Residents, although I am sure Winchester see this as beneficial transfer of a long term expenditure. I also feel whilst these positions are now declared interests it has to be more than declared but action taken to insure any potential conflicted interest can not be a factor and positions be considered to ensure that no conflict of interest potential or otherwise is present when decisions are taken, influenced or discussed. This impacts on so many considerations for issues to be discussed that I feel the duality of parish and district positions is not practical and democratic process and residents would be better served by unilateral representation with improved resident communication and participation which is currently an ongoing issue.

- 6) There has been a lack of adequate communication to the public of Consultations, meeting dates, minutes and agendas for minutes, issues with accuracy of minutes in terms of public participation and the details of issues included in such a way that conveys the considerations and discussions that have taken place, whilst I acknowledge the minutes are not verbatim the substance is not there to inform accurately. We have community notice boards which are not used and development resident social media pages which are not utilised despite many repeated requests for years. Efforts to start residence associations have been actively discouraged and at meetings I have been treated personally in a way which has led me to write to the Parish Clerk with my concerns. This has not even been met with the courtesy of reply. I feel that public participation and community development may be facilitated by the use of virtual access to meetings and feel that the new Parish has many families with children to care for which may prohibit leaving them to attend in person or health conditions which also make attendance in person difficult such as extreme vulnerabilities to COVID. Can online virtual meetings be set up?
- 7) Drainage and sewer issues continue to impact on residents and this has now resulted in Wellington Park play equipment being removed which is a loss of community facilities for families and youth especially. Teens still congregate there but have nothing to do and behaviour has deteriorated when there have been no issues here previously. My partner purchased a family home with the use of a pleasant children's park in front of it, but the state of the area now is devaluing to his investment and the residents quality of life, immediate environment and socialising for families with children. It was provided as part of the section 106 agreement and this park should be reinstated. However the foul sewer continues to flood the children's park when there is a seasonal amount of rain but this year also occurring in August. This is not helped by the foul water and contents reaching the stream with enough volume to cause the stream to overflow its banks onto the park, and spreading the pollution even further. This reaches our front path which is especially concerning as our entrance is flush with the ground and I am a transplant patient who is immunocompromised. Yet every few months we live in the environment of a toilet unable to exit onto contaminated public paths or open my kitchen / bedroom / hallway windows due to the sewage and airborne contamination risk directly outside. We could not let our spaniel exercise as usual and she was confined to using the back garden during the day. This stress triggered a series of fits through the night from which she could not recover. Holly is very much missed by us and many other residents who grew to love her. It is completely

unacceptable that this has continued for 6 years unresolved occurring between two and three times per year for residents. I brought the issue to the forum in 2018 and was assured by a councillor that they would act to help the issue. In fact what occurred was also unacceptable. They contacted Southern Water case handler for my private residential complaint, and advised them not to provide me with any further information. Luckily I requested and received a print out of all my file notes with Southern Water, including the details of the named Councillor's interventions prior to an IT gliche in their computer systems which erased all previous records. I have observed a CCTV camera inspection of the drains which took place, however no drainage plans of the development had been submitted to refer to and compare at that time. Since then residents including myself had an onsite inspection visit from Southern Water managers in December 2022 who lifted covers and also have reported high volumes of surface water in the foul drainage system and still a lack of drainage plans submitted by Taylor Wimpey to Southern Water. I am aware that a meeting took place between Taylor Wimpey and Southern Water on 6/1/2023. I am also aware of the opinion of Southern Water submitted to Winchester regarding the development and drainage capacity and deficit already on the existing network prior to permission to build and the requirement to carry out an upgrade prior to building. This was not done. Capacity on the network has since been required for Berewood, Carpenter's Field, and Taylor Wimpey, the industrial sites completed and yet to be, all which at the time capacity was assessed were not completed. My question remains how did due process including for planning, building control processes, and any application to southern water to connect the drainage for the development to the mainline network take place without drainage plans being submitted to refer to?? How did Southern Water provide home owners with paid for informed pre-purchase drainage reports without noticing there were no plans submitted from which to write these?

- 8) The implication of the sewer issues for adoption of roads is clear, despite what has been misleadingly communicated to residents who have and still are purchasing their homes under the assurance that adoption will be completed. Berewood are on a private ofwat license to Leep, (was SSE) not southern water public adoption of drains which I gather from Hampshire standards has considerations for adoption of roads?. There is no section 104 signed for taylor Wimpey adoption of drains process. How can a 12 months inspection period to complete adoption of drainage by Southern Water take place if taylor wimpey plans have not even been submitted to southern water? How can roads on the estate be adopted by Hampshire Highways without the accepted standard of drainage and adoption by Southern Water of the drains under the roads first? I would question whose motivated to fix the situation? Southern Water? Taylor Wimpey? Hampshire Highways? Councils? Each have been aware of the issues from the beginning and each is benefiting from a lack of expenditure with the same revenue in the continuation of this status quo. It is residents who are paying in many ways and it is completely unacceptable. This needs to be sorted out and quickly now, no further excuses, dither or delay in fixing the sewers, getting the streetlamp heads out of storage and fitting them in order to adopt the roads. If Taylor Wimpey aren't completing the works, then that is what the bond is for. Residents will not wait 20 years till it is too late for the public to activate the process which is their right to ensure that the roads are publicly adopted.
- 9) Relating to this is the suggestion to close the second development entrance providing an eastern mid point access off Hambledon road via Sickle Way. This makes no sense other than

in the interests of maintaining a private development without the conditions to meet the right to ensure public adoption. Sickle Way is conducive to traffic flow easement which is already a need due to heavy traffic on London Road/ Hambledon Road as a main arterial route to and from Waterloo, retail park, the hospital, the tip, towns and villages North of Waterloo and to residential areas including the new developments. Berewood roundabout is already queued, particularly at peak work and school times. The other exit and entrance is through the Taylor Wimpey North exit via Darnel Road and this too struggles at these times and with delay due to tip access. Sickle Way acts as a helpful mid way point for traffic that would otherwise add to these pressures. Without this traffic would build up along the main road and cause impacts on other surrounding roads, which also lead back to a motorway junction. It would cause delay for emergency services who use these roads to and from the hospital. Also the residents on Taylor Wimpey development need an East access point for timely emergency access via Sickle Way. The internal roads to be crossed to reach all areas east to west through the estate are too narrow for emergency vehicles to access via the spine road access point and with the inadequate family home parking provision by design in the development this is exacerbated and made impassable by parked cars. The delay which would be caused would endanger life and as a matter of health and safety Sickle Way needs to remain open to access. Removable bollards have already proven to be an unworkable hindrance rather than a solution to emergencies in the development already and even if crews have keys the padlocks are rusted to the point of unusable. Retractable ones for residents and emergency crews would not be conducive to easing area traffic. Issues such as ambulance and fire emergencies have occurred where timely access via Sickle Way was critical. Closure does not make any common sense, is not in residents' best interest in the majority other than to residents of Sickle Way (I acknowledge including Newlands Parish Councillor) but it induces unacceptable severe life or death health and safety risks and would cause traffic chaos for remaining residents of the development and much wider. It would also require an amendment of planning S278 to be in accordance with the Highways Act 1989 which would not make sense to propose given all considerations.

- 10) Much of what I am saying can be summed up as the public adoption of the estate needs to be completed. Local democracy needs to be transparent, accountable, communications with residents improved and community development be more than a token title of a talking shop without intention or action which has legal standing and is currently only working in the best interests of all but residents.

In accordance with the National Planning Framework and Guidance on Plan Making I previously requested a Neighbourhood Plan as a way of supporting many issues at this forum and at Parish Council meetings. There were efforts facilitated by the community development officers to complete a community plan with residents which is not the same thing which I contacted them about the possible change to a Neighbourhood Plan but for some reason this doesn't seem to be a welcome suggestion! Both take similar efforts but only the Neighbourhood Plan has legal standing for residents' best interests to be served. Please could we have a Neighbourhood Plan and also does the MDA have a statement of common ground for cross boundary matters? Does the MDA have a statement of Community Involvement? Please could these be shared with residents publicly or if not completed, could these be completed?