



MH/cg/HP13032

26 September 2014

Ms Claire Jones-Hughes  
Programme Officer  
[bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com](mailto:bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com)

Dear Ms Jones-Hughes

**INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE FAREHAM LOCAL PLAN PART 3: THE WELBORNE PLAN  
ISSUE 3: SITE, SETTING, ALLOCATIONS, DESIGN PRINCIPLES & CHARACTER AREAS (WEL3 to  
WEL8)  
WRITTEN STATEMENT IN RESPONSE TO INSPECTOR'S QUESTION**

I refer to the above matter and confirm that I am included in the list of potential participants on behalf of my clients, The Hastings Family, at the Hearing Session for Issue 3 of the Independent Examination of the Local Plan Part 3: The Welborne Plan due to take place on Thursday 16 October 2014.

I wish to reserve my right to participate in this Hearing Session on behalf of my clients, however, I also set out below our response to the relevant Inspector's question set out in the 'Issues and Questions' document dated August 2014.

I confirm that our previous written submission relating to the Publication Version (dated 11 April 2014) of The Welborne Plan remains valid and request that the comments below are read in conjunction with our previous statement.

Question 3.3

For the reasons set out in our previous written submission in April 2014, we do not believe that the proposed use of the land to the east of the A32, west of Pook Lane and north of the M27 (my clients' site) as a landscape buffer is justified or achievable.





As previously explained, the land includes perimeter landscaping but is otherwise largely scrubby, overgrown and underused, accommodating some poor quality equestrian buildings. The site is therefore considered to have very little amenity value or function and, as existing, would not provide a significant landscape buffer as the Plan currently intends and is therefore not achievable.

I note that my clients' site has a similar locational context and constraints to the adjoining land to the east and west, yet the two adjoining sites are identified for employment use and a landscape buffer is not considered to be necessary in these locations as it is on my clients' site. It therefore does not appear logical or necessary for my clients' site to be allocated as a landscape buffer in the middle of an otherwise continuous portion of land allocated for employment use along the northern edge of the M27.

For the reasons set out in our original written submission, it is submitted that the identification of my clients' site is not justified. It is considered that the land should instead be identified for employment use and that the site is equally suitable for this use as the already allocated employment land adjoining on both sides.

I trust that the above comments are of assistance and if you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Hawthorne'.

**MARTIN HAWTHORNE**  
Director  
For and on behalf of WYG

cc: Mr Ian Judd  
Mrs Lynda Hastings