

Issue 03 Site Setting, Allocations, Design Principles and Character Areas (WEL3 to WEL8)**3.1 Is the proposed boundary of Welborne appropriately justified?**

The Joint Promoters (JP) consider that the boundary of Welborne is appropriately justified.

3.2 Has the Council satisfactorily assessed the constraints to development in the area, including biodiversity, agricultural land value, highway capacity and noise, flood risk, utilities infrastructure, archaeological and other heritage assets, and landscape quality? Where necessary are identified assets afforded appropriate protection?

Welborne has been subject to extensive investigation and FBC has assembled a comprehensive evidence base. Any outline planning application for the site will, in any event, be required to assess these issues again as part of the supporting Environmental Statement.

3.3 In broad terms, is the disposition, scale, density and type of proposed land use (for example as shown on the Strategic Framework Diagram), appropriate and justified? Are the uses proposed for land at 72, Kiln Road (employment) and to the east of the A32, west of Pook Lane and north of the M27 (landscape buffer), justified and achievable? (See representations WP465 and WP466)?

JP have made detailed comments elsewhere about the location of the Secondary School. The Strategic Framework Plan will need to be altered to take account of the suggested change, together with other consequent changes to reflect final M27 J10 arrangements and Green Infrastructure issues. The Welborne Plan (WEL4) requires developers to prepare a Structuring Plan to accompany initial planning applications for Welborne. Policy WEL4 provides for the Structuring Plan to be kept under review.

3.4 There are a number of proposed land uses where uncertainty remains, yet paragraph 1.60 of the Plan advises that planning applications need to be 'consistent with the Strategic Framework Diagram'. Does this reliance on the Diagram provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate any change in circumstances?

JP have set out in representations the detailed comments on the disposition of land uses in relation to WEL3 (in particular the proposed location of the Secondary School). Outline planning applications consistent with the Strategic Framework diagram are supported provided that the diagram is changed to deal with the disposition of land uses. JP request that the Strategic Framework Plan is changed. In addition para 1.6 of the Plan should use the wording the planning applications should be "broadly consistent with the Strategic Framework Plan". This wording should provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate changes in circumstances.

- 3.5 **There are references in the policies to over 20 documents that the Council would expect from prospective developers at various stages in the development process. Bearing in mind local plans should make clear what is intended to happen, where and when this will occur and how it will be delivered, is there sufficient clarity regarding the Council's expectations in terms of delivery. Is the Council's comprehensive approach as set out in policy WEL4 sufficiently clear and will it be effective? If not how could clarity be improved?**

JP have consistently argued that the Welborne Plan is over complex and repetitive. The detailed representation set out suggested revised wording to simplify the suggested processes.

- 3.6 **Will the identified settlement buffers be sufficient to ensure the satisfactory achievement of the Council's objective of maintaining settlement separation? Are the references to precise distances in policy WEL5 unduly prescriptive?**

JP consider that the proposed buffers are sufficient to ensure settlement separation. Their effectiveness will largely be determined by detailed design. That is a matter for the outline planning application and will be a key topic in the Design and Access Statement and Green Infrastructure Strategy. JP have suggested alternative Policy wording in Policy WEL 5 in relation to the Wickham.

- 3.7 **Should policy WEL6 make reference to potential housing densities (or elsewhere in the Plan)?**

WEL6 is an expression of General Design Principles and should not make reference to potential housing densities. These principles will guide the detailed design process. The appropriate density for each development parcel will emerge as part of the preparation of an outline planning application. Density and massing is anticipated to be one of the most significant plans forming part of the outline planning application.

- 3.8 **The last paragraph in policy WEL6 is not a policy but a statement of intent by the Council to prepare a Design Guidance SPD. Would it be more appropriate to make the reference in the supporting text?**

JP consider that the reference is made in the supporting text.

- 3.9 **Will the Strategic Design Codes be subject to any form of consultation or review in order to ensure consistency across the area?**

This is an issue for FBC to address. JP would be willing to collaborate with any further proportionate consultation process.

- 3.10 **It is suggested in section 3.4 of Core Document EV09 (New Community for North Fareham) that by 2050 over 22% of the residents of Welborne could be working at home. Do the Council's policies provide sufficient advice on the provision of homes, which are able to accommodate work requirements? (See also question 4.5)?**

The Welborne Plan is based on a high level of self-containment. No guidance in the document precludes the provision of homes which are able to accommodate work requirements. Continuing changes in the homeworking technology suggest that the level of adaptive changes to the physical specifications of buildings is likely to reduce.

- 3.11 **Is sufficient weight placed by the Council on issues of noise, light pollution and air quality?**

The Welborne Plan deals adequately with these issues. The Environmental Statement accompanying an outline planning application will address all significant impacts in respect of noise, light and air quality.