

## Local Plan Part 3: Draft Welborne Plan Regulation 18 – Preparation of a Local Plan

### Summary of Representations by Major and Minor Landowners, Specific Consultation Bodies and Other Key Organisations

#### Major Landowners

---

- |                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| BST Group & Buckland Development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Major landowners confirm that they are working closely with each other and with their development partners.</li><li>• Concern that the site identified in the masterplan may not be big enough to support 6,500 houses unless a much higher density of housing (more than 38 dwellings per hectare) is accepted.</li><li>• Average density should not however exceed 35 dwellings per hectare and that constraints on the site such as noise from the M27, restrict the total capacity to around 5,500.</li><li>• Concern that there are substantial residential areas within the Concept Masterplan that are very close to the M27 and within areas of high noise.</li><li>• Absence of a published Financial Viability Appraisal to support infrastructure development is a fundamental concern.</li><li>• The Draft Plan is overly prescriptive – policies need to be more flexible.</li><li>• The draft Plan should only include a Junction 10 alteration which has the support of both Transport for South Hampshire and the Highways Agency and which has satisfied the appropriate standards, through robust modelling testing.</li><li>• Greater flexibility needed on the overall amount and mix of employment land which should be focused to the west of the A32.</li><li>• A risk that the cost of environmental mitigation (Green Infrastructure/ open green space), particularly of buying land will undermine the viability, funding and delivery of the development.</li><li>• The location and general principles of the district centre are supported.</li></ul> |
|----------------------------------|--|

#### Minor Landowners

---

- |             |   |
|-------------|---|
| Bovis Homes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Bovis applauds the Council's commitment to laying the foundations for the delivery of Welborne and investing public monies to contribute to a robust evidence base.</li><li>• The missing link in both the policies and the evidence base is how and when the infrastructure is needed, phased and paid for.</li><li>• Whilst Bovis supports the development of a new community at Welborne, the key evidence regarding delivery that is currently publically available is limited and we therefore cannot be satisfied that the objectives and infrastructure needs will be met.</li></ul> |
|-------------|---|
-

---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council should encourage the formation of a ‘single delivery vehicle’ for the entire project recognising that it is one of the largest strategic developments in the country and will be delivered over a long period of time.</li> <li>• Community Infrastructure Levy is another viability concern to Bovis in securing deliverability.</li> </ul>	
<hr/> <p>Mr F Hedges, Mr G Moyse, Mr R Moore, Laly Family, Hastings Family &amp; Flynn Family c/o WYG &amp; Ian Judd</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall support and confirmation that their land is available.</li> <li>• Suggesting that land next to the Meon could make a better contribution to Green Infrastructure / open green space than the Knowle Triangle.</li> <li>• Suggest that land between Pook Lane and A32, next to M27 should be employment rather than Green Infrastructure/ open green space.</li> </ul> <hr/>

## Specific Consultation Bodies

---

<p>Environment Agency</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of the vision and objectives.</li> <li>• Plan generally provides a sound basis for the proposed development.</li> <li>• Concerned that there is still uncertainty within the plan as to how the site’s waste water will be dealt with.</li> </ul>
<hr/> <p>English Heritage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support policy requiring a comprehensive masterplan to be developed to support a planning application.</li> <li>• Dean Farmhouse should be set within Green Infrastructure / open green space to conserve it and perhaps better reveal its importance (including its relationship to its setting).</li> </ul>
<hr/> <p>Natural England</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pleased that their advice in earlier consultations relating to the preparation of the plan has, in general, been taken.</li> <li>• It is not clear from the Plan what the current and future situation is with Green Infrastructure / open green space areas at Fareham Common, Knowle Triangle and Dash Wood, in terms of their biodiversity value and accessibility to the public.</li> <li>• It is not clear how the road network will relate to the onsite public open space.</li> <li>• No recognition of the negative effect of the M27 on the value of Green Infrastructure provision, especially Fareham common.</li> </ul>
<hr/> <p>Network Rail</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumes that the short term decision to develop strong links to Fareham Station via the BRT and bus network enhancements is the most value for money option and represents the strongest business case at this time.</li> <li>• Any future investigation to a potential halt/station on the Fareham to Eastleigh line would require discussions with South West Trains, business case development and detailed timetable work.</li> </ul> <hr/>

---

Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is not enough evidence at this time for the Highways Agency to assess the impact upon the Strategic Road Network (Motorways and Trunk Roads).</li><li>• Need more detail of the design of the proposed Junction 10 works and how it interacts with both Junction 9 and Junction 11.</li><li>• All future transport infrastructure improvements should ensure that all strategic highways improvements from J9 to J11 are also included. The need for such improvements should be established by further model testing of when future traffic impacts create material impacts between J9 and J11 in terms of queues and delays.</li><li>• The Highways Agency would like to see greater commitment to the promotion and adoption of sustainable transport measures.</li><li>• The Highways Agency would want to see greater commitment to develop pedestrian and cycle routes to access public transport facilities.</li></ul>
Hampshire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Main area of concern for the County Council is the proposed location of the new secondary school and one of the primary schools on land east of the A32.</li><li>• The ideal location for the schools is next to other community facilities and as they should form the heart of the new development.</li><li>• Hampshire County Council as Highway Authority has serious concerns about the school site east of the A32 and strongly objects to this site.</li><li>• The Highway Authority also has concerns over the proposed location of the Household Waste Recycling Centre at Crockerhill Industrial Park.</li><li>• The opportunity has been missed to provide a dedicated Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) bus/cycle route through the site to further encourage increased usage and help promote sustainable transport.</li><li>• The concept masterplan is supported, having less environmental impact as well as having potentially fewer Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) issues in respect to the water protection zones than the other options considered.</li><li>• The scale and location of the Green Infrastructure / open green space within the 'downland' character area is unlikely to achieve the desired objectives.</li></ul>

---

Winchester City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City Council is concerned that the secondary school is located to the east of the A32 separating it from the main development.</li> <li>• Some remaining concerns regarding the landscape impacts north of Heytesbury Farm and along the Knowle Buffer.</li> <li>• Winchester welcomes the improvement of J10 and the rejection of development at J11 and would suggest this need to take place in the earliest phase possible.</li> <li>• Support the retention of the areas within Winchester District (including Knowle Triangle and Dash Wood / Ravenswood) as semi-natural green space, which is consistent with the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1.</li> <li>• Concern that the requirements for energy &amp; water conservation don't seem to increase over the plan period, or have scope to be reviewed to take account of the length of the scheme.</li> </ul>
Homes & Communities Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the proposals to create a new community at Welborne.</li> <li>• Proposals help address housing need and will deliver economic growth in the Fareham and wider south Hampshire area.</li> </ul>
Scottish & Southern Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmation that the high voltage overhead lines to both the north and the south can be either diverted or undergrounded.</li> <li>• Confirmation that lower voltage lines would be gradually replaced as part of development.</li> </ul>
Scotia Gas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No specific capacity issues in this area – however any new development will need to be assessed and new pipelines may be needed.</li> </ul>
Southern Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development proposed in the Welborne Plan will create additional flow and load to the [Peel Common] works, which may need further investment and should therefore be recognised in the Plan.</li> <li>• Major off-site sewerage would be needed to connect Welborne to Peel Common Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) with the engineering configuration and route of the infrastructure needing to be investigated.</li> <li>• Any infrastructure specifically needed to serve the new development should be paid for by the development.</li> </ul>
Portsmouth Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portsmouth Water can supply the Welborne site with a sustainable source of water.</li> <li>• Pleased to see that Eco-Town standards have been dropped in favour of more pragmatic solutions, as our objective is to maximise water efficiency and not to “minimise water consumption”.</li> <li>• Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) need to be very carefully considered due to the underlying groundwater zones and any underlying clay.</li> <li>• The location of water mains needs to be given careful consideration when locating buildings and infrastructure.</li> </ul>

## Other Key Organisations

Partnership for Urban South Hampshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In overall support as Welborne Plan is in accordance with the South Hampshire Strategy.</li> </ul>
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The findings of the Habitat Regulations Assessment have concluded that, for the International and European designated sites; "significant effects are considered a likely or uncertain outcome of one or more of the masterplanning options".</li> <li>The Green Infrastructure / open green space has not been informed by an ecological appraisal.</li> <li>The proposals within the plan will lead to a significant adverse effect on the Botley Woods Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</li> <li>There is no clarity of what contributions will be made to off-site Green Infrastructure / open green space.</li> </ul>
Campaign for the Protection of Rural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome the progress that has been made in attempting to "pin-down" many of the uncertainties that accompany a development of this scale.</li> <li>Welcome the reduction from the original South East Plan housing numbers to some 6,500 dwellings and 78,650 sq. m of employment space, and the withdrawal of the J11 business park which represent a more realistic amount of development given the constraints of the location.</li> <li>CPRE still objects to the fundamental proposal for a new town, thinking it as unnecessary to meet Fareham's own affordable needs.</li> <li>Concerns over reductions in energy efficiency proposed, the lack of a finalised transport solution, the type and purpose of the off-site Green Infrastructure / open green space, atmospheric pollution, disturbance to European habitat sites, levels of water consumption and the size of buffer between settlements.</li> </ul>