

## Comments on changes to the Welborne Plan

### **MM1- Review of Local Plan**

Whilst a timetable and statement of commitment to review are commendable, what mechanisms are in place to ensure these are adhered to?

### **MM2 – Relationship between Welborne and Fareham to the South**

Transport links are mentioned here in connection with creating a functional part of Fareham and the wider South Hampshire area. Recognising the problems which would be generated by increased traffic movements to the north, Winchester City Council has requested that the plan specify that access to Welborne will be principally to and from the south via the A32 and junction 10 of the M27. I fail to see how the predicted 2% rise in northbound traffic can be regarded as a reliable projection and how the residents of Welborne can be persuaded not to travel north to avoid the congestion of the M27. Assuming that the majority of journeys are to and from the south, this strategy has dire consequences for Fareham. There is neither full funding for, nor an agreed layout for a revised junction 10. The A32 to the south of the M27, and surrounding roads in North Fareham will be unable to cope with the increase in traffic.

### **MM3 – Settlement Buffers**

On the basis of the proposals there will be no separation of communities. A 50 metre buffer zone is completely inadequate and the circumstances whereby this would be increased to 75 metres would allow gardens of existing settlements to be included which means that the actual distance between communities could be less than 50 metres. There will be no visual separation as the plans do not take into account the topography of the site which slopes upwards from south to north.

### **MM4 – General Design Principles**

Current levels of air quality, noise and light pollution should be measured and documented within the plan to ensure that the effects of the development can be properly measured and monitored.

### **MM5 – Pedestrian and Cycle Movement across the A32**

As both a cyclist and pedestrian this is a very important modification to me personally but also to the population of the new development and especially the many children who will have to negotiate the much busier roads. There is no detail as to how pedestrian and cycle movements will be prioritised. Can this actually be achieved alongside the competing pressures of cars, buses and heavy goods vehicles? What crossing points, cycle lanes and footpaths are proposed and how will they operate? Without detail this is just an aspiration and is meaningless within the context of the plan.

### **MM7 – Early Office Provision**

There is already an over capacity of office space within Fareham and therefore the need for early office provision is not understood. The rationale behind the creation of employment space appears to be to promote self containment. However, the reality is that employers will recruit from a wider area and there is therefore the potential exists, if employers do locate themselves in Welborne, for yet greater traffic volumes because of commuting. The necessary infrastructure should therefore be in place before any such provision.

### **MM8 – Retail and Leisure Development within the District Centre**

Fareham Town Centre is already struggling with many empty retail units and decaying buildings. There is not enough detail on the vision for retail and leisure provision within Welborne and how it will fit with existing provision in Fareham and Wickham.

### **MM9 – Location of Secondary School**

Whilst having no issue regarding the proposed location of the school close to the district centre, I fail to see how neighbouring schools in Fareham will be able to meet the demands of the extra pupils in the period before the school becomes functional. My understanding is that nearly 3000 homes will have been constructed by the end of Main Phase 3. Where is the evidence that existing schools can absorb this demand?

### **MM10 – Affordable Housing**

The justification for building Welborne, as presented by the Council, was the housing need in Fareham and the lack of affordable housing. It appears that developers are now being allowed to fall short of the target of 30% affordable homes on the grounds of viability. How will the council ensure that overall the 30% target will be met? What mechanism will exist to force developers to make up any shortfall in subsequent phases?

### **MM11- South Facing Development**

See comments under MM2 above. Residents will travel north if they feel that is in their interests to do so and to avoid congestion. A considerable amount of traffic already travels north on what is an extremely busy stretch of the A32 between Fareham and Wickham. The local road network in Fareham cannot deal with existing traffic volumes, let alone the prospect of Welborne traffic being actively encouraged to add to this. There is no detail on how road modifications will help or how they will be funded.

### **MM12 – Access links to the A32**

This modification adds no clarity to the plan. What will the access links be? How many are required? Is there a traffic impact assessment to inform this point?

### **MM13 – Traffic Management on the A32**

Again there is no clarity as to how additional traffic movements will be discouraged from travelling north.

### **MM14 – Principle Access from the South**

This aspiration relies on the enhancement of junction 10 of the M27, the design and funding of which remain to be announced. Without the infrastructure this cannot be achieved.

### **MM15 – Allotment Provision**

Whilst this modification is to correct an error, the extremely small amount of land to be allocated to allotments is disappointing and demonstrates that the council is paying lip service to the concept of a town based on green principles and open spaces designed to promote health and well-being.

### **MM16 – Structural Landscaping Schemes**

The site slopes upwards from the south and visual impact will be considerable. How landscaping schemes will lessen the impact is not clear and without more detail I fail to see how this is achievable.

### **MM17 – Energy Efficiency Standards**

This is extremely important in the context of a development this size, yet there is no clarity or firm target regarding the energy efficiency standards to be achieved. There is an opportunity here to minimise the environmental impact of this huge development but it appears profit is being prioritised and green considerations are secondary. The Passivhaus requirement is watered down, allowing developers to escape their obligations to build even a very small percentage of homes to this standard.

### **MM18 – Water Efficiency, Supply and Disposal**

There is no solution within this plan for waste water conveyance and disposal. Surely this important aspect should be clarified within the plan and not left until the actual development phase proposals are put forward. The scale of the infrastructure required will impact hugely on Fareham residents.

### **MM19 – Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems**

Why is there not a flood risk assessment already? It is acknowledged that rainfall is becoming more unpredictable and villages downstream of Welborne already suffer frequent flood events. This development could have catastrophic consequences for neighbouring settlements if this issue is not addressed now rather than when planning applications are put forward.

### **MM20 – HWRC**

This modification is supported.

### **MM21 – Phasing Plan**

- The uncertainty regarding junction 10 of the M27 requires urgent clarification. To defer completion until 2022 will result in unacceptable traffic chaos.
- The provision of a secondary school should be brought forward so as to reduce pressure on existing schools.

- Medical facilities should be included much earlier to reduce impacts on already overstretched local healthcare facilities.
- Affordable homes should be prioritised from the start to address the shortage of social housing.
- Public transport improvements should be prioritised and introduced as early as possible.

### **MM22 – Deferral of infrastructure Contributions**

This modification is supported.

### **MM23 – Monitoring and Review**

All monitoring and review processes and mechanisms should be made clear and transparent and placed in the public domain.

Diana & Michael Stevens

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]