

Planning Officer
Fareham Borough Council
Civic Offices
Fareham

Mrs Elaine Tower



Dear Sir / Madam

I write with regard to the proposed Welborne site situated to the North of Fareham in the countryside gap between Funtley and Wickham

I consider this plan unsound and not viable on numerous counts they are as listed below:-

1. I found the documents were very difficult to comprehend in some parts the terminology used, in my mind, were contradictory. I found so many contradictions surrounding Chapters 3, 4 and 6 that I thought I was reading more than one proposed site. The maps were unclear to understand and some were of a 'smudged' quality not produced to the high detailed requirement as deserved for such an important document relating to the proposed site's consultation.

2. Chapter 3

Para 3.8 The proposed site contains two Gas pipelines of high and intermediate pressure running diagonally across the site. Health and Safety Standards are detailed stating that high occupancy facilities are difficult to evacuate and therefore no development should be within a 195 metre exclusion zone of the gas pipelines. According to the Welborne Policies map in the appendices it shows that a shopping complex, car parking and school facilities are very near these pipelines and within the 195 metre exclusion zone. This is totally unviable and unsafe.

Para 3.9 The site contains high voltage overhead power lines traversing North and to the side of Knowle Road. There is no mention of building height within the Welborne plan and should these overhead power lines remain they will represent a height and density constraint ensuring the lines to be safely accessed for repair to avoid any breach of Health and Safety Standards.

Para 3.10 The high pressure water mains, according to the framework, are to be diverted. This will cause major upheaval to the surrounding settlements and should any problem be encountered where will the excess water flow to? As the Welborne site is on ground sloping upwards away from Funtley and water flows downhill – Funtley will be the target for flooding. We have had a lot of recent flooding and do not wish our foundations to be water logged constantly from this site. See also 3.12 and 3.13 Flood zones 2 and 3 identified by the Environment Agency applies.

- Para 3.16 Nature Conservation states that "Fareham Common and Blakes Copse are Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation" and 'SINCs' are a local designation and both of these are within the Welborne site and within the settlement buffers and will therefore **NOT** be available for development. Why then does sub chapter 3.59 state that "It is likely that improvements to the strategic road network; and in particular to Junction 10 of the M27, will

require some land at Fareham Common”. This is contradictory and I consider that Fareham Borough Council have hidden statements within other chapters (Chapter 3 then read Chapter 4 and Chapter 6). I do my homework and have cross matched chapter upon chapter and there is evidence here that FBC have misled the general public within the document – This is misleading and hidden within various chapters – This is therefore unsustainable for Nature Conservation.

Chapter 4

Character areas 4.1 to 4.23 are unsound or unstable on the following points:-

- The sub chapters here mention Chalk when in fact most of the designated site area is on Clay!!!! Unsound statement for the development to proceed without a sub soil investigation and thorough study. The railway tunnel in Highlands Road is a classic example - it collapsed in 2007 closing a major arterial route in North Fareham – all down to clay ‘heaving’.
- Woodland clearings - this is misleading as it infers that trees currently in place will be removed, This is unstable for the environment as when it rains the tree roots harbour the water to prevent fluvial flooding – this is therefore unstable and unsound for clearing of any woodlands within the site..
- Delineated boundaries when this is mentioned in Chapter 3 to be 50 metres – this is therefore contradictory and misleading - Unsound statement in Chapter 4 in relation to Chapter 3.
- People of Funtley currently experience noise from the M27 especially on rainy days and when the wind blows from the South – this will not be easy to do and therefore is practically unavoidable.
- Hedgerows and trees in 4.23 it states “hedgerows and trees and illustrations of how they could be retained” The word ‘could’ has been used this is misleading ‘could be’ means we read it as ‘removed if the trees are in the way’ - Not environmentally friendly on this point – Unsound.
- Chapter 3 has part of the Common to be ‘earmarked’ for M27 redevelopment – So a green space is to be created by a busy Motorway junction? Fareham Common is a SINC. Chapter 3 also states it is **NOT** to be developed - Contradictions appear throughout this plan - Unsound until contradictions have been addressed (See Chapter 3 above and comments at 6.28 below)

Historic Environment 4.24

- “The full extent of the archaeological character of the site will not be known until the first phase of the site wide archaeological assessment has been completed by the site promoters” If this site has been ‘earmarked’ since well before 2012 - why has a site wide archaeological assessment not been performed? FBC should have addressed this from the very beginning – this is negligence by the council – how can we respond in an appropriate way when half the studies have not been done or completed?
- The Neolithic Long Barrow has recently been identified and this monument should be considered to be of more than local significance and is therefore indicated on the Constraints Map – It is a significant monument and should be retained and kept in place where it is.
- The archaeological assets should remain in situ. To remove a monument such as the Neolithic Long Barrow would be desecration of our historic past. I have

contacted English Heritage who are interested that this stays for our heritage and future generations. Have FBC contacted the English Heritage?

Chapter 6

With Regard to 6.1.1 “improving accessibility to healthcare” there is no mention throughout the whole sustainability document of how Fareham Borough Council are going to improve on health care accessibility or indeed how they are to engage with the NHS Trust in Portsmouth. This NHS Trust is already stretched to the maximum. To even think about Welborne being developed with houses being built before the sound infrastructure and much improved road networks for this area to allow emergency vehicles access is not legally sustainable to protecting human life.

6.2.6 Obesity is a major problem now throughout England and Wales as indeed a lot of developed countries. The map shown in the document at 6.2 is flawed on the following points:-

- It is totally illegible to read. I have increased my computer to 100% and more to read the map. This is totally unacceptable for the Council to produce a document with illegible maps within it. How do you expect someone to be able to decipher this?
- The diagram itself shows Welborne very clearly though in red! How biased can this be?
- The other colour schemes are not explained – I cannot decipher the words for the 4 areas listed.
- There are 8 other shaded areas - what do these mean? There is no explanation given.

How does Fareham Borough Council expect the general electorate to decipher this properly?

The council are not providing us with the correct tools or indeed easy to read documentation. Therefore on these points raised it now begs the question - Is this sustainable? No it is not.

6.2.7 and fig 6.3 – How nice you are thinking of the decibel noise for Welborne. People live in Funtley a darn sight closer than Welborne will be. No action has been taken to reduce our noise levels - it is constant all the time even Xmas day!!! Stop thinking about new developments and start thinking about the people who are actually here NOW!!!. This is not sustainable for the future

6.2.8 The areas coloured bright red – How can houses be built here when it is on Fareham Common – This is a SINC - Don't cover it up in concrete and move the green site elsewhere – We need green trees, green foliage actually produces the oxygen we need to breathe via Photosynthesis. If you remove the green foliage and trees will you provide us with oxygen cylinders instead? See comments above relating to Chapter 3 and 4 - yet again another contradiction!!!!

6.2.9 Noise level studies were performed 19th – 24th April 2012 – This document was created in November 2013. The data is now out of date. I suggest this is unsustainable until a more detailed survey has been done especially over the weekends - My back garden on a Sunday is not peaceful at all!!!!

Overall this chapter on Health and Noise is unsustainable due to all the above but also to be considered is that Queen Alexandra hospital is about 7 miles away to the east and Southampton General is about 9 miles to the west. Both these hospitals are running at maximum quotas. There are numerous occasions when there are no beds, Intensive care is full, wards have to close due to many factors including lack of funds, reduced medical staff, and the norovirus outbreaks which happen far too often to name a few examples. Fareham does not have a hospital on these scales. Perhaps Fareham Borough council would be better looking at providing us with a hospital for the current population rather than introducing more people to hinder an already creaking NHS.

Chapter 7

Archaeology

A heritage strategy and management plan **will be** prepared and agreed with the County Archaeologist, This will include proposals to include the Neolithic Long Barrow within green infrastructure. Why has FBC not already prepared and consulted with the County Archaeologist prior to this plan being delivered to the Fareham residents for responses? FBC again are not preparing and delivering suitable documents in a **ready state** for comment.

7.2.17 then states that a Geophysical study identified the Long Barrow and they have said it should be considered of national significance and that any such damage or removal of such a monument should be wholly unacceptable.

7.2.18 The Long barrow is designated within the site to be a part of the green environment and therefore shown to the public. With this in mind will English Heritage be offered the site and add it to their list of monuments?

To summarise the above 7.2.15 – 7.2.18 These are contradictory when will FBC prepare the documentation and perform the surveys?

These surveys and documentation should be available with this sustainability document not at some point in the future. How can we respond to a half done project? It must be noted that contradiction makes this unsound and it is difficult to actually know what FBC have actually done or not.

Chapter 8

Appendix and comment from Bryan Jezeph (Consultant) In Oct 2013 *“The SA does not mention the changes to the number of units proposed and the extended timeline to 2041. The Core Strategy trajectory planned for 5,350 dwellings by 2026 and the Inspector acknowledged this would create a shortfall. The Draft Welborne Plan further reduces this to 2,300 dwellings by 2026 and the SA does not make reference to the implications of this reduction. It will limit the ability of the site to provide facilities in the early phases of development for the first residents meaning they will have to travel off site to access them and this will generate traffic”*.

Why does the SA not mention changes to the number of houses but instead give an around 6000 figure?

The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) has the following main objectives for house building and one of these is “Affordable and meeting needs of the market, identifying accessible sites for 5,6-10 and 11-15 years worth of housing/growth”

Extension of building to 2041 is more than 15 years housing / growth time and therefore this is unsound at this stage.

Welborne is to be where there are safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion. A Garden City is really what is being devised here. Crime will occur no matter where you are – you need to ensure you minimise the possibility of crime taking place in the first instance.

There is no mention of adequate streetlighting – This will have a detrimental effect on the night skies.

There is no mention that the local Police headquarters based in Fareham Town Centre are to be increased or at what cost this may incur to all Fareham residents in their council tax.

For a safe environment, free from crime, within the housing development at Welborne this SA has not addressed this so it is unsound.

Welborne is of a high housing density and any new ‘Garden City’ should not compromise sustainability or principles.

The chapter on Housing does not address what type of house or dwelling is to be considered other than 10% will be ‘Passivhaus’

How can you state 10% when you do not give a definite number in the first instance?

Yours Sincerely

Elaine Tower