

FAREHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Development Sites and Policies Plan

Statement on Issues and Questions

Issue 9 – Facilities and Infrastructure (DSP48 – DSP56)

October 2014

DCD-13

9.1 *Is the plan supported by robust and up-to-date information on infrastructure requirements and their delivery?*

- 9.1.1 The NPPF expects Local Planning Authorities to plan positively to meet infrastructure requirements (paragraph 157) and to work with other authorities to assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure and its ability to meet forecast demands (Paragraph 162). The Council has met this requirement through the production of a robust Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (DFI04). This IDP sets out what infrastructure is anticipated to be required over the Plan period for the Borough excluding Welborne, which is dealt with in a separate IDP that supports the Welborne Plan (See EV27 and EV29 from the Welborne Plan Examinations Library).
- 9.1.2 In addition to setting out the infrastructure requirements, the IDP also provides details about when infrastructure will be required and how much this is expected to cost. Wherever possible, details are also included about how the infrastructure will be funded and which body or organisation is responsible for doing so. In order to provide transparency on the Council's intentions regarding the balance between Community Infrastructure Levy funding and Section 106 contributions, separate columns have been provided to detail the funding expectations where these are known.
- 9.1.3 The IDP is a 'living document' and has been updated a number of times during the preparation of LP2 to take account of new evidence, the outcomes of public consultation and on-going engagement with key stakeholders, including neighbouring local authorities, Hampshire County Council and infrastructure providers. A detailed list of the key stakeholders, which have been engaged in the process of preparing the IDP, can be found in Appendix A of the IDP document.
- 9.1.4 The current version of the IDP is up-to-date and was revised in the Spring of 2014, taking account of the comments made on LP2 during the period of consultation undertaken in accordance with Regulation 19 (February to April 2014). Revisions to the IDP were also undertaken to ensure that it would provide appropriate infrastructure planning evidence to support the Council's review of its Community Infrastructure Levy rates.
- 9.1.5 Following revision, the IDP was subsequently made available to the public for comments (between 25th June and 6th August 2014) at the same time as the public consultation on the Council's Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (DFB10) setting out proposals for the review of Fareham's Community Infrastructure Levy Rates. As a result of the consultation on the IDP, there were only three representations made. These are summarised alongside the representations to the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule in CD-04 (see PDCS 008c, PDCS 0010a and PDCS 0011j). None of the representations made resulted in any specific changes to the IDP.

9.2 Do policies DSP49 and DSP50 accurately reflect the aspirations of the County Council as Highway Authority?

9.2.1 Policy DSP49 (Improvements to the Strategic Network) is an accurate representation of Hampshire County Council’s current proposals as Highway Authority for improvements to the Strategic Road Network in the Borough. This has been confirmed by representation made by the Highway Authority (HCC) (DREP393) on the Publication Version of the Plan and the associated revisions made to the Plan, through the schedule of Minor Changes to the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites & Policies Plan Publication Version (DSD02).

9.2.2 The schemes referred to in Policy DSP49 form key components of a major programme of highways works aimed at improving transport access to Fareham and Gosport peninsula. These schemes are at various stages of design and implementation, and alignments are shown as ‘safeguarded’ on the Policies Map if, either a Preferred Route has been approved by Hampshire County Council or, if the project forms part of a firm construction programme.

9.2.3 Project development work is on-going and recommendations for ‘Preferred Route’ status on several other components of the programme are scheduled to be brought forward over the coming months. The Council is aware that the progress on this scheme, and other highway schemes in the Borough, will continue post-adoption. Fareham Borough Council will continue to liaise closely with the Highway Authority to ensure that such progress is taken into account in the upcoming review of the Local Plan, as committed to in the Local Development Scheme (LDS) (DFB09).

9.2.4 Policy DSP50 “*Access to Whiteley*” is also a true reflection of the Highway Authority’s current proposals for improving access to Whiteley to serve the North Whiteley development. The Highway Authority (HCC) has recently reviewed Policy DSP50 and confirmed to Fareham Borough Council that they are content with the wording subject to the following minor modifications:

9.2.5 Policy DSP50: Access to Whiteley

The parcels of land as shown on the Policies Map will be safeguarded for the following improvements to serve development:

- **The remaining section of Rookery Avenue linking the Whiteley Area Distributor Road to Botley Road.**

Road connections from Whiteley to Botley Road for general traffic via Yew Tree Drive will not be permitted before Whiteley Way is completed between Junction 9 on the M27 and the A3051, Botley Road north of Curbridge, providing unless the outcome of the trial opening and further transport assessment, including the impact of the expansion of North Whiteley, demonstrates there is no indication of

does not indicate severe adverse impacts and it is demonstrated to be safe.

9.3 *Is policy DSP50 justified bearing in mind the uncertainty with regard to delivery?*

9.3.1 Completion of the remaining section of Rookery Avenue, providing the infrastructure for a new through route between Whiteley and Botley Road, is considered to be potentially important in terms of an overall transport and access strategy for Whiteley. However, as referenced in paragraph 6.21, depending on progress of access proposals at North Whiteley (which falls within the boundary of Winchester City Council) this position may need to be reviewed in due course.

9.3.2 Until such time as development proposals are brought forward, together with the associated agreement to complete Rookery Avenue, the Highway Authority (HCC) intends to continue monitoring traffic movements on Yew Tree Drive and the adjacent road network, and undertake further transport assessment as required to take account of the impact of the planned North Whiteley development.

9.3.3 The Council therefore considers that Policy DSP50 is justified in terms of representing both the current functionality of the local network and the current position regarding access to the wider Whiteley site. If, through progress at North Whiteley, the policy position changes this will be reflected in the review of the Local Plan.

9.4 *Is sufficient weight attached to meeting the needs of cyclists and pedestrians? If not what changes should be made to the plan?*

9.4.1 There are various references within Chapter 6 of the Submission Version of LP2 to initiatives and measures aimed specifically at promoting walking and cycling, in line with the objectives of the Borough's Core Strategy (DLP02) CS5 (Transport Strategy and Infrastructure). These references include improving access within the Borough by all sustainable modes of transport (which include cycling and walking), and the enhancement of facilities for pedestrians and cyclists provided for as part of the programmed strategic network schemes.

9.4.2 The Green Infrastructure Strategy for Fareham Borough (DNE12), referred to in Chapter 4 of the Plan, provides details of potential additions or improvements to the cycle network within the Borough and new links that cross the Borough boundary. Hampshire County Council is working with Fareham Borough Council to actively explore opportunities to bring forward a number of these cycle route enhancements.

9.4.3 LP2 also emphasises the importance of effective connectivity between different transport modes, and in particular the provision of enhanced

interchange facilities at Fareham Railway Station. To provide further clarity and in recognition of the evidence in the Fareham Railway Station Travel Plan (DTR05) that cycling was the main means of accessing the station for 10% of rail passengers, the Council proposes a modification to the third sentence of paragraph 6.17:

The Council will continue to work with the highway authority (Hampshire County Council) and transport operators to facilitate the provision of an enhanced transport interchange in the railway station area to enable buses, cars, pedestrians, cyclists and rail services to operate safely and efficiently together.

- 9.4.4 Overall, it is considered that the Plan attaches sufficient weight to meeting the needs of cyclists and pedestrians, commensurate with the fact that details of these measures will only become available following further design development of the infrastructure schemes.

9.5 *Is sufficient weight attached to the need to improve air quality in the Borough, particularly in the Air Quality Management Areas?*

- 9.5.1 LP2 clearly references (paragraph 6.6) that the two Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within the Borough were required due to the regular occurrence of traffic congestion, and the consequential effect on air quality at the relevant locations.

- 9.5.2 A primary objective of the strategic road improvements is to reduce traffic congestion on these routes and to affect a positive impact on air quality. The Air Quality Action Plans (AQAPs) for these areas, developed in compliance with guidance issued by DEFRA, have defined actions for reducing vehicle emissions and improving public transport alternatives, and setting targets and indicators for monitoring the effect of these initiatives.

- 9.5.3 Therefore, it is considered that Fareham Borough Council has attributed sufficient weight to the need to improve air quality in the Borough. To further emphasise the importance of on-going work within the AQMA areas the Council proposes a modification to paragraph 6.6, adding the following sentence:

The Council will work with the Highway Authority (Hampshire County Council) and other stakeholders to improve traffic flows and introduce other measures to improve air quality within the AQMA areas and elsewhere in the Borough.

9.6 *Does policy DSP56 constitute ‘a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources’ (NPPF paragraph 97)?*

- 9.6.1 The Council commissioned the production of a Renewable Energy Capacity Study (DFI01) to understand the contribution the Borough can make to energy generation from renewable and low carbon sources, in line with the

overall objective of NPPF paragraph 97. The opening paragraph of Policy DSP56 concludes that any negative impacts from renewable energy projects should be carefully balanced with the wider benefits of providing renewable energy, which emphasises that the Council will appropriately consider the wider benefits of such proposals.

- 9.6.2 The Renewable Energy Capacity Study highlighted the technologies that are most likely to be relevant to Fareham, being solar and wind, whilst also highlighting the least constrained areas in the Borough that are suitable for these technologies. The Study also identified potential in the Borough for district heating and combined heat and power (CHP) and suggested some locations which may be suitable. Through the identification of suitable locations, including the maps of least constraint for solar and wind (Appendix H), the Council satisfies bullet point 3 of paragraph 97, which states that local planning authorities should “*consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy*”.
- 9.6.3 Policy DSP56 expands on the findings of DFI01 and allows for proposals for renewable and low carbon energy development in the Borough subject to a series of caveats. The majority of these caveats relate to the character, amenity and ecology reflecting the second bullet point of paragraph 97 which states policies should ensure that “*adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily, including cumulative landscape and visual impacts*”. The fourth bullet point paragraph 97 of the NPPF is also reiterated in Policy DSP56 where the Council supports community-led initiatives (last paragraph in Policy DSP56).
- 9.6.4 It is also important to note that the Local Plan also includes Core Strategy Policy CS16: Natural Resources and Renewable Energy which states that development of one or more dwelling or over 500sq.m of non-residential floorspace will be encouraged to contribute to a 12MW renewable energy target. CS16 also states that major developments should aim to maximise on-site renewable energy productions and resource efficiency.
- 9.6.5 Overall the Council believes that the approach taken in the Local Plan, both through Policy DSP56 and Policy CS16 meets the requirements of paragraph 97 of the NPPF. It is considered a positive strategy, but also serves to strike an appropriate balance between encouraging the use of renewable and low carbon technologies, whilst having due regard to the potential impacts that need to be considered.