

Fareham Borough Council

**THE LOCAL PLAN PART 3: THE WELBORNE PLAN (LP3)**

**ISSUES AND QUESTIONS**

Including draft timetable

August 2014

**INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE FAREHAM LOCAL PLAN PART 3: THE WELBORNE PLAN (LP3)**

**Venue:** The hearing sessions will be held in the Civic Offices, Civic Way, Fareham, PO16 7AZ commencing on Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> October at 10.00am.

**Council:** Fareham Borough Council will be participating in all hearing sessions.

**Statement deadlines:**

All Statements, for the Hearing Sessions must be sent to the Programme Officer by **midday on Friday 26<sup>th</sup> September 2014**. This deadline relates to the receipt of both the **paper and electronic copies**.

**Statements:**

The Inspector requests written responses from the Council to all the matters raised.

Written Statements from Representors are not compulsory but if Representors feel a Statement is warranted they should seek only to answer the Inspector's Questions as far as they relate to their original representations.

**The examination starts from the assumption that the Council has submitted what it considers to be a sound Plan and that the Council has fulfilled its legal duty with regard to the Duty to Co-operate. The hearings will therefore be concerned only with considerations relating to the soundness of the document and the legality of the process followed, and all submissions should address those issues as appropriate.**

The Guidance Notes provided set out the requirements for the presentation of all Statements. Its provisions should be thoroughly read and implemented as otherwise Statements could be returned. Please note the 3,000 word limit.

In the Statements from respondents it would be very helpful for the Inspector to have a brief concluding section stating:

- what part of the Plan is unsound;
- which soundness criterion it fails;
- why it fails (point to the key parts of your original representations);
- how the Plan can be made sound; and
- the precise change and/or wording that you are seeking.

The Inspector will give equal weight to views put orally or in writing.

**If you have any queries – please contact the Programme Officer  
Tel: 01273 381518 (Mob 07737 786425) or by e-mail at [bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com](mailto:bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com)**

## **ISSUES AND QUESTIONS**

### Preamble

If the Inspector is satisfied that an Issue or question has been satisfactorily addressed in the submitted Statements it is possible that it may not be included in the final Agenda. Consequently the timetable and lists of participants may be subject to change, so please contact the Programme Officer or view the programme on the Examination page of the Council's web-site.

### Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> October - 10.00

#### **Introduction by the Inspector**

#### **Opening Statement by the Council**

#### **Issue 1 – The Duty to Co-operate, Legal Requirements and the Relationship between the LP3, LP2, the Core Strategy and other Planning Documents**

#### ***Potential Participants***

***Fareham Borough Council***

***Mrs R Saunders***

***Bryan Jezeph (Persimmon Homes)***

***Buckland Development Ltd***

***Cllr Mrs P Bryant***

***CPRE***

***Wallington Village Community Association***

***Winchester City Council***

***Wickham Society***

#### Questions

- 1.1 Has the Duty to Co-operate been complied with?
- 1.2 Have any cross-boundary strategic issues been identified? If so are they clearly identified in LP3?
- 1.3 Has LP3 been prepared in accordance with:
  - the local development scheme
  - the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)
  - national legislation and policy in the NPPF
  - the Sustainable Community Strategy
  - the public sector equality duty?
- 1.4 Is LP3 based on a sound process of sustainability appraisal and testing of reasonable alternatives, and does it represent the most appropriate strategy in the circumstances? Is there clear evidence demonstrating how and why the preferred strategy for Welborne was selected?
- 1.5 Have the requirements of the Habitats Regulations been satisfied? The Appropriate Assessment Report (HRA04) advises that it cannot be concluded that the ecological integrity of the site will not be adversely affected with regard to wastewater treatment and discharge impacts on the Solent Maritime SAC (paragraph 7.2.4). How is this uncertainty reflected in LP3 and how will a satisfactory outcome be achieved?
- 1.6 Is the relationship between LP3, the submission LP2 and the adopted Core Strategy sufficiently clear and consistent?

- 1.7 The draft Welborne Design SPD has been prepared and there are a number of references to it (and to other SPDs) in the policies of LP3. However, these SPDs will have less weight than LP3 when adopted because they have not been through the same statutory process. Would it be more appropriate for any specific references to 'non-statutory' SPDs to be made within the supporting text rather than within a 'statutory' policy?
- 1.8 What is the status of the South Hampshire Strategy and how much weight should be attached to its contents? Does LP3 reflect the aspirations for the wider South Hampshire area?

**Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> October - 14.00**

**Issue 2 - The Vision, Objectives and Development Principles for Welborne (WEL1 and WEL2)**

***Potential Participants***

***Fareham Borough Council***

***Mrs N Buckley***

***Miss A-M Causer***

***Mrs R Saunders***

***Cllr Mrs P Bryant***

***Bryan Jezeph (Persimmon Homes)***

***Buckland Development Ltd***

***CPRE (Hampshire)***

***The Funtley Village Society***

***Wallington Village Community Association***

***Wickham Society***

***Winchester City Council***

Questions

- 2.1 In broad terms do the policies of LP3 include sufficient detail to enable a decision maker to react appropriately to a development proposal? (NPPF para 154)?
- 2.2 Does policy WEL2 display an appropriate balance between aspiration and realism?
- 2.3 In broad terms are the principles for development as set out in policy WEL2 justified and would the development contribute to the sustainable growth of the Borough?
- 2.4 The sixth bullet point of policy WEL2 refers to a 'revised Transport Strategy'. Should that reference be more explicit?

**Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> October - 10.00**

**Issue 3 - Site, Setting, Allocations, Design Principles and Character Areas (WEL3 to WEL8)**

***Potential Participants***

***Fareham Borough Council***

***Mrs N Buckley***

***Mrs R Saunders***

***Miss A-M Causer***

***Cllr Mr J Bryant***

***Cllr Mrs P Bryant***

***Cllr T Evans***

***Martin Hawthorne (for Mr Laly and the Hastings Family)***

***Ms Mary Power (for Mr A Dutton, Bovis Homes)***

***Buckland Development Ltd***

***CPRE (Hampshire)***

***The Fareham Society***

***The Funtley Village Society***

***Wallington Village Community Association***

***Welborne Standing Conference***

***Wickham Society***

***Winchester City Council***

Questions

- 3.1 Is the proposed boundary of Welborne 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?
- 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).
- 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?
- 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?
- 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?
- 3.7 Should policy WEL6 make reference to potential housing densities (or elsewhere in the Plan)?
- 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?

- 3.9 Will the Strategic Design Codes be subject to any form of consultation or review in order to ensure consistency across the area?
- 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)
- 3.11 Is sufficient weight placed by the Council on issues of noise, light pollution and air quality?

**Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> October - 14.00**

**Issue 4: Economy and Self-Containment (WEL9)**

***Potential Participants***

***Fareham Borough Council  
Buckland Development Ltd  
Ms Mary Power (for Mr A Dutton, Bovis Homes)  
CPRE (Hampshire)  
Fareham Society  
Wickham Society***

Questions

- 4.1 Bearing in mind the objective of self-containment, is the relationship between employment and housing provision appropriate in terms of timing?
- 4.2 Is the scale of employment provision justified? What is the Council's fallback position should demand for employment land not materialise?
- 4.3 Are the locations of the proposed employment development appropriately justified?
- 4.4 Is the type and range of proposed employment uses appropriately justified?
- 4.5 Is the Council's approach sufficiently aspirational - will it result in a high level of self-containment? Is there more the Council could do to facilitate home working and sustainable travel?
- 4.6 Is the Council's approach to office provision (for example safeguarding 3ha of land for later in the plan period) clear and justified? In terms of the sustainability of Welborne why is office development not proposed for earlier in the plan period?
- 4.7 Does the Council have a fallback position should the upgrade of junction 10 of the M27 be delayed (on which the provision of much of the employment floor space relies)? Will the Council's phasing strategy weaken the achievement of self-containment?

**Friday 17<sup>th</sup> October - 10.00**

**Issue 5: District Centre, Local Centre and Community Hub (WEL10 to WEL13)**

***Potential Participants***

***Fareham Borough Council  
Buckland Development Ltd  
Cllr Mrs P Bryant***

Questions

- 5.1 Has the Council satisfactorily demonstrated that the provision of the proposed community services and facilities is viable?
- 5.2 Has the Council achieved an appropriate balance between retail provision, self-containment and ensuring that no material harm would be caused to nearby existing retail areas?
- 5.3 Policy WEL11 refers to 'robust impact assessments'. Is it sufficiently clear what is required in these assessments, when they are required and how the Council will assess their content?
- 5.4 Is it sufficiently clear, in land use terms, what differentiates the community hub from the local centre?

**Issue 6: Education, Community and Health Facilities (WEL14 – WEL16)**

***Potential Participants***

***Fareham Borough Council  
Hampshire County Council (Consultee)  
Mrs N Buckley  
Miss A-M Causer  
Mrs S Chambers  
Mrs R Saunders  
Cllr Mrs P Bryant  
Cllr T Evans  
Martin Hawthorne (for Mr G Moyse)  
Buckland Development Ltd  
CPRE (Hampshire)  
The Funtley Village Society  
Knowle Village Residents' Association (Mrs S Chambers)  
Welborne Standing Conference  
Winchester City Council***

Questions

- 6.1 Is there evidence that capacity exists off-site to meet the wider healthcare needs of the Welborne community (for example at Queen Alexandra Hospital)?
- 6.2 Is the Council's approach to securing the shared use of some school facilities for community use sufficiently robust?
- 6.3 Is the Council's approach to Nursery provision, not on the primary school sites, sufficiently clear and robust?
- 6.4 Is the timing of the provision of the first primary school by the end of Main Phase 1 appropriate? Should the aspiration be to have the school available sooner?

- 6.5 Although the Council has identified two potential sites for a secondary school, the preferred location for the school is to the south of Knowle:
- Is this the most appropriate location for a secondary school, particularly in terms of sustainability (i.e. is it justified?)
  - Can this site be satisfactorily delivered (i.e. is it effective?). The secondary school playing fields would be provided within the boundary of Winchester City Council. Would this accord with the policies in the City Council's Development Plan? Is there evidence that the playing fields could be satisfactorily implemented?

If the Council's current proposal is sound then what is the justification for identifying an alternative site?

- 6.6 Is the timing of the provision of the secondary school by the end of Main Phase 3 appropriate? Should the aspiration be to have the school available sooner?
- 6.7 There is reference to an 'all-through' school which 'will be explored further'. Should not that exploration have already taken place in order to ensure that LP3 is justified (the most appropriate strategy) and effective (deliverable)?
- 6.8 Are existing ambulance, fire and police service arrangements appropriate to cover the new community?

**Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> October - 10.00**

**Issue 7: Transport, Access and Movement (WEL23 – WEL28)**

***Potential Participants***

***Fareham Borough Council  
Hampshire County Council (Consultee)  
Highways Agency (Consultee)  
Mrs N Buckley  
Mrs R Saunders  
Miss A-M Causer  
Mr E Morrell  
Cllr Mr J Bryant  
Cllr Mrs P Bryant  
Cllr T Evans  
Buckland Development Ltd  
Bryan Jezeph (Persimmon Homes)  
Ms Mary Power (for Mr A Dutton, Bovis Homes)  
CPRE (Hampshire)  
The Fareham Society  
The Funtley Village Society  
Knowle Village Residents' Association (Mrs S Chambers)  
Wallington Village Community Association  
Wickham Society  
Winchester City Council***

Questions

- 7.1 The development at Welborne is reliant on the creation of an 'all-moves' junction 10 on the M27. A final scheme has not been agreed but the Strategic Framework Diagram is based on Option 3 of the Transport Strategy. Does this have the support of the Highways Agency? Have all realistic options been considered and been subject to sustainability testing and when will the preferred option be selected?



- 7.2 What will be the consequences, in terms of traffic and movement, of not completing the M27 J10 improvements until 2022?
- 7.3 Is there any evidence to demonstrate that traffic to and from the proposed community at Welborne would have significant adverse effects in terms of highway safety and movement of traffic that cannot be mitigated?
- 7.4 Policy WEL23 refers to both a Transport Framework and a Transport Assessment. The former is not included in the Glossary but is referred to in paragraph 7.14. Is it clear exactly what is required in each document? Is there the risk of information being duplicated?
- 7.5 Is criterion (ii) of policy WEL23 sufficiently clear – what is ‘Travel planning’ (not in Glossary)?
- 7.6 Is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the junction improvements listed in paragraph 7.27 (and in policy WEL25) can be satisfactorily funded and implemented within the appropriate timescale and without threat to the viability of the other elements of the development at Welborne. What is the Council’s fallback position should progress on the junction improvements be delayed?
- 7.7 There is a reference in paragraph 7.24 to the provision of four road junctions between Welborne and the A32 – is this requirement justified?
- 7.8 Is there any evidence that traffic to and from Welborne would have an adverse effect on highway safety in Wickham, Knowle or Funtley that could not be satisfactorily mitigated? Should policy WEL25 make it clear that Welborne should look to the south for its key transport links?
- 7.9 Is the last bullet point of WEL25 criterion (iv.) which refers to ‘other roads’ sufficiently clear? Is the reference to traffic light provision at the junction of the A32/A334 in Wickham justified (paragraph 7.27.1)?
- 7.10 Can it be demonstrated that the Bus Rapid Transit link from Welborne to the town centre can be satisfactorily routed and subsequently implemented? What evidence is there that the BRT link will reduce the number of car journeys to and from Welborne? When is it anticipated the service will be introduced?
- 7.11 How will BRT and the other bus service improvements referred to in paragraph 7.38 be funded and implemented?
- 7.12 What work has been undertaken to assess the feasibility of providing a station on the Fareham to Eastleigh railway line? Is the Council’s approach sufficiently aspirational?
- 7.13 Why does policy WEL28 not refer to the provision of the pedestrian and cycle links listed in paragraph 8.38?

**Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> October - 14.00**

**Issue 8: Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and Landscape (WEL29 – WEL35)**

***Potential Participants***

***Fareham Borough Council***

***Mrs N Buckley***

***Mrs R Saunders***

***Cllr Mrs P Bryant***

***Cllr T Evans***

***Mr A Wells (for Atherfold Ltd)***

***Buckland Development Ltd***

***CPRE (Hampshire)***

***RSPB***

***The Fareham Society***

***The Funtley Village Society***

***Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust***

***Knowle Village Residents' Association (Mrs S Chambers)***

***Welborne Standing Conference***

***Wickham Society***

***Winchester City Council***

Questions

- 8.1 What is the evidential basis for the 108 ha of green infrastructure referred to in paragraph 8.6? Are the standards set out in policy WEL29 justified?
- 8.2 Is the Council's methodology and reasoning in relation to the SANGs provision sound? How will the SANGs be delivered and over what timescale? What is the basis for the figure of 84ha required for SANGs (representing only 70% of the SANGs standard)? The sites referred to in LP3 would result in up to 70.5ha of SANGS. Paragraph 8.21 explains that the shortfall will be met through a financial contribution towards mitigating impacts along the coast. What are the mechanisms for the identification and delivery of such mitigation measures?
- 8.3 Is there any substantive evidence that the development should contribute to the protection of the New Forest SPA from increased recreational disturbance?
- 8.4 Has the Council given consideration to the role that land north and south of Funtley Road, Funtley, could play in mitigating the impact of the proposed development in terms of biodiversity? If so, what conclusions were drawn?
- 8.5 Does policy WEL31 provide sufficient protection for important habitats and species? The policy refers to both an ecological assessment and a biodiversity assessment – are they the same thing?
- 8.6 How will green connections to outside Fareham Borough be achieved? Is this element of policy WEL32 deliverable?
- 8.7 Policy WEL33 includes reference to 'a new garden community'. This is not referred to in the vision or the objectives and the glossary only includes Garden City. Is it sufficiently clear what the Council envisages when it refers to a garden community?

**Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> October - 10.00**

**Issue 9: Energy, Water and Waste (WEL36 – WEL40)**

***Potential Participants***

***Fareham Borough Council***

***Mr E Morrell***

***Mrs N Buckley***

***Mrs R Saunders***

***Cllr Mr J Bryant***

***Cllr Mrs P Bryant***

***Buckland Development Ltd***

***Paul Sansby (Portsmouth Water)***

***CPRE (Hampshire)***

***The Fareham Society***

***The Funtley Village Society***

***Knowle Village Residents' Association (Mrs S Chambers)***

***Wallington Village Community Association***

***Wickham Society***

Questions

- 9.1 Is the reference to the 'Passivhaus' standard within policy WEL36 justified? If it is then what is the justification for only 10% of dwellings being expected to meet that standard?
- 9.2 Are there other renewable energy targets, for example in relation to thermal efficiency and energy generation that should be referred to in LP3 and which could then be reflected in the Energy Strategy that is to accompany the relevant planning applications?
- 9.3 Policies should provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal. However, there is uncertainty regarding water supply and wastewater disposal. The supporting text to policy WEL37 advises that water supply and wastewater treatment services will need to be delivered 'potentially prior to the first main residential phase'. If this is the case why is the policy not more specific about how these infrastructure elements will be secured?
- 9.4 Has the issue of flood risk been adequately assessed and considered, particularly in relation to the communities of Wallington, Funtley and Titchfield?
- 9.5 Is there evidence that a satisfactory sustainable Urban Drainage System (SuDS) can be delivered?
- 9.6 Is policy WEL40 and in particular the location of the Household Waste Recycling Centre, appropriate and justified?

[Wednesday 22nd October - 14.00](#)

**Issue 10: Homes and Affordable Housing (WEL17 – WEL22)**

***Potential Participants***

***Fareham Borough Council  
Buckland Development Ltd  
CPRE (Hampshire)  
Wickham Society***

Questions

- 10.1 What is the justification for the requirement for 15% of market homes to be designed to meet higher accessibility standards and is the reference to economic viability in the third paragraph of policy WEL17 appropriate and justified?
- 10.2 Is the Council's approach to the provision of private market rental housing sufficiently flexible?
- 10.3 Core Strategy policy CS18 requires 40% affordable housing on sites of 15 or more dwellings. What is the justification for reducing the percentage at Welborne to 30% bearing in mind the significant need for this type of housing in the area?
- 10.4 Is the reference in paragraph 2 of policy WEL18, to the precise number and mix of affordable homes being agreed by the Council at the time a phase comes forward, a justified approach? Does it demonstrate that the plan is positively prepared and effective?
- 10.5 Is the tenure split, of 70% being affordable or social rent and 30% being intermediate provision, justified?
- 10.6 Is the inclusion of policy WEL22 on gypsies and travellers consistent with national policy? Does it have any substantive impact on the effectiveness of LP3?

[Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> October - 10.00](#)

**Issue 11: Delivering the New Community including Viability, Monitoring and Review (WEL41 – WEL43)**

***Potential Participants***

***Fareham Borough Council***

***Mrs N Buckley***

***Mrs R Saunders***

***Cllr Mrs P Bryant***

***Buckland Development Ltd***

***Ms Mary Power (for Mr A Dutton, Bovis Homes)***

***Bryan Jezeph (for Persimmon Homes)***

***Paul Sansby (Portsmouth Water)***

***CPRE (Hampshire)***

***The Fareham Society***

***The Funtley Village Society***

***Wallington Village Community Association***

***Wickham Society***

***Winchester City Council***

Questions

- 11.1 The Stage 2 Viability Testing (Core Document EV30) concludes that currently the Welborne Plan appears to be unviable (paragraph 1.52). What evidence is there to demonstrate that overall the proposed development at Welborne, including infrastructure provision, would be viable and deliverable? Are the mechanisms in place to ensure that funding is available to deliver the infrastructure when it is required? What are the implications of the recent Government announcement (15 August) regarding the large sites infrastructure programme?
- 11.2 What are the main risks to delivery; does the Council have an appropriate fallback position; and is there sufficient flexibility to accommodate any unforeseen circumstances?
- 11.3 Is the phasing plan sufficiently clear; justified; and based on realistic timescales? Is it sufficiently clear exactly what infrastructure will be required before a subsequent phase can commence? Has the right balance between 'flexibility' and 'certainty', in terms of infrastructure provision, been achieved?
- 11.4 How will issues of different land ownerships (e.g. in relation to SANGs provision) be resolved?
- 11.5 Is the principle of the long-term safeguarding of land justified (as referred to in policy WEL42)?
- 11.6 Are the housing and employment trajectories based on sound evidence?
- 11.7 In order for the plan to be found sound it must be effective. In order to test its effectiveness over the course of the plan period it must be capable of appropriate monitoring. Table 11.1 lists the indicators and targets but is the list sufficiently detailed? There is no indication of the process by which the targets will be monitored; what is meant by monitoring 'on a regular basis'; or how the Council would respond if the level of performance is not satisfactory. On this basis can it be concluded that LP3 will be effective?
- 11.8 Are the triggers for a review of the document sufficiently robust?

**COUNCIL'S CLOSING STATEMENT**

**INSPECTOR'S CLOSING COMMENTS**

- End -

**ID-06 Issues and Questions: Summary of changes:**

**Participants**

Cllr A Clear – withdraw from appearing Issues 3, 6 and 8.

Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust – added to Issue 8

Highways Agency – appearing as statutory consultee for Issue 7

Hampshire County Council – appearing as statutory consultee for Issue 6 and 7