

MH/cg/HP14016

26 September 2014

Ms Claire Jones-Hughes Programme Officer bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com

Dear Ms Jones-Hughes

INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE FAREHAM LOCAL PLAN PART 3: THE WELBORNE PLAN ISSUE 3: SITE, SETTING, ALLOCATIONS, DESIGN PRINCIPLES & CHARACTER AREAS (WEL3 to WEL8)

WRITTEN STATEMENT IN RESPONSE TO INSPECTOR'S QUESTION

I refer to the above matter and confirm that I am included in the list of potential participants on behalf of my client, Mr Balvinder Laly of Lalys, at the Hearing Session for Issue 3 of the Independent Examination of the Local Plan Part 3: The Welborne Plan due to take place on Thursday 16 October 2014.

I wish to reserve my right to participate in this Hearing Session on behalf of my client, however, I also set out below our response to the relevant Inspector's question set out in the 'Issues and Questions' document dated August 2014.

I confirm that our previous written submission relating to the Publication Version (dated 11 April 2014) of The Welborne Plan remains valid and request that the comments below are read in conjunction with our previous statement.

## Question 3.3

For the reasons set out in our previous written submission in April 2014, we do not believe that the proposed use of the land at 72 Kiln Road (my clients' site) for employment is justified or achievable.

As previously explained, my client's land currently comprises two residential properties together with associated curtilages. The existing residential uses on my client's land will have a greater end value than



First Floor, The Pavilion, Botleigh Grange Office Campus, Hedge End, Southampton, SO30 2AF Tel: +44 (0)2382 022800 Fax: +44 (0)2382 022889 Email: planning.southampton@wyg.com www.wyg.com



any form of employment use such that the land is unlikely to ever come forward for employment development, resulting in the two existing dwellings on my client's site being retained and representing an incongruous use with the surrounding land if this is allocated for employment. The proposed use of my client's site is therefore considered to be unjustified and unachievable.

As set out in our original written submission, it is considered that my client's land must be allocated for a use with a higher end value than its existing residential use, i.e. retail or increased residential development. For the reasons previously given, on balance the most appropriate allocation for my client's site is considered to be continued residential use. A proposed strategy for achieving this, together with ensuring that appropriate employment land is still provided elsewhere in the Welborne Plan area, is set out in our original statement and we refer the Inspector to this previous submission.

I trust that the above comments are of assistance and if you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

**MARTIN HAWTHORNE** 

My Lea

Director

For and on behalf of WYG

cc: Mr Ian Judd

Mr Balvinder Laly, Lalys