

## Local Plan Part 3: Draft Welborne Plan Regulation 18 – Preparation of a Local Plan

### Detailed Summary of Representations

The series of tables presented in this document provide a detailed summary of the representations that were made on each section and / or policy of the Draft Welborne Plan during the six-week public consultation period between 29 April and 10 June 2013. Comments are not always individually attributed by respondent, but are summarised by plan section or policy and a number reference given (as per Table A below) for the respondent(s) who submitted comments on that particular section or policy.

Table A: Respondent Reference Number (as used in Summary Tables)

01	BST Group	21	Scottish & Southern Energy Power Distribution	41	The Theatres Trust
02	Buckland Development Ltd	22	Scotia Gas Networks	42	Christians Together in Fareham (CTiF)
03	Bovis Homes Group PLC	23	Southern Water	43	Fareham Labour Party
04	Flynn family	24	Portsmouth Water	44	Cllr Katrina Trott
05	Hastings family	25	Homes and Communities Agency	45	Hallam Land Management Ltd
06	Fred Hedges	26	Standing Conference	46	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce
07	Laly family	27	Southampton City Council	47	Atherfold Investments Ltd
08	Russell Moore	28	Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service	48	QinetiQ
09	Graham Moyse	29	OFWAT	49	The Co-operative Group
10	Environment Agency	30	Civil Aviation Authority	50	Cyclists' Touring Club (CTC)
11	English Heritage	31	Wickham Parish Council		
12	Marine Management Organisation	32	The Fareham Society		
13	Natural England	33	Community Action Fareham	99	Fareham Borough residents (Anonymous)
14	Network Rail	34	RSPB	98	Non-Fareham Borough residents (Anonymous)
15	Highways Agency	35	Funtley Residents Society	97	Developers/ Agents (Anonymous)
16	Hampshire County Council	36	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	96	Community Groups/ Organisations (Anonymous)
17	Eastleigh Borough Council	37	CPRE Hampshire	95	Landowners (Anonymous)
18	Gosport Borough Council	38	New Forest National Park Authority	94	Local Businesses (Anonymous)
19	Winchester City Council	39	George Hollingbury MP	90	Unknown
20	Partnership for Urban South Hampshire	40	Fareham Wheelers Cycling Club		

## Chapter 1 Introduction and Planning Context

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
How to respond to Consultation Draft Plan	<p>Difficulty in navigating the online consultation pages and completing the online consultation response process.</p> <p>Paper format seen as far more straightforward.</p> <p>Overreliance on online methods, whilst later evening exhibitions required particularly at both Fareham and Wickham.</p>	98, 99
Fareham's Development Plan	<p>This is a policy document and not a Plan - it does not contain the information required of a plan for a major project, namely estimated costs, timescales and milestones.</p> <p>Opposition to the principle and need for Welborne.</p> <p>Support for proposals which help address housing need and will deliver economic growth in the Fareham and wider south Hampshire area.</p>	25, 98, 99
The Purpose of the Plan	<p>Support for delivery of a significant amount of affordable housing.</p> <p>Development will mean young people in area can remain in area to live and work. Will ease pressure on the open green spaces and strategic gaps elsewhere in the borough.</p> <p>Support for the delivery of Welborne and investing public monies to contribute to a robust evidence base.</p> <p>Support for a cohesive approach to the totality of all the issues to establish a new successful settlement which is critical to Welborne's success.</p> <p>Positive to now see a plan on the development after much early uncertainty.</p> <p>Concern over the ability of the area to be able to take it, the impact on local peoples' lives, the loss of farmland / countryside, the impact on the surrounding villages, the impact of traffic and the potential for increased flooding.</p> <p>Questions over the need for the development in terms of the Fareham population and many houses being up for sale.</p> <p>Question why development cannot be located entirely on brownfield land in the borough.</p>	03, 07, 08, 25, 37, 43, 98, 99
Local Planning Policy Context	<p>Providing a range of the number of houses is too vague – only the minimum number to satisfy viability should be planned for.</p>	98, 99

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	There are several conflicting paragraphs in the document.	
Wider Planning Context	The draft plan does not provide evidence of viability and deliverability to demonstrate how the key tests of 'soundness' within paragraph 182 of the NPPF have been met.	01, 02
The Concept Masterplanning Process	<p>Recognised that landowners will need to prepare a comprehensive masterplan which is viable and deliverable as part of a future planning application. Welcome flexibility of the parameter plans.</p> <p>The Concept Masterplan appropriately reflects the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) guidance on housing in new settlements based on the principles of Garden Cities.</p> <p>Support for a single comprehensive masterplan for the entire scheme on the basis of equalisation.</p>	01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 08, 09
Other Evidence Studies		
Policies Map	<p>Opposition to fixing the location of the secondary school.</p> <p>Fareham's Policies Map should be amended to show the extent of the draft Welborne Plan boundary and reflecting the main principles of development.</p>	01, 02
The Comprehensive Masterplan and Process for Determining Planning Applications	<p>The importance of a flexible approach to development due to the development period is noted; however it will need to be assured that future development does not impact/contradict on early mitigating decisions taken to ensure certain developments do not take place in certain locations.</p> <p>Support for the requirement for a comprehensive masterplan.</p>	11, 97
Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment	To be addressed separately.	
Consultation Process and Next Steps	<p>There has been insufficient engagement with the major landowners to ensure proposals are market tested. The Core Strategy Policy CS13 commitment that the masterplan will be produced in partnership with development interests has not been met.</p> <p>The draft plan suffers from a lack of detail in places that makes it hard to visualise what might be expected to result. The use of illustrative models of how other similar development has been done elsewhere is needed to resolve this.</p> <p>There is too much attention paid to other parts of Fareham Borough to protect their countryside areas and not</p>	01, 26, 33, 90, 98, 99

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
	<p>enough attention paid to the concerns of those living near Welborne.</p> <p>Six weeks is too short a period to effectively engage the wide range of community groups with an interest in the plan.</p> <p>Inadequate level of consultation which does not do enough to listen to local views - want a referendum on decision to develop Welborne.</p> <p>Concern over the purpose of consultation process as it will not alter development in any way and that the preferred option had advanced from each of the four options consulted on in July 2012.</p> <p>Previous consultations have been ignored as objections to principle of development have not been complied with.</p> <p>Very complicated, user unfriendly and time consuming due to length of plan document.</p> <p>Should have been better promotion of the consultation, together with a long-term display of the exhibition boards in Fareham shopping centre, whilst exhibition boards should have contained more detail.</p> <p>Concerns about the lack of detail on some topics and the consequent difficulty in visualising and understanding the nature of the development likely to come forward.</p> <p>Hope that consultation comments are fully taken into account and that process will receive relevant and informed information which will help enhance the final plan.</p> <p>Support for consultation.</p>	

## Chapter 2 Vision, Objectives and Development Principles

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
Review of the Welborne Vision	<p>Change in words for self-containment is a retrograde step and weakens the aspiration for a self-contained community - further undermined by the secondary school &amp; employment to the east of A32.</p> <p>Reducing the proposed high levels of energy efficiency due to viability is a short-term approach and does not match the aspirations set out in the vision previously supported by the local community - additional funding should be sought.</p> <p>Concern for the need of both retirement flats and single person flats due to excess local availability - focus should be on providing 3 bedroom young/early family homes.</p> <p>Concern over ability to deliver a high level of self-containment and whether employment opportunities on-site will come forward and employ people living there.</p> <p>The removal of references to Eco-Towns is essential in order to viably deliver Welborne consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Support for adopting garden city approach over the former eco-town model.</p> <p>Distinctive development character and house design is supported.</p>	03, 24, 32, 37, 97, 99
Additional Vision Statement and Objectives	<p>Support for introduction of garden city principles and revision to self-containment and energy objectives.</p> <p>Concern that the garden city principles introduced are not being applied in the form of lower housing densities (25-30 dph).</p> <p>Question over whether strong connections with Fareham can be developed due to the location of M27 in-between.</p> <p>Concern over the level of environmental sustainability proposed and the impact of Welborne on rural tourism.</p> <p>Water use should be maximised in terms of efficiency and not simply minimised.</p> <p>Unsure fully as to what garden city principles mean and why the sustainable development principles previously applied are no longer present.</p> <p>How the garden community principles applied would mean Welborne differs from any other large scale development.</p>	01, 02, 10, 24, 32, 97, 98, 99

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>Concern that the final development will remain fragmented and not provide clear habitat greenways.</p> <p>Provision of much green space supported.</p> <p>General support for additional objectives.</p>	
<p>High Level Development Principles WEL1</p>	<p>The principle of strategic access from J10, altered to provide east off-slips and west on-slips, is supported.</p> <p>Should avoid reference to maximum floorspace in policy WEL 1 order to maintain flexibility of alternative future approaches.</p> <p>Support for flexibility in approach for green infrastructure and affordable housing, though policies should provide alternative mitigation options and be subject to a test of development viability.</p> <p>Concern that infrastructure will not come forward to support the early houses.</p> <p>Concern that there is no mention of historic environment in policy WEL1.</p> <p>Support for policy WEL1 as it accords with South Hampshire Strategy policies 1, 3 and 14.</p> <p>Broad support for sustainable design, commitment to biodiversity, green infrastructure and a commitment to strong urban form.</p> <p>Ambiguity and confusion as to whether Welborne is being planned as a separate community, or as an extension to Fareham.</p> <p>Full support for the avoidance and mitigation of ecological impacts and the provision of a net gain for biodiversity.</p> <p>Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) welcomed, but some policy revisions required to ensure the prevention of runoff and the reduction of pollution.</p> <p>Larger SUDS features within the open spaces which drain multiple future phases would have to be delivered in their entirety at the outset in order to prevent a short term increase in flood risk before those future phases are delivered.</p> <p>SuDS would potentially provide a method of attenuating pollution and improving water quality.</p> <p>Broad support for the high level development principles underlying the plan and particularly the commitments on masterplanning, design, green infrastructure and for the range of community services which the plan provides for.</p> <p>Major questions and concerns on transport policies, environmental infrastructure and housing density.</p> <p>Greater recognition required on the impact of motorway noise on areas of development and how that will be</p>	<p>01, 02, 09, 10, 11, 20, 26, 36, 98, 99</p>

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>mitigated.</p> <p>Support for a connected network of Strategic Green Infrastructure</p>	
<p>Additional Development Principles WEL2</p>	<p>The reference to 'garden city principles' is ineffective and not justified.</p> <p>There is no flexibility in WEL2 for alternative options.</p> <p>Question over what the criteria is for a 21<sup>st</sup> century Garden City and how/whether it can be met over such a large area.</p> <p>Critique of the meadows character area due to its lack of viability and location of residential building next to M27.</p> <p>Critique of open and expansive description of central park, as potentially alternative, equally as good, non-open and expansive proposals could come forward.</p> <p>Support for the Woodland Character area in the north of Welborne.</p> <p>No need for policy WEL2 as is duplicated by subsequent policies.</p> <p>Disappointment that there is no mention in policy WEL2 of the listed heritage assets on the Welborne site.</p> <p>Support for policy WEL2 as it accords with South Hampshire Strategy policies 5, 6 and 14.</p> <p>Broad support for sustainable design, commitment to biodiversity, green infrastructure and a commitment to strong urban form.</p>	<p>01, 02, 11, 19, 26, 99</p>
<p>Sustainable Development</p>	<p>Concern that the development will not meet sustainable principles.</p>	<p>32</p>

Chapter 3  
The Welborne Site

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
Site and Setting	<p>Figure 3.1 should indicate the area which is being excluded in the allocation as shown in Figures 3.2 and 3.3.</p> <p>Poor location which will lead to the loss of the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p>	10, 32
Constraints, Capacity and Opportunities	<p>Figure 3.2 is not justified and should not prematurely preclude further development in 'existing built form' areas or the use of alternative approaches. It is too prescriptive to impose 'absolute constraints' at this stage. The figure should be deleted.</p> <p>There is a significant gap in the evidence base, as a noise assessment has not been completed. There are considered to be significant areas near to the M27 motorway where noise constraints would make housing development unsuitable, even with mitigation and more employment uses should be indicated in these areas. A 40m noise buffer is not adequate and noise barriers should be built both north and south of the M27.</p> <p>In relation to paragraph 3.12, the discharge of surface water run-off to ground within the groundwater SPZ1 would be considered if there was a suitable risk-based approach used in designing the scheme. In paragraph 3.15 it is not acceptable to "assume" that it will be possible to protect the character and setting of listed buildings on and adjoining the site. This needs to be properly demonstrated. The reference in paragraph 3.16 to a buffer around Roche Court is supported. Paragraph 3.18 should include the areas east of the A32 as areas of highest landscape sensitivity. Paragraph 3.19 deals with matters that would be better to include under the 'Heritage' subsection. The site is good farmland and this should be seen as a constraint as the population is increasing and needs more food production.</p> <p>Concern over any development within the Area of Ecological importance.</p>	01, 02, 10, 11, 26, 32, 37, 97, 99
Overall Quantum of Development	<p>Plan does not identify how paragraph 47 of the NPPF has been taken into account to clarify how the level of employment and housing is designed to meet the objectively assessed needs of the Borough and other adjoining areas.</p> <p>There will be a significant shortfall in projected housing supply in the Borough to 2026 against objectively assessed needs. As a result, the Council should reconsider its entire development strategy for the Borough before proceeding with the next stage of the Welborne Plan.</p> <p>The overall level of housing delivered may not reach 6,500 due to the conclusions of the HRA, scheme viability and detailed masterplanning studies. The plan should be more flexible to allow for a reduction in the overall quantum of</p>	01,02, 03, 09, 26, 37, 39, 44, 45, 98 99



# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>homes should site constraints (such as noise) or viability demonstrate that 6,500 is not achievable.</p> <p>As there is no detailed land-budget included in the Draft Plan, it is unclear how the Concept Masterplan has reached a figure of 6,500 homes, at an average density of 38 dph, or how landowners' views on density have been taken into account, as stated in paragraph 3.23. There is concern that if densities need to increase to accommodate the required level of housing, the scheme would not reflect commercial demand and would be inconsistent with the overall vision. A more appropriate average density would be no more than 35 dph and this would lead to an overall capacity of around 5,500 homes. There is also no evidence that the methodology applied to determine the overall site capacity has taken into account the discounting of 12.5-15% required for such things as play areas, incidental open space, utilities infrastructure and verges.</p> <p>There is a tension between the concept of 'garden cities' with its low densities and the volume of housing that is being sought. Densities of about 24-40 dph are considerable not consistent with 'garden city principles' and it would be better to hold back on volume of housing until there is greater assurance that the scale of development is acceptable.</p> <p>The scale of development is too large and not in keeping with the rural/village feel of the surrounding areas and will erode this character and will impact on the wildlife on the site and cause significant noise and light pollution into surrounding areas. It will also impact on property investments and values in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>Basis upon which the figures for the new town at Welborne were brought forward is flawed and should be re-examined. Concern that the housing density is based on what was required to accommodate 6500 houses &amp; supporting services and not those lesser densities which are consistent with garden city principles.</p> <p>The development is too large when taking into account all of the vacant properties in the surrounding areas which should be put into use first. Although the need for affordable homes is accepted, the case for thousands of market sale homes is not clear and must be in doubt given the continuing depressed economic conditions.</p> <p>Reduction in the number of dwellings and employment space (including withdrawal of J11 business area) from previous consultation stages welcomed, though further reductions are still required.</p> <p>The cancellation of the South East Plan and the new freedoms for local authorities to set their own housing numbers means that FBC should take to opportunity to review the level of housing needed at Welborne.</p>	
Alternative Development Options	<p>The selection of Option 3 by the Council is supported, as is the rejection of options requiring reliance on Junction 11 and proposing an employment park north of that junction.</p> <p>The use of Junction 11 should be reconsidered as it would make for a safe access route. It should not be rejected</p>	18, 99

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	on grounds of cost alone.	
The Plan Boundary	<p>There is concern that the boundary around the area east of the A32 is not firm and the development may be expanded in the future.</p> <p>Question as to how the Crockerhill Industrial Park has become included within Welborne boundary.</p> <p>Land to the immediate south and west of Funtley between Funtley Road and the M27 motorway should be included within the plan to meet the need for green infrastructure and to provide a settlement buffer between Funtley and Fareham. This should include a community building, a shop and a limited amount of housing.</p> <p>Land at Knowle Triangle and land north west of Ravenswood House should be included within the plan to allow for residential development and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Concern that plan boundary includes a significant area of farmland.</p>	09, 47, 98, 99
Allocation of Land WEL3	<p>Figure 3.3 is not justified and should be amended to reflect development principles, but with flexibility to allow for change.</p> <p>The allocation of a site for the secondary school is supported, although the location of the school shown east of the A32 on Figure 3.3 is not justified and should be moved to the heart of Welborne.</p> <p>WEL3 is insufficiently flexible to allow for a lower quantum of housing and overstates the actual capacity of the site because the densities being assumed (40 dph) will not allow for an interesting and marketable scheme which would require densities closer to 35 dph. The imposition of a cap on employment is prescriptive and restrictive and limits the ability to respond to market demand. Policy should be incorporated into WEL1. WEL3 should use the qualification "up to" in relation to the overall target for housing to enable the development to reflect market demand.</p> <p>WEL3 is supported. Although delivery of homes and employment floorspace is greater than the target in the PUSH South Hampshire Strategy to 2026, development at Welborne will extend to 2041.</p>	01, 02, 03, 20, 32
Comprehensive Approach WEL4	<p>The need for a masterplan to be prepared for the whole site by site promoters is supported. However, WEL4 is prescriptive, inflexible and unreasonable in requiring a masterplan for the whole site to accompany planning applications for 'significant development proposals'. The policy should be amended to require the submission of a comprehensive masterplan with outline planning applications and for subsequent applications for reserved matters or detailed applications to reflect the submitted comprehensive masterplan. The comprehensive masterplan will need to be flexible enough to reflect changes in circumstance over the life of the project and will need to be subject to regular review.</p>	01, 03, 04, 05, 09, 11, 32

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>The policy wording is not effective as without reference to a controlling mechanism (s106 agreements) and consideration of a phased delivery of the whole community to allow for funding subsequent infrastructure, there is a risk that parts of the site will come forward and then the development will stop as funding for the whole scheme has not been considered.</p>	
Existing Properties within the Plan Boundary		
Area of Search Outside of the Plan Boundary Area		
<p>Maintaining Settlement Separation WEL5</p>	<p>WEL5 is too prescriptive as buffer widths should be determined at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The southern margins of Fareham Common have the capacity for some limited residential development without undermining the proposed buffer function of that land.</p> <p>There is concern about the adequacy of the settlement buffers and that WEL5 does not go far enough. The policy could result in a proliferation of scout huts and skate parks and that these should be located outside of the buffers which should have a tougher 'no development' requirement. Allotments are not appropriate in a buffer zone. The buffers overall are too small and need to be larger at 100m, 150m or 500m wide. A requirement is needed that housing adjoining the buffers is restricted to a maximum density of around 20 dph.</p> <p>The requirement for a 50m buffer with Knowle/Ravenswood Hospital and Wickham is welcomed. However, the existing vegetation along the Knowle buffer is vulnerable to pressures from the development and therefore an additional landscaped buffer should be provided on the Fareham side.</p> <p>The Knowle buffer is inadequate to prevent coalescence and Knowle Village will be entirely consumed by a new town and will not retain its character. Knowle's homes will be blighted and will have their value affected. The housing near Knowle and Funtley should be lower density and restricted in height to avoid impacting the two villages. The central park should be moved westwards to form a large buffer between Welborne and Knowle.</p> <p>No mention of maintaining settlement separation with Crockerhill, as with other surrounding communities and the plan is incorrect in stating that the site is reasonably enclosed with planting along the boundaries - the landform dips away from residential properties on the A32 and so are not screened.</p> <p>Housing near the borders with Wickham Parish should be lower in density and the amount of GI in these areas should be greater. Blakes Copse cannot serve as an effective buffer as it is deciduous and open for much of the year. The depth of this buffer should be increased to provide effective year-round screening. WEL5 does not go far</p>	<p>01, 02, 10, 19, 20, 26, 31, 35, 37, 39, 44, 98, 99</p>

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
	<p>enough for the areas north of Heytesbury farm where the landscape is sensitive and visible. The tree belt shown on the Habitats Plan is not enough and a more robust and continuous woodland buffer is required along the northern edge of the site.</p> <p>References to the need for consideration of drainage issues in areas adjoining Funtley are strongly supported. However, flooding issues need to be dealt with on a catchment-wide basis - this requirement should be linked to the Flood Risk Assessment and wider SuDS Strategy within Policy WEL33.</p> <p>The effective width of the Funtley buffer is uneven and favours some existing residents (south of the recreation ground) over others further east in Funtley where the buffer is only 50 metres.</p> <p>WEL5 is supported as it aligns with policy 5 of the PUSH South Hampshire Strategy.</p>	

## Chapter 4 Urban Design and Character Areas

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
High Level Design Principles	Support for the general design principles and strategic design code. Support for the principle of creating a 21 <sup>st</sup> garden city at Welborne, but the densities are too high to achieve this. The design policies should be simplified and combined into one policy, which should require a promoter lead approach to masterplanning which is not too prescriptive.	01, 02, 20
Comprehensive Masterplan WEL6	The principle of the landowners preparing a comprehensive masterplan is accepted, but the policy should be clear that this is required at the outline stage and not for every subsequent phase.  Concern regarding the level of detail required to be submitted in the comprehensive masterplan by the site promoters and the requirement for a Design Statement to be submitted with each phase of the development.  There is too much repetition between policies WEL4, WEL6 and WEL7 which should be combined and the requirements in WEL6 scaled back to accept that a full detailed masterplan for the whole site is not a reasonable expectation from day one. The masterplan will need to adapt as the development progresses.  Broad support for the commitment to masterplanning which developers will be required to follow.	01, 02, 03, 26
Character Areas	Paragraph 4.10 should have the reference to opportunities to create higher density typologies deleted due to the need to maintain visual and physical separation between Wickham and Welborne.  Concern that the development will not have any character due to the examples of other recent nearby developments.	98, 99
Character Sub-areas		
General Design Principles WEL7	WEL7 should be combined with WEL4 and WEL6.  Agreement with the policy requirement to set out and justify design responses; however the boundaries of the character areas and design aspirations are too prescriptive.  Support for phase of development being accompanied by a design statement – consistent with SHS policy 5.  Broad support for the commitment to the design principles and the requirement for a Strategic Design Code (to be prepared by Fareham Borough Council) which developers will be required to follow and to submit a design statement with each phase.	01, 20, 26

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
Strategic Design Code WEL8	<p>WEL8 is unjustified and should be deleted.</p> <p>The intention to keep the Strategic Design Code under review is welcomed. It is essential that the County Council is consulted on proposals for the design of the development and specifically on the size, configuration and location of the schools.</p> <p>Concerned that a Strategic Design Code could be too prescriptive, impose additional costs and create delay - responsibility for preparing design codes should rest with the promoters of the site.</p> <p>Design guidance should be the responsibility of the landowners and be informed by a detailed understanding of what is viable and what is necessary to meet market demand. A strategic design code prepared by the council will add unnecessary financial burdens and create delays.</p> <p>Design Code will need to ensure that hedgerows and trees are not planted on top of water mains and other utilities.</p> <p>Need to provide adequate car parking provision within the design code to prevent streets from looking untidy and being unsafe for children / people crossing roads.</p> <p>Support for policy WEL8 and a Design Code SPD – provides consistency with SHS policy 5.</p> <p>Support for integration of SuDS and other water features within design code.</p>	01, 02, 10, 16, 20, 24, 32, 99

## Chapter 5 Economy and Self-Containment

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
Self-containment	<p>Support for encouraging self-containment but delivery requires flexibility.</p> <p>Residents had specific concerns about the principle of self-containment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reduced emphasis on self-containment will have impacts which ought to be detailed in the plan.</li> <li>• If the provision of infrastructure is found to be unviable, self-containment will be unachievable.</li> </ul> <p>The plan is internally inconsistent as it aims for self-containment in this section but paragraph 2.4 says that some residents' needs can only be met off-site.</p>	01, 17, 99
The Economy and Employment WEL9	<p>Highways Agency would like to see trip rate associated with levels of employment development.</p> <p>Hampshire County Council, PUSH and members of PUSH commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overall employment allocation is higher than the target for Welborne in the South Hampshire Strategy (SHS) however it is recognised that the timescales are different with the Welborne Plan continuing past 2026 up to 2041. In particular the office allocation is higher than the SHS target of 34,000sqm for Welborne, which in any case is probably too high as it was based on 2010 forecasts which assumed a strong return to growth by now when in reality, continued economic difficulties will mean demand has dropped since then. The plan should promote no more than 34,000sqm of offices, or at least phase any excess beyond 2026 to avoid conflict with the PUSH 'cities first' policy.</li> <li>• Support the approach of locating offices in or adjacent to the district centre. Any office development outside the district centre should be phased in line with the 'centres first' approach.</li> <li>• The following should be taken into account in identifying the level of employment floorspace: accessibility within the M27 corridor; commuting patterns; South Hampshire Spatial Strategy and recent employment forecasts.</li> <li>• The proportions, quality and nature of B1, B2 and B8 floorspace need to differentiate Welborne from other sites in South Hampshire to mitigate competition and the risk of over-supply.</li> <li>• Trigger points should be added to the plan to allow flexibility in the make-up of employment space over the development period.</li> <li>• Design of workspace will need to reflect aspirations to attract knowledge-based business services and their rapidly changing needs. Support for investment in a business incubation centre.</li> </ul>	01, 02, 03, 05, 11, 15, 16, 17, 20, 26, 27, 32, 37, 43, 46, 48, 94, 98, 99

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>The BST group submitted a critique of chapter 5 of the plan which can be summarised as follows:</p> <p><u>Overall approach</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the ‘balanced community’ approach but recognise that there will be flows of commuters to and from Welborne. Seeking to influence self-containment by providing local employment opportunities in a high quality development.</li> <li>• Transport arrangements, including buses, trains and completion of Junction 10 should be crafted in such a way that they are attractive to businesses.</li> <li>• An employment area focussed on the District Centre is supported.</li> <li>• WEL9 is unduly prescriptive and restrictive and lacks flexibility to adapt to change.</li> <li>• The amount of employment shown east of the A32 is too large. Moving some of this use to the west of the A32 would enhance viability and is a better land use than the residential areas shown close to the M27.</li> </ul> <p><u>Quantum of employment floorspace</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The concept masterplan underprovides for jobs so more employment floorspace will be needed to maximise self-containment.</li> <li>• The policy should not place a cap on employment floorspace and it should not necessarily be linked to the number of houses because different types of employment floorspace have different employment densities.</li> <li>• The policy should be less prescriptive about the level of offices and more responsive to the market.</li> </ul> <p><u>Location of employment floorspace</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be focused to the west of the A32 where there is better vehicular access, buildings can reduce the impact of motorway noise, employees will generate footfall in the district centre and parks, and the closer co-location of homes and jobs could achieve more effective self-containment.</li> <li>• B use class premises need to be included in the district and local centres.</li> <li>• Agree that Dean Farm will provide initial phase of employment and could be expanded in the long term.</li> </ul> <p><u>Mix of employment uses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy should allow more flexibility between employment generating uses so that the employment numbers can be achieved in response to market demand.</li> <li>• The most recent employment densities research (Deloitte/OffPAT/HCA, 2010) has not been used and this would show a trend towards less office space per worker and more industrial and warehousing per worker,</li> </ul>	



# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>thus indicating that Welborne will require a lower proportion of office floorspace and more general industry, R&amp;D, warehousing and non B class employment space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The mix between B1 and B2/B8 should be broadly in balance but with a higher proportion of B1c light industry and a smaller quantum of B1a offices because demand is weak and it could compete with offices located in the cities.</li> <li>• Other employment generating uses such as hotels should be permitted.</li> </ul> <p><u>Sectors/Specialisms</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focus on specific economic sectors should remain flexible in the plan to accommodate market changes.</li> <li>• Although it is logical for Welborne to aim to achieve a differentiated offer to elsewhere in the sub-region to avoid direct competition, it is difficult to separate individual sites.</li> <li>• Intention to focus on STEM skills subject to market demand.</li> <li>• Agree that entrepreneurship and small businesses will be important and support the provision of flexible accommodation, incubation space, and the opportunity to develop a relative specialism in construction skills, research and development.</li> </ul> <p>Policy needs to make it clear that employment floorspace is to encourage self-containment and not to challenge more established employment destinations.</p> <p>There should be flexibility for a wider range of commercial uses.</p> <p>The landowners of land between Pook Lane and A32 think it should be identified as employment land rather than open space because it is not constrained by noise, air quality, the gas pipeline or the groundwater source protection zone. It has existing access off Pook Lane and is well located to the proposed employment east of the A32.</p> <p>English Heritage agree that redevelopment of Dean Farm and Crockerhill need to be sensitive to the listed buildings Dean Farmhouse and Mill House. Policy should require Dean Farmhouse to be set within green infrastructure to limit harm to its setting.</p> <p>People who move to Welborne will already have jobs elsewhere and companies moving into Welborne will already have staff living elsewhere, so the idea of self-containment is flawed. Unless commuting can be prevented by some mechanism, the employment development will increase traffic and carbon emissions as shown in the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The number of residents assumed to work on-site or at home is unrealistically high. There will be more commuters</p>	

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>than the plan assumes including those commuting in and out, and this will lead to traffic congestion.</p> <p>Questions over whether it is possible to provide the level of jobs identified and therefore self-containment may not be achievable.</p> <p>If self-containment is successful, a parking strategy for employment will not be needed.</p> <p>Business units are likely to be vacant. There is already long term vacant and under-used employment floorspace in the immediate vicinity of the site (North Hill and Knowle) and in Fareham (Segensworth and Broadcut). Few sectors are increasing in terms of premises or headcount at the moment so evidence is needed to justify that employment space has a reasonable prospect of being taken up.</p> <p>It is likely that industrial and warehouse development in the western employment area will result in HGV movements in residential areas, contributing to a negative effect on quality of life.</p> <p>The Fareham Society are concerned that the area to the east of the A32 is not suitable for employment, especially large B2 or B8 which will be visually prominent and impact on the landscape and historic environment (Roche Court and North Fareham Farm). The location is separated from the main residential part of the new community will not be integrated with or achieve a high level of self-containment, and this will result in traffic congestion. The scale of the changes to the Pook Lane/A32 junction to accommodate freight movements will have a significant harmful impact on Roche Court, its Gate Lodge and historic parkland. No account has been taken of the high pressure gas pipeline and the groundwater source protection zone which constrain the site east of the A32. All employment should be located to the west of the A32 making use of the parts of the site most affected by noise which are not suitable for the housing which is currently proposed.</p> <p>There are insufficient jobs for the current population. There is no business hub planned to create sufficient new employment. A large scale office development similar to 1000 Lakeside is needed to create work. Small scale employment development will not meet demand from occupiers.</p> <p>Fareham Labour Party believe Welborne should provide a number of anchor employers and jobs that cover a range of skills in order to maximise self-containment.</p> <p>The employment amounts seem to be highly over specified.</p> <p>Support for the exploration of business linking with education.</p> <p>CPRE believe the location of the employment areas on the strategic and local road network will lead to traffic heading north up the A32 through a number of historic Meon Valley villages within the South Downs National Park. To encourage an outcome that would lead to an adverse impact upon the Park would be contrary to National Park</p>	

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>statutory purposes as laid out in the Environment Act.</p> <p>Need to encourage more open access methods of providing connectivity and provide broadband speeds of 1000Mb/s. Local companies could be better placed to provide this service than BT. Fareham has exceptionally good connectivity to the UK national fibre network so now it must take advantage of its unique position.</p> <p>The Chamber of Commerce and other local businesses suggest the policy should ensure that the employment area is visible from the motorway and that the road access is obvious immediate and direct in order to attract businesses.</p>	
Social and Community Facilities	<p>BST supports the provision of a range of facilities, social, sport, retail and leisure to support businesses that locate in the New Community.</p> <p>Space is needed for several churches that local faith groups/churches can 'bid' for so that they can have ownership of their facilities which will enable them to grow and evolve and provide the social 'glue' for the new community. There should be some developer contribution for these new churches. Such churches are likely to take the form of multi-purpose buildings that would themselves provide space for a wide range of faith and non-faith community uses.</p> <p>The plan needs to recognise that building a community is about more than 'bricks and mortar'. There must be initiatives during the construction to bring new residents together. It is essential also that the community facilities are delivered very early, even if there are few 'customers'. This is to ensure that self-containment and community cohesion can be supported from the earliest phases.</p> <p>Existing swimming facilities in Fareham are overcrowded. This needs addressing at Welborne.</p>	01, 33, 42, 98, 99
The District Centre WEL10	<p>District centre located close to Portsmouth Water's 900mm main and the diversion route is not clear.</p> <p>BST Group support the location of the district centre and early phasing. A bespoke retail assessment prepared by Deloitte identifies errors in the Council's GVA study and concludes that a greater amount of retail could be accommodated in Welborne's district centre to support self-containment and without a material impact on Fareham and Wickham centres. This would be more sustainable than existing patterns of retail trading. Policy WEL10 is overly prescriptive and should be more flexible to enable the landowner to consider a range of retail formats. Flexibility could be delivered by removing maximum floorspace thresholds but maintaining the requirement to undertake an impact assessment. Figure 5.1 is detailed so references to it should state that it is indicative only, or it should be removed from the plan. Landowners support the provision of a wide range of uses and in addition the policy should encourage leisure, hotel and conference facilities. The location of the business incubation centre</p>	01, 02, 03, 09, 16, 20, 24, 26, 31, 32, 33, 37, 49, 98, 99

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>should not be prescribed as alternative locations such as Dean Farm may be more suitable.</p> <p>PUSH support for the provision of a district centre.</p> <p>Bovis believe the requirement for a retail impact assessment should be deleted because it puts another burden on the developer and the GVA study defines the size of store that is acceptable. It may not be appropriate to deliver the food store early before there is a critical mass of new residents to support it just so that it can contribute to site wide infrastructure. Phasing should be led by viability so the policy should be amended to reflect that the district centre may be phased over a longer period.</p> <p>The Co-op supports the principle for the creation of a new District Centre to serve the new community but emphasise that development here must be consistent so as to maintain the hierarchy of retail centres as defined in the adopted Core Strategy. They object to the use of the GVA Retail Study Update (Oct 2012) and NCFN Supplementary Paper (Dec 2012) as evidence because they use flawed market share assumptions and are not internally consistent. The evidence identifies a convenience goods floorspace capacity of up to 1286sqm net up to 2027 which is below the 1900sqm allocated in WEL10. A coherent Borough-wide approach to capacity should be taken.</p> <p>The Standing Conference, the Fareham Society, Moyse (minority landowner) and local residents agreed that the district centre ought to be more central in the community to fulfil its role of serving the new residents. This would also enable it to better serve Knowle. It was stated that the policy should give significantly more weight to the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal which shows that the district centre should be located in a more central location.</p> <p>The Fareham Society is concerned that the phasing of the district centre will result in an out of town shopping 'destination' not a true district centre.</p> <p>The Standing Conference, CPRE Hampshire and local residents raised concerns that there level of retail provision may be inadequate to support self-containment. Stronger retail provision was called for, particularly the main food store, to enable it to be the first choice for residents' day to day needs. It should attract footfall to support the smaller local shops in Welborne.</p> <p>Community Action Fareham supports the principle of co-locating retail, community and health facilities in a central position on the site.</p> <p>Regarding the retail impact assessment the Fareham Society and a local resident believe a full retail impact assessment is required before the pre-submission plan is prepared and it cannot be left until the planning application. Wickham Parish Council supports measures to ensure the new district centre does not compete with</p>	

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>Wickham. Wickham must be included in the retail impact assessment.</p> <p>Local residents raised questions over whether businesses such as post offices, banks, village shops and pubs will be viable at Welborne as there is a national trend of them closing down. A resident said the Supplementary Retail Paper is not fit for purpose because it relies on the drive time data which bears no relationship to reality.</p> <p>WEL10 should include a reference to the need for the District Centre to maintain the viability and vitality of the Village and Local Centres and not preclude provision of other commercial or leisure uses within or adjacent to the local and village centres. The location of the District Centre must support its role as central hub for the new community, well connected with green routes. Whilst it is accepted that it needs to be near the A32 this should not be at the expense of its community role. The size of the District centre is insufficient to ensure that it will succeed in meeting the day-to-day needs of the Welborne residents. It should be larger with more retail space being encouraged, along the lines of Petersfield's offer. Provision is needed for access at Welborne to FBC's services such as housing and council tax to avoid people having to drive into Fareham for these.</p> <p>The intention to bring the District Centre forward in an early phase is supported and the opportunity exists to build the first primary school adjacent to this centre.</p>	
<p>District Centre Community Building WEL11</p>	<p>The provision of the main community building at the District Centre is supported although WEL11 is unduly prescriptive in the inclusion of floorspace areas. This is restrictive and lacks flexibility to adapt to change.</p> <p>WEL11 is supported as it is in line with policy 3 for the PUSH South Hampshire Strategy.</p> <p>The inclusion within the main community building of library provision by 2028 is supported and this should not be delivered as a separate building as the model of library service applied at Welborne will be self-service and operation without full-time staff. The space required would be less than the started 490 sq. m as the need for staff facilities, entrance area and public access IT area can be shared with other uses in the community building.</p> <p>The new community building must be built as soon as possible and provide enough storage space for the different groups that will use it. This should be delivered in a way that maximises flexibility of use and potential revenues for the management and minimises running costs. The provision for a policing hub and other community services at the District Centre is supported, particularly the emphasis on shared facilities. The policy should go further to give active support to existing voluntary and '3<sup>rd</sup> Sector' groups.</p> <p>The use of the shared-use community building for faith groups is supported, but will be acceptable only initially and will not be adequate for the long term as it would limit their activities. Equally, prior to the completion of the new community building a temporary community building needs to be considered to allow groups to become established.</p>	<p>01, 02, 16, 20, 26, 31, 33, 41, 42, 98, 99</p>

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>For the early stages of the development, there is sufficient capacity at Knowle Village Community Hall and Wickham Community Centre to meet the needs of the initial residents until the community building is complete.</p> <p>The new community building should allow for performance facilities to enable community theatre groups to become established and perform there. This has a valuable role to play in community cohesion and identity.</p>	
District Centre Healthcare Services WEL12	<p>WEL12 is unduly prescriptive and restrictive and lacks flexibility to adapt to change. WEL12 should also reflect that health services are also appropriately located in the local or village centres.</p> <p>WEL12 is supported as it is in line with policy 3 for the PUSH South Hampshire Strategy.</p> <p>Queen Alexandra Hospital is running at capacity and will not cope with another 13,000 people. Further hospital provision is needed and the new 'cottage hospital' at Sarisbury Green is not enough. Concern over ambulance service provision.</p>	01, 02, 20, 98, 99
The Village and Local Centres WEL13	<p>WEL13 is too prescriptive on the quantum of the community building or indeed the need for such a facility. The reference to "small scale" services should be deleted. The reference to the "Welborne Design SPD" is not necessary.</p>	01, 02
Education	<p>The principle of an educational campus to the east of the A32 is supported as a flexible site for the schools, ensuring there is sufficient land west of the A32 to deliver housing. However, safe pedestrian crossing for the A32 will be required. If it is intended to move the educational campus to the west of the A32, the area around Charity Farm is the best location as it would be close to public transport and the District Centre and would avoid drawing traffic through the community which would be the case if the campus was located near Funtley.</p> <p>The siting of the main school area east of the A32 is inappropriate, dangerous and contrary to the principles of self-containment and to the Council's own Sustainability Appraisal which said a more central location would be more sustainable, especially near Funtley or nearer to Knowle. No provision is made for parents who will deliver their offspring by car and children will not use the bridge. Older children may think it fun to run across the road - accidents will happen.</p> <p>The school complex should be within the main Welborne area, at the heart of the community, adjacent to the District or a local centre and with good accessibility by foot/cycle and potential for joint use of drop-off and car parking. Schools should have visibility and civic presence and be situated alongside other public buildings. Safe routes to the primary schools will be essential. It is premature to consider the potential for an 'all through' school until the issue of locating the schools has been resolved.</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given to the noise impacts of the new schools on existing residential areas in Funtley.</p>	01, 09, 16, 26, 32, 33, 43, 44, 98, 99

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
	<p>The schools should be delivered as early as possible to embed self-containment and limit unsustainable travel patterns. An all-through school is supported as a means to bring forward the timing of the secondary school. There is concern that schools will not be delivered until much later (like at Whiteley) and that existing schools will be affected by being at breaking-point with additional pupils from Welborne.</p> <p>The principle of shared-use facilities at the schools is supported, but there should not be an over-reliance on these facilities as the track record of management of these facilities by schools in Hampshire is not always good with higher costs to community groups and limited involvement of local people.</p>	
<p>Primary and Pre-School Provision WEL14</p>	<p>The concept of an all-through school is supported. However, it would be better to locate the first primary school west of the A32 near to the District Centre to ensure it is at the heart of Welborne and to avoid it being distant from the early phases of residential development and avoid the additional expense of a footbridge. The concept of shared facilities at the primary schools is supported as these should be made available to community groups outside of school hours.</p> <p>Safety concerns from location of school east of A32.</p> <p>The minimum land requirement in WEL14 is too prescriptive as is the trigger for a temporary primary school facility, which does not take into account the type of homes to be delivered. Further discussion on the timing of primary places is required and any trigger points should relate to child yield only.</p> <p>The intention to deliver pre-schools as part of the primary schools is supported. If the intention to deliver pre-school facilities as part of the primary schools is maintained, additional space will be required beyond that indicated in paragraph 5.61 and WEL14. This will need to allow for outdoor free-flow play areas. The assumption on the number of pre-school places required (stated in paragraph 5.58) is incorrect. Further work is needed on the precise number of places, but will be in the region of 354 sessional places and 348 additional full-time day-care places.</p> <p>There is a need for continuing dialogue about the number of primary school places required. The figure of 1,500 places in the draft plan is too low and should be in the order of 1,950, based on pupil yields of 0.3 primary age children per dwelling as set out in the HCC Developer Contributions Policy. This would result in the requirement for 3 x 3FE schools.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.61 requiring larger sites to allow for flexibility in the size of the schools is supported. The site required for the primary schools should be between 2.8 and 3.0 ha each, with the upper end of the range being recommended until specific sites have been identified and agreed with the County Council. There are many site-specific factors that need to be taken into account and the proposals can be tested and progressively refined in dialogue with the County Council.</p>	<p>01, 02, 03, 16, 20, 42, 43, 98, 99</p>

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>The requirement for a temporary primary school provision will have funding implications of up to £2M in addition to the cost of the three identified permanent schools. The first permanent school will be needed in 2019 when there will be 1 x FE. The costs of any temporary provision could be reduced by locating the temporary provision at the future permanent school.</p> <p>The requirement for temporary provision is not an effective use of s106 monies. This should be deleted the focus should be on the permanent provision. Spaces in existing schools should be fully explored even if this requires greater travel distances.</p> <p>WEL14 is supported as it is in line with policy 3 for the PUSH South Hampshire Strategy.</p> <p>The primary school located near to Funtley should be moved nearer to the heart of the development as it is likely to impact Funtley with additional noise and with people accessing the school by through Funtley.</p>	
<p>Secondary School Provision WEL15</p>	<p>The location of the secondary school east of the A32 is not appropriate or justified as this land should be seen as a long-term/reserve site for some 700 homes and would give rise to safety concerns for students having to cross the A32. The secondary school should be located in the west of the site adjacent to the Knowle Triangle so that area could provide a role as school playing fields, which would be more consistent with the Sustainability Appraisal. Alternatively it should be part of the same 'campus' with the District centre and the community building.</p> <p>It will not be certain until approximately 2025/27 how large the secondary school will need to be and further work with HCC is required.</p> <p>The appropriate size of the secondary school is considered to be 9 FE (1,350 places) and this will be required earlier (by 2025 at the latest) to prevent overcrowding at existing schools. A site area of 9.2-10.5 ha will be required. There are many site-specific factors that need to be taken into account and the proposals can be tested and progressively refined in dialogue with the County Council.</p> <p>WEL15 is supported as it is in line with policy 3 for the PUSH South Hampshire Strategy.</p>	<p>01, 02, 16, 19, 20, 33, 09, 99</p>



Chapter 6  
Transport, Access and Movement

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
Approach to transport	<p>The Highways Agency considered that additional work was required on the transport modelling and impacts upon the strategic road network before they could support the Welborne Plan. In particular, they identified a need for greater information on assumptions in the draft SRTM model, including estimates of affordable housing. Also, infrastructure phasing should cover when strategic highways improvements are required, from J9 to J11. This should be established by further testing of when traffic impacts create material impacts in terms in queues and delays. A series of phased transport interventions should be forthcoming from this assessment.</p> <p>BST Group suggested that whilst much work has been done on the transport strategy there has only been limited exchange of information, some of which has been confirmed as incomplete at the time of AAP issue, between FBC and the landowners. The landowners suggest fully cooperative joint working on access is essential to secure a viable masterplan and design layout. Moreover the draft Plan must be supported by an evidence base which informs the SA/SEA process. Finally, the BST Group support the use of the TfSH model to assess the main impacts of the development and establish reference traffic flows for use in assessments for planning.</p> <p>Fareham Society, CPRE, Funtley residents society and others local residents object to lack of certainty over transport impacts at this stage and the desire to have additional information, including full traffic modelling results.</p>	1, 15, 32, 35, 37, 44, 98, 99
Transport Principles for Welborne WEL16	<p>The Highways Agency support self-containment principle, but state it needs to be supported by evidence of proven methods to achieve. They also confirm the reference to <i>minimise</i> needs to be replaced with <i>mitigate</i>.</p> <p>BST supports the transport principles identified in Policy WEL16, but notes point vi implies there will be no residual effects when there are currently significant noise, pollution and other environmental impacts in the base network. They therefore recommend that “<i>resulting directly from the development</i>” be added after “<i>mitigate any environmental impacts</i>”</p> <p>Winchester City Council suggest it is important to encourage movement from the site to the south and on to the M27, whilst CPRE suggests the generation of additional road traffic associated with development under the AAP may result in significant effects on the ecological integrity of European designated sites and are concerned as to the potential damage to the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The Standing Conference, CPRE and local residents do not consider sufficient detail about how traffic will be</p>	1, 15, 18, 19, 20, 37 39, 44, 98, 99.

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>handled along the A32, both northwards towards Wickham and southwards has been given.</p> <p>The major landowners and Gosport and Winchester Councils all support the decision for Junction 10 of the M27 to provide the main access to the site. One local resident objected to this choice.</p> <p>PUSH expressed support for this policy (and the others in this chapter) as they were consistent with the aims of the South Hampshire Strategy.</p> <p>Concern over the increased noise and air pollution resulting from the increase in traffic.</p>	
Transport & Land Use Integration	<p>Paragraph 6.11: The major landowners fully support this statement yet believe the current proposed masterplanning has not fully optimised the optimal solution for the site, nor correctly assessed the implications in terms of transport or environment of the current indicative layouts proposed.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.14: The major landowners believe there is a better approach to the parking and smarter choices work cited. This needs to include the consideration of all modes and developments such as complete mobility package options across the site and pay due regard to the viability of employment uses proposed within the development. Greater need is required to encourage internalisation It is suggested that this will need to form a combination of practical, Intelligent Transport System and social measures. This will need a different approach to the defined monitoring regimes in the 'Smarter Choices' document previously submitted. One resident suggested minimum spaces to limit the number of parked cars on the road.</p>	1, 2, 99
Access to the Strategic Highway Network	<p>Paragraph 6.16: The major landowners note the improvements to J11 but consider these minor improvements. There are considerable existing structural problems with J11 that reflect the current and future existing network problems. The landowners believe the proposed J10 works mitigates many of these as such J11 should not be a focus on the development to solve rather form part of a detailed assessment of the existing issues and the potential solutions based on current committed development. The effects of the development could then be added as a cumulative impact and any marginal costs of additional mitigation established.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.18: The major landowners fully support a properly designed and considered all moves Junction 10 and see this as the only credible primary access solution for the Welborne development. The AAP proposed all movements junction 10 designs are questionable as to the extent that it can be achieved within the defined site constraints and from the assessment work we have undertaken it, will be of a considerable size with complex multi lane arrangements that will be hard to make work effectively. This will require considerable care with the defined lane allocation to ensure the theoretical capacity can be practically achieved.</p>	1, 2, 99

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>BDL welcomes the recognition in paragraph 6.18 that consideration is being given to an alternative option. It should recognise that there is potentially more than one other viable option. Work undertaken on behalf of BDL and BST Group, by Halcrow and WSP, has identified an alternative option for creating an all moves Junction 10 which is deliverable and its construction would not require the use of land not controlled by BDL and the BST Group. It has transport benefits over the option identified in Figure 6.1 and they consider it increases the commercial attractiveness of the planned employment area and District Centre, increasing significantly the marketability of the site.</p> <p>Figure 6.1: The Highway Authority considered the plan should be expanded to show all accesses onto the A32, including those further north. Additionally, the Highway Authority queried the proposed status of the existing Dean Farm Access shown on the plan. Both major landowners considered the option outlined in Figure 6.1 fails the NPPF tests of being both 'justified' and 'effective'. They point out that this option may not be deliverable or may require compulsory purchase, a potential source of delay when there are alternatives. They consider the option has not been shown to be the most appropriate strategy by reference to the evidence base or SEA/SA process. The landowners consider an open comparative assessment of options for Junction 10 should be undertaken.</p> <p>Local residents and one local business expressed a number of concerns about the possible access to the Strategic Highway Network. They are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over clarity of possible access design;</li> <li>• Concern over tail backs on to M27 and queues on A32;</li> <li>• Suggestion for alternative J10, with works to the north west of existing junction.</li> <li>• Concern about numbers of traffic lights on A32;</li> <li>• Concern proposal is convoluted.</li> <li>• Concern J10 was not meant to be all moves – new slips will result in negative impact for Fareham town Centre.</li> <li>• Additional traffic attracted by western slips makes the link from Welborne to the town centre significantly less attractive.</li> <li>• Concern the gyratory will require a large area of land and will reduce attractiveness of GI and increase severance, especially if development takes place east of A32.</li> <li>• Visual, noise and pollution impact of new westbound on slip.</li> </ul> <p>Doubts over capacity of proposed design.</p>	
Main Vehicle Routes	Paragraph 6.22: The major landowners agree that an alternative solution with the westbound slip located to the west is much more desirable and believe this is essential to the scheme's effectiveness and viability. We would	1, 2, 99

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	also welcome the opportunity to further discuss the detail of both options.	
Managing Wider Impacts	<p>Paragraph 6.24: The major landowners have concerns over the prescriptive nature of the description as it could limit the development viability and is aligned to the Council's preferred Junction 10 design which we believe can be proven not to be the best solution for accessing the site.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.25: BST Group suggests the following text is appended to the paragraph - "<i>The effectiveness, deliverability and viability (affordability) of a range of measures will be assessed in detail as the planning process moves forward.</i>"</p> <p>BST Group agrees the listed junctions need to be considered but in terms of the direct consequence of the development impact taking into account the current prospective impacts from existing proposed development and background traffic. We believe that an appropriate methodology would be to assess the cumulative traffic impacts of the development using the SRTM, outputs and appropriate mitigation design. This would need to take into account that there are current congestion issues on parts of the network.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.28: BST Group state there are considerable current issues with the motorway that are caused by general growth and other consented developments. These should be considered and mitigated and then the development traffic should be added in along with the proposed junction improvements and a full impact of the differences assessed.</p>	1, 2, 99
Road Transport and Access WEL17	<p>The Highways Agency consider there is insufficient evidence at present to assess the impact upon the strategic network. Regarding the proposed design for Junction 10, they require further detailed designs and merges with J9 and J11. In addition, they suggest an additional point:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>vi Mitigation measures on residential roads within Fareham town centre, Wickham and Funtley if required to mitigate the impacts of the development.</i></p> <p>The Agency also states that reference should be made to an s278 agreement for works to strategic network, and that reference should be made in the policy to impacts of the proposal along the main M27 carriageway and Junction 9.</p> <p>The Highway Authority noted that the "<i>spine network of routes</i>" mentioned is not shown on Concept Masterplan D2. The Authority thought this section should refer to the potential need for safeguarding of any third party land needed to deliver mitigation measures.</p>	1, 2, 3, 15, 16, 19, 26, 31, 32, 35, 39, 43, 44, 98, 99

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>The major landowners endorse the proposed main north-south route through the development. However, they consider that Policy WEL17 is too prescriptive taking account of the level of transport modelling and assessment work carried out to date and that much is stated as currently incomplete. The list of off-site improvements is too specific and should be left for determination in Transport Assessments accompanying planning applications. The key issue that needs to be resolved is the preferred design for the all moves Junction 10; the option presented has been insufficiently modelled through the SRTM to ensure it is deliverable, whilst Figure 6.1 is not tested and should be deleted. The list of off-site improvements in WEL17 is not justified and analysis has not been completed or approved. However, BDL supports the potential closure of Pook Lane.</p> <p>Bovis homes asked that consideration be given to a review of the eastbound slip lane (north of the M27) and that the alternate alignment set out in Parson Brinkerhoff's report as defined on Option B be assessed, realigning the eastbound off slip. They also made proposals for the phasing of interventions. Bovis homes has expressed concern regarding alternative slips to the west, which could lead to a worse design, increasing severance.</p> <p>The Fareham Society, CPRE and others expressed concern there was insufficient evidence to support the plan at present, that transport modelling evidence and a full Transport Assessment is required at this stage</p> <p>Local residents expressed concern on how the road traffic generated by the development and an all-moves J10 will add to existing problems on neighbouring roads leading to increased traffic congestion, longer journey times, noise and air pollution. Additional specific points made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over uncertainty of role of HA and HCC;</li> <li>• The capacity of the M27, A32 and local road network to accommodate additional traffic and potential for negative impacts on safety, congestion and journey times;</li> <li>• Feasibility of making J10 all moves, due to proximity of J10.</li> <li>• The capacity of the proposed gyratory;</li> <li>• The possibility of implementing sound insulation measures on the new J10 slips;</li> <li>• The need for new road infrastructure to be in place before development commences – doubt that it will be implemented;</li> <li>• Concern over lack of clarity and certainty for J10 improvements and other local road improvements identified;</li> <li>• The role of the A32 will change – it is a fast road and will need to be slowed, and in addition pedestrian improvements will be required on both sides;</li> <li>• Concern local road improvements identified will not go far enough to mitigate impacts – Kiln Road, North Hill and Park Lane mentioned several times. Concern emphasis will be on BRT prioritisation, to the detriment of other considerations;</li> </ul>	

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern there should be no direct route from the development through to Funtley.</li> <li>• Concern measures to prioritise BRT route through north Fareham to the new community could be difficult to implement, leading to further congestion for other road users and for limited impact on modal split. Wickham Road and North Hill mentioned in particular</li> <li>• Particular concerns about the impacts of the proposed BRT route on north Fareham;</li> <li>• Requests for further details on road layouts, possible mitigation measures;</li> <li>• Disturbance during construction / phasing of works,</li> <li>• Additional measures will be required at locations in addition to those identified;</li> <li>• Doubts over predicted traffic patterns in the summary modelling statement;</li> <li>• Concern over rate running in Mayles Lane and other locations.</li> <li>• Concern traffic impacts will affect wider area than envisaged, such as Colden Common.</li> <li>• Development of Welborne is contrary to principle of reducing the need to travel.</li> <li>• Concern road improvements may require third party land.</li> <li>• Concern that funding for J10 improvements will come from public finances.</li> <li>• Concern assumptions made on home working and destination of traffic are incorrect;</li> <li>• Concern heavy goods vehicle traffic will increase on local roads, adding to noise and air pollution and vibration impact on local homes</li> <li>• The impact of construction traffic; for will and construction materials will add to congestion</li> </ul> <p>Local residents, Funtley Residents Association, Wickham Parish Council and others highlighted existing traffic concerns through north Fareham, Funtley and Wickham. The following specific examples were highlighted –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Market Quay - Sometimes the congestion from this roundabout goes right back to the slip roads on the M27;</li> <li>• Delme roundabout – there are delays getting out onto the roundabout – implementing traffic signals may improve matters;</li> <li>• Kiln Road North Hill are very bust at rush hours, and drivers increasingly use Funtley via River Lane as a rat run;</li> <li>• Existing problems in Wickham make it unsuitable for additional traffic – mitigation proposals at the junction with the A334 would mean the loss of important verge;</li> <li>• Station roundabout – Bus Priority measures have led to additional congestion.</li> </ul> <p>Local opinion was split on the option to upgrade Junction 10. Some supported this, others thought Junction 11 would have been better, with some suggesting alternative motorway junction arrangements.</p>	

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>Winchester CC, Wickham Parish Council and local residents called for measures to encourage Welborne traffic to travel south from the site, reducing the impact on Wickham and other locations to the north. Concern was expressed that improvements may be needed north of the A32/B2177 junction, Wickham village centre, etc. and the policy should provide for this.</p>	
<p>Public Transport WEL18</p>	<p>The Highway Authority considered that the opportunity has been missed in the masterplan to provide a dedicated BRT bus/cycle route through the site to further encourage increased patronage and help promote sustainable transport as a key feature of the development.</p> <p>Gosport BC would be interested to know how traffic management measures linked to the TAP and to enable BRT priority are evolving.</p> <p>BST objected to unconditional financial commitment as defined in the Public Transport Plan - instead this should be considered part of the operational and viability agreements. BST Group requested the full operational and viability assessment work that underlies the proposed route of BRT to Fareham. This includes the measures required and how they will be achieved to ensure the BRT route down the A32 offers an advantage over use of the private car. BST Group also considered limiting the number of stops to three in the draft Plan would result in some long journeys to this mode. They consider five may be a better number as the needs of all the community must be met.</p> <p>BDL supported the aspiration to provide high quality public transport, including BRT which should serve Welborne as a whole.</p> <p>Bovis considered that BRT proposals should recognise the possibility that over time alternative schemes may be considered which could be less financially demanding, and therefore suitable claw back provisions are needed.</p> <p>Network Rail assumes that the short term decision to develop strong links to Fareham Station via the BRT and bus network enhancements is the most value for money option and represents the strongest business case at this time. They confirmed that any future investigation to a potential halt/station on the Fareham to Eastleigh line would require discussions with South West Trains, business case development and detailed timetable work.</p> <p>Regarding a rail halt, the major landowners agreed it needs to be considered and proven to be operationally and economically viable. Bovis Homes considered it is not feasible, and should be removed.</p> <p>Gosport BC and local residents sought greater clarity on the proposed BRT route through north Fareham to Welborne.</p>	<p>1, 3, 14, 16, 18, 26, 31, 32, 35, 39, 44, 98, 99</p>

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>The Standing Conference also raised concerns over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doubts there sufficient allowance in design to get prioritised/separate bus routes through the new development;</li> <li>• The need for subsidy;</li> <li>• Concern BRT and smarter choices be sufficient to keep traffic impacts on the A32 and surrounding network at an acceptable level;</li> <li>• Concern BRT will be at the expense of other road users in North Fareham.</li> </ul> <p>Local residents expressed support for the provision of a rail halt south of Knowle. Opinions on BRT were split, with some expressing some support / concern it may not be delivered, while others expressed concerns over the impacts BRT operation and priority measures may have on the local area. In addition, the following issues were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uncertainty over whether BRT will serve Knowle, which has poor public transport links;</li> <li>• Concern likely BRT route through Fareham will be subject to delays making it unattractive;</li> <li>• Buses mainly used by children and OAPs.</li> <li>• Concern no date given for extension of BRT to Portsmouth.</li> <li>• Details of any increased services to and from Funtley?</li> <li>• Concern that details and funding for BRT are not yet in place.</li> </ul> <p>Wickham Parish Council requested that Wickham is added as a named village served by additional bus routes. Fareham Society requested more details of the routes to be used south of the M27.</p>	
Encouraging Sustainable Choices WEL19	<p>The Highways Agency supported the principles in the policy but would like to see greater commitment to the promotion and adoption of measures.</p> <p>The Fareham society considered that Travel Plans can only demonstrate how more sustainable travel could be achieved and not ensuring that sustainable travel will be achieved.</p> <p>Some local residents expressed doubts that measures will work and that transport will continue to be dominated by the private car.</p>	15, 32, 98, 99
Cycling and Pedestrian Linkages	The Highways Agency has requested greater commitment to develop pedestrian and cycle routes to access public transport facilities.	15, 16, 31, 32, 40, 50, 99



# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
WEL20	<p>The County Council's countryside service considered there was limited connectivity between the development and with the surrounding countryside and communities. However, the indicative North-South link shown in Figure 6.3 was welcomed as an opportunity to complete the Meon Valley Trail, creating a walking and cycling route that links West Meon, Corhampton, Droxford and Wickham to Knowle, Welborne and Fareham.</p> <p>Another important and desirable walking and cycling route would be to connect the main North-South route with the bridleway to the west of the site (Fareham bridleway 515/83b/82). This would provide access to Titchfield and the minor road connections to the coast.</p> <p>Reference should be made to Countryside Access Plan Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) for Hampshire.</p> <p>Doubts whether older children will use a bridge to cross the A32. Support for improved cycle links to Fareham and Wickham, whilst links to surrounding areas should be improved and extended.</p> <p>In general local residents supported the policy, but in many cases thought it did not go far enough. Comments made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of detailed suggestions for improve cycle linkages; There was a call for a cycle circuit facility in the development;</li> <li>• The need for cycle parking throughout the development;</li> <li>• The need for attractive cycle routes away from the A32;</li> <li>• The need to ensures the A32, as the most direct route, is safe for cyclists;</li> <li>• More links to longer distance cycle routes, to employment centres such as Portsmouth, Hedge End and Portsdown;</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to route under M27 at Hookhouse Coppice and bridge over M27 100m to the east;</li> <li>• The need for a target percentage of journeys starting or finishing in Welborne that should be undertaken by sustainable means;</li> <li>• The masterplan layout should include segregated routes for cycles;</li> <li>• Improve links across the M27 including existing footpaths and bridleways;</li> <li>• The need to improve links through north Fareham south of the M27 to encourage cycling and walking to Fareham town centre and the train station;</li> <li>• More east-west links;</li> <li>• Segregated routes;</li> </ul>	

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
	<p>Crossing the A32 was identified as a problem for cyclists and pedestrians. One resident thought an underpass would be a better solution than a bridge.</p> <p>A few local residents supported the closure of Pook Lane for through vehicular traffic, highlighting its use for horse riders and cyclists.</p> <p>There was a request for a rerouting of an existing footpath running through the garden of a residential property in Funtley, which will see its use increase.</p> <p>Wickham Parish Council requests that measures are taken to complete the Meon Valley Trail link through the Welborne site</p>	
Detailed points suggested by Highways Authority	<p>The Highway Authority suggested the following minor changes to the text: Transport for South Hampshire (TfSH) is now known as Transport for South Hampshire and the Isle of Wight (TfSHIOW).</p> <p>The Highways agency wanted the document to refer to the Highway Authorities – not just Highway Authority.</p>	16

Chapter 7  
Homes

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
Market Housing Mix and Flexibility WEL21	<p>The development-wide broad mix is acceptable and the full mix of dwellings will be needed from the outset. However, specifying unit mix and design standards is too prescriptive. The approach in the draft plan may become out-dated and restrict market demand. WEL21 should reflect the approach in WEL22, with requirements at each phase to be based on evidence of the need/market demand at the time of planning applications.</p> <p>References to self-build homes are supported. WEL21 should ensure that the inclusion of development parcels for self-build is determined by market demand and should not be imported on landowners.</p> <p>WEL21 is supported as it is in line with policy 12 for the PUSH South Hampshire Strategy.</p>	01, 02, 20, 44, 99
Affordable Housing WEL22	<p>The commitment to deliver a significant element of affordable housing at Welborne is supported, as is WEL22 which is in line with policy 12 for the PUSH South Hampshire Strategy. The policy provides flexibility in terms of the type of units to be delivered and takes account of viability. The reference to 'pepper potting' of affordable housing is also welcomed. However, the reference to a 'significant' proportion of lifetime homes should be deleted.</p> <p>WEL22 should reflect the definition of affordable homes within the NPPF and set out the requirements for social rented and intermediate homes as well as affordable rent. The recognition that each phase should be viable is supported, but targets for affordable homes that cannot be viably delivered in any phase should not be 'rolled forward' to future phases as this could make those unviable.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.18 concedes that achievable levels of affordable housing are unknown. This uncertainty is unhelpful in terms of setting realistic assumptions about trip-rates for housing of different tenures at Welborne and greater clarity on targets and funding is sought.</p> <p>High proportions of affordable homes in developments depress prices as potential purchasers are not keen on areas with housing association homes. This in turn deters developers from investing in new development in these areas. Questions as to whether the number of affordable homes being planned for is actually required.</p> <p>The plan should be seeking a greater level of affordable housing with high proportions for social rent and shared ownership homes as well as other affordable tenures with long-term security of tenure. The target should seek 50% of homes to be affordable overall.</p> <p>The development must not go ahead if it cannot deliver 30-40% affordable housing. Paragraph 7.17 indicates that delivering affordable housing is based on hope and not fact and certainty. Commitments made elsewhere in the</p>	01, 02, 03, 15, 20, 25, 26, 43, 44, 97, 98, 99

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
	<p>plan for infrastructure provision and energy generation/carbon standards are not compatible with the need to fund at least 30% affordable housing.</p> <p>To make the affordable homes more viable, low impact techniques and co-housing options should be considered which dramatically reduce build costs while promoting high ecological standards and excellent potential for community involvement and cohesion.</p>	
Private Rented Housing WEL23	<p>The need to provide homes for market rent is supported as is WEL23 which is in line with policy 12 for the PUSH South Hampshire Strategy. However, WEL23 should not seek to secure the stated proportion of rental homes within every phase as this may not be appropriate. It should also include the same viability test for the provision of affordable housing as set out in WEL22. The requirement for site promoters to actively seek the commitment of one or more institutional investors is too prescriptive. A wide range of investors may wish to be involved. Overall, there is concern that WEL23 is not evidence based and is therefore unjustified as it is untested.</p> <p>WEL23 is a burden on the scheme and could significantly impact the viability and deliverability of the development. The policy is contrary to the NPPF and should be deleted. The emphasis on market rental homes which will need supporting with welfare top-ups (Housing Benefit) is not welcome as they often have 6-month tenancy renewals with high fees and only benefit landlords and not tenants. The emphasis should be on affordable housing accessible by those on minimum wage.</p>	01, 02, 03, 20, 26, 99
Extra Care Provision WEL24	<p>The encouragement for the provision of specialised housing for older people and the inclusion of extra care accommodation at Welborne is supported, but WEL24 is too prescriptive regarding the number of units and timing of delivery which should reflect market demand. There needs to be clarity over whether extra care units would be classed as 'C3' and if they would count as part of the overall housing target and whether the extra care would be subject to WEL22 affordable housing policy. Work is needed to assess whether this is the right size for Welborne.</p>	01, 16, 99
<b>Housing issues not included within Chapter 7</b>	<p>Due to the proximity of key infrastructure and transport routes, there should be explicit consideration of whether the site could provide for 'Traveller' / transit sites to help meet the requirements of the Travellers Accommodation Assessment for Hampshire (2013).</p> <p>Policies WEL21-24 suffer from a lack of supporting evidence on delivery.</p>	19, 26, 99

## Chapter 8 Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
The Green Infrastructure Strategy	<p>General support for the GI chapter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England is pleased that earlier advice has in general been taken into account in preparing the Welborne Plan.</li> <li>• PUSH support policies WEL 25-29 as they provide more detail on how the potential impacts on the internationally protected sites will be mitigated; and are therefore consistent with the SHS</li> <li>• The county is concerned that the scale and location of the GI is unlikely to achieve stated objective of creating a sense of openness; in particular the central downland park is too narrow to create either a sense of openness or long views.</li> <li>• Concerns are raised regarding the limited connectivity of the development with the surrounding countryside.</li> </ul> <p>It is far from clear as to how the GI strategy has been developed and calculated; and how this relates to the masterplan.</p> <p>The principles from the <i>Making Space for Nature</i> review should be applied to the development including ensuring the GI strategy delivers a robust network of green space through the development and into the surrounding landscape. We welcome the commitment to use good ecological evidence to inform the GI strategy and commitments to protect and enhance habitats and species of conservation importance. Chapter 8 has a focus on the enhancement of terrestrial habitats and corridors. Given that the proposal is set between the Meon and Wallington catchments, a greater emphasis should be placed on improving wetland habitats. Both the River Meon and Wallington are of exceptional high nature conservation value, but could be improved. The plan should make stronger commitment to protect and enhance these important features.</p> <p>GI Strategy should meet the open spaces needs, protect the ecologically sensitive habitats and species and achieve a net gain for biodiversity. Support the aspirations to create a garden city approach. It is however, unclear if this GI Strategy is informed by an ecological appraisal of the site and its surrounding area. The plan needs to clarify if Knowle Triangle, Fareham Common and Dash Wood will be opened up for public access. Dash Wood is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and the plan and Green Infrastructure Strategy does not identify whether this will become public open space for recreation or not. If it is to be opened up to the public then evidence is needed to demonstrate that public access will not result in a detrimental effect on the habitats and species of importance for this SINC. Without such an assessment to understand the existing carrying capacity of the site then the plan fails to take into account the adopted Fareham Core Strategy Policy "CS4 Green Infrastructure,</p>	01, 09, 10, 13, 16, 19, 20, 36, 38, 47, 99.

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>Biodiversity and Geological Conservation. It would also fail to meet the requirements of the Welborne plan policy WEL1. The river Meon should be protected from adverse impacts related to the development and this is currently not covered in the plan. Clarification is needed about what contributions will be made to GI outside of the site, and this should include the Forest of Bere.</p> <p>Support for the Green Infrastructure Strategy seeking to ensure that any potential adverse effects on nationally and internationally protected sites (including those within the New Forest National Park) identified through the SA/HRA work are avoided. Pleased to note that where adequate mitigation or avoidance measures cannot be achieved on site through the provision of Green Infrastructure, a financial contribution will be sought to provide off-site mitigation measures.</p> <p>Landowner of Knowle Triangle, land west of Dash Wood known as 'Hill View' and land adjoining River Meon confirm that their land is available and deliverable.</p> <p>Concern about loss of access to the countryside for residents of North Fareham.</p> <p>Land outside of the site boundary near to Funtley should be allocated as GI as part of a small-scale development scheme. This could contribute to Welborne's accessible off-site GI and provide a resource for Funtley residents.</p> <p>The Welborne GI Strategy should contribute to the Forest of Bere proposals in the PUSH GI Strategy.</p>	
<p>On-site Green Infrastructure WEL25</p>	<p>Support for policy but further clarity is needed on whether space is primarily allocated to recreation or biodiversity. Attractive green routes need to radiate from the district centre.</p> <p>There should be a requirement within this policy to conserve and enhance historic features.</p> <p>Ensure land is set aside for existing natural habitats such as commonly sighted, roe and muntjac deer, squirrels, badgers, foxes, moles, voles, hedgehogs, weasels, nesting sky larks, swifts, swallows, house martins, lapwings, buzzards, sparrow hawks, kestrels, adders, grass snakes and slow worms.</p> <p>Unclear whether the 74ha of on-site GI includes the 22ha at Fareham Common.</p> <p>WEL25 is too prescriptive and is unjustified. The quantum can only be assessed in light of the scale and quality of provision proposed within relevant planning applications.</p> <p>Whilst it may be possible for school playing fields to serve as part of the GI required for community use, this is likely to be available only outside of school hours and in agreement with the schools due to potential child protection issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not clear how the road system will relate to the on-site GI.</li> </ul>	<p>01, 02, 11, 13, 16, 20, 26, 40, 98, 99</p>

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is not proper recognition of the negative impact of the motorway and how this will affect the value of nearby GI.</li> <li>• No statement in the policy which stresses the importance of testing the viability and deliverability of GI on third party land.</li> <li>• There would appear to be a discrepancy between the council's standard for accessible natural green space and the requirement set out in WEL 25</li> <li>• Lack of green space.</li> <li>• Astroturf pitches with floodlighting and changing rooms to accommodate multi-sports provide activity for youths, are low maintenance and can be used all year round.</li> <li>• No plans for a multi-disciplinary cycling facility, which could go a long way in increasing the success of cycling in Welborne.</li> <li>• Why isn't Crockerhill incorporated/ linked into the onsite green infrastructure strategy.</li> <li>• No detail on the need to conserve and enhance historic features on the site as previously indicated in WEL1.</li> <li>• Statement on the green infrastructure strategy being based on the need to conserve and enhance the historic features on the site and adjacent areas (in WEL1) is not reflected in Chapter 8.</li> </ul> <p>Support for WEL25 by PUSH as is consistent with the aims of SHS Policy 14.</p>	
<p>Avoiding and Mitigating the Impact on Internationally Protected Sites and Off-site Green Infrastructure WEL26</p>	<p>Environment Agency, Standing Conference and PUSH broadly support the principle.</p> <p>Current use of Fareham Common, Knowle Triangle and Dash Wood is unclear as the plan suggests they are semi-natural green space but air photos suggest they are intensive arable. Proposals for these sites should include multiple entry points to allow circular routes.</p> <p>Winchester City Council supports the retention of the areas within Winchester District (including Knowle Triangle and Dash Wood/Ravenswood) as semi-natural green space which is consistent with the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1. WCC strongly support the references to appropriate uses and long-term management and funding on these sites but suggests that the policy should be amended to make clear the requirement for development to fund any acquisition and laying out, as well as management and maintenance of these areas in the long term. Suggest a consistent terminology is used as there is reference to 'natural greenspace' and 'semi-natural greenspace.'</p> <p>Landowner for the centre of Fareham Common supportive of identification of their land within the plan.</p> <p>Landowners of Knowle Triangle, Dash Wood and Meon Water Meadows generally support the proposals and are keen to ensure that a comprehensive approach is taken to bringing forward their land as it is necessary to fulfil the principles of the GI strategy and address the recreational impact on European sites. Meon Water Meadows would</p>	<p>01, 02, 04, 08, 09, 10, 13, 19, 20, 26, 32, 34, 37, 38, 39, 99</p>

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>provide better quality alternative greenspace than Knowle Triangle and the area adjacent to Ravenswood House because they would enable public access to the river which could deflect visitors from the coast. It would also link the site to the proposed pedestrian and cycle improvements via the old railway line through to Dash Wood. Knowle Triangle could then partially be used as school playing fields if the school was to be relocated.</p> <p>The policy should only require 92ha of semi-natural greenspace as this is the amount required based on population forecasts and application of the Thames Basin Heaths standards. It should not allocate a total of 99ha made up of Dash Wood, Knowle Triangle and Fareham Common. It is unclear whether the 74ha identified in policy WEL25 is in addition to the 92-100ha in WEL26. If it is in addition, then there would be significant overprovision of semi natural greenspace. There should not be a distinction between on-site GI and adjoining GI as both should equally well serve residents. Wording of the policy should be changed to ‘on-site <u>or</u> off-site measures proposed’ as the landowners believe a solution may be feasible using land within their control. There should be greater flexibility allow an alternative solution to mitigating the impact on European sites to Natural England’s satisfaction.</p> <p>The natural greenspace proposed does not appear to be sufficiently attractive meet the requirements of the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>The GI proposed does not appear to include any areas of sufficient scale and attractiveness, particularly to dog walkers, to reduce coastal visits.</p> <p>There must be a full range of recreation and other open space amenities from the outset, not as a later afterthought.</p> <p>BST believe WEL26 is too prescriptive and is unjustified.</p> <p>RSPB broadly support the approach of providing both on and off site measures to mitigate the impact on the Solent European sites. However they are concerned that 70% provision of SANGS may not be sufficiently precautionary. Policy WEL26 should be amended to acknowledge: 1. the need for further assessment of the identified SANGS to determine their capacity with respect to existing visitor numbers and nature conservation interests, and 2. the likely need for a further financial contribution to be made to the emerging New Forest mitigation strategy, and 3. the need to fully assess the use of the development site and surrounding areas by SPA birds and the requirement to avoid/mitigate any direct or indirect impacts on these birds as a result of the development. The plan should also fully consider the option of the delivery of low to mid levels of residential development (5400-6500) as the HRA identifies this would reduce pressure on the European sites and allow for greater alternative recreation space within the development.</p> <p>The Plan underemphasises the critical importance of the HRA, and it is premature for the plan to say that the “expectation” is that Welborne will avoid or mitigate its potential impacts through the provision of natural green</p>	



# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>space. The green space exists currently and therefore should not be described as additional provision or mitigation as overall there will still be a net loss.</p> <p>Using the Thames Basin Heaths as a comparator to the Welborne proposal misses the point that the land set aside as mitigation in that case (SANGS) was primarily to compensate for predation of birds by domestic cats. This is not the case in Welborne, where the adverse impacts on European sites are air pollution, water, waste, disturbance, loss of habitat, and these cannot be dealt with by provision of green space.</p> <p>The Winchester Local Plan includes land within their district as green space to help prevent coalescence of settlements, so it does not absolve Fareham from providing sufficient green space within their own authority boundaries.</p> <p>New Forest NPA support the policy approach that development proposals must assess the potential impacts on sites of national and international importance and set out the on-site and off-site measures proposed. Welborne may provide significant opportunities for the delivery of some important sub-regional green infrastructure. Welcome the opportunity to work with FBC in developing any off-site measures in order to avoid or mitigate the potential impacts on the New Forest National Park protected sites.</p> <p>There needs to be greater clarity as to how the mitigation land will be used to both enhance their biodiversity value and create access.</p> <p>FBC has not discussed with BDL options for mitigating environmental impacts, or discussed how the costs of mitigation can be kept to a minimum (as required in Para 176 of the NPPF)</p> <p>There is an inadequate justification for the level of mitigation land required, or whether it includes the semi-natural green space on site. The level and type of mitigation required should be identified through the HRA process.</p> <p>There is a requirement in the NPPF that the options for the level of land required for mitigation should keep costs to a minimum. The council has not discussed with the landowners the options for mitigating environmental impact. The policy should not pre-judge the outcome of the HRA work.</p> <p>Question over whether average housing densities are calculated on the basis of the inclusion of off-site GI areas.</p> <p>PUSH support for WEL26 as consistent with aims of SHS Policy 14.</p> <p>Opposition to off-site GI being provided by Winchester CC without that authority benefitting from housing receipts.</p>	
Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity WEL27	<p>Environment Agency, Standing Conference and PUSH support the inclusion of policy.</p> <p>The proposals could have an adverse impact on existing ancient woodland and SINCS.</p>	10, 13, 20, 26, 32, 34, 98, 99

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>The trees that line the access road to Dean Farm and those that surround the estate should be protected from being cut down as they are home to both Greater Woodpeckers and Green Woodpeckers.</p> <p>Policy should make reference to biodiversity design features which should be incorporated into the development such as green roofs and bird and bat nesting/roosting opportunities. Advises one nest/roost box per home. This would go some way to conserving species in Fareham Borough which are already declining in numbers.</p> <p>Concern about loss of countryside habitats and ability to educate children about looking after the countryside.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over the loss of wildlife and whether it can meet guidance from the Hampshire Wildlife Trust.</li> <li>• When considering compensatory land the time/ risks to establish alternative habitat should be taken into account.</li> <li>• Potential to fill the Funtley buffer with a comprehensive range of British native species in order to create a habitat corridor to help balance the watershed area protecting the foundations of adjacent Funtley properties, as well as to break the view.</li> </ul> <p>Insufficient demonstration that the natural fauna, flora and habitat will be conserved and that there will be adequate replacement for any loss</p>	
<p>Green Corridors and Connections WEL28</p>	<p>Clarity needed on what the long distance green routes will be and how they link beyond the site boundary and especially that Mayles Lane will not be used for motorised traffic.</p> <p>Para 8.39 - It appears that only very limited improvements to existing routes are proposed which will in no way compensate existing residents for the loss of the existing access to the countryside which will be lost to development.</p> <p>The access via Pook Lane is totally unacceptable.</p> <p>The green corridors should be planted with native, traditional hedgerows and other 'wild' plantings to increase their usage for wildlife, and support the aim of the development to improve biodiversity in the area. By providing wild foods that can be foraged (blackberries, hazelnuts, wild garlic, elder, etc), the wild plantings could also back up the provision of allotments and community orchards, helping with form a local, sustainable community.</p> <p>Concern that east-west cycle link will lead to an adverse impact on Botley Woods SSSI and the plan does not give assurances that recreational impacts have been considered or any avoidance and mitigation measure have been proposed. The impact should be considered in combination with the impact of the North Whiteley development.</p> <p>Request a cycle link continuing the old rail route from Wickham, to link to the Meon valley from Fareham by bike.</p>	<p>20, 26, 32, 36, 90, 98, 99</p>

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>Request for new cycle routes rather than just upgrades to existing ones. The plan only shows north-south routes and has left out east-west routes.</p> <p>Keen that the footpath that runs directly north from Pook Lane (parallel with, and in between, the Wallington river and the A32) and the bridleway on the south side of the M27 (originating in Broadcut and ending at the motorway bridge) are improved to cater for bikes and horses and linked together as a bridleway. We would also welcome any further opportunities for bridleways in Fareham borough, as there are very few in east Fareham, despite many horse owners in that area.</p> <p>PUSH support for WEL28 as consistent with aims of SHS Policy 14.</p>	
<p>Governance and Maintenance of Green Infrastructure WEL29</p>	<p>The policy should be revised to state 'Proposals to develop all or part of Welborne, whether in full or outline, must be accompanied by a full green infrastructure network and management plan for the site as a whole to be agreed with the Borough Council before any part of the Welborne development commences.'</p> <p>General support for policy.</p> <p>PUSH support for WEL29 as consistent with aims of SHS Policy 14.</p>	<p>20, 26, 32</p>

Chapter 9  
Energy, Water and Waste

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
Energy WEL30	<p>BST believe that WEL30 is too prescriptive in relation to requirement for CHP at the District Centre.</p> <p>Scotia Gas Network state there are no specific capacity issues for gas supply to the site but further work will need to be carried out. Gas pipeline diversions may be required but this will not be known until detailed site layouts are available.</p> <p>Scottish and Southern Energy confirmed all overhead power lines on site can be either diverted or undergrounded but the plan should recognise that the cost must be paid by the development.</p> <p>HCC advocate the requirement for an Energy Strategy to be submitted alongside planning applications. Welcome requirement to meet at least Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 and support the push for higher standards in future development phases stating that an integrated approach to energy attracts higher property values. They support CHP and district energy and are interested in examining the role that can be played by an ESCo or MuSCo.</p> <p>The BST Group think the policy is too prescriptive calling for more flexibility to explore a range of energy options at each phase. Reference to “best practice” regarding public buildings needs to be clarified as this may be unduly restrictive and contrary to NPPF paragraph 96. Buckland Development Ltd state that Code for Sustainable Homes levels should only be sought on energy, water and waste criteria. They support the fabric first approach. The requirement for a proportion of homes to be Passivhaus is too onerous and specific. Both major landowners agree the requirement for a CHP or district heating network is too prescriptive and more flexibility is needed.</p> <p>The Standing Conference, George Hollingbury MP and Winchester City Council are concerned the requirements for energy do not have scope to be reviewed over the development period. The policy should include a trigger to raise standards at appropriate times in the development.</p> <p>PUSH are concerned the policy does not accord with South Hampshire Strategy policy 19 which requires development to meet Code level 4 rising to 6 from 2020 subject to viability and for non-residential development to meet BREEAM ‘excellent’ standard. Welborne should be encouraged to meet the highest standards possible subject to viability and therefore it is suggested that some reference is made to meeting some level/standard for energy.</p> <p>George Hollingbury MP requested greater flexibility in the policy so that technology does not become outdated.</p> <p>Cllr Trott suggested the policy should be stronger to take advantage of the economies of scale when developing</p>	01, 02, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 39, 44, 46, 99

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>this site. All buildings should be built to passivhaus standard.</p> <p>Local residents also raised a number of other points about energy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All homes at Welborne should be required to meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 as this is already a requirement within the rest of the Borough.</li> <li>• Provision of low carbon energy technologies will require significant financial capital which could affect the ability to deliver affordable housing.</li> <li>• CO2 emitted during the production of energy technologies should be offset against the benefits of CO2 savings throughout the lifespan of the technology.</li> <li>• Concern about the possibility of a biomass fuelled energy plant.</li> <li>• Support for Passivhaus which would make the new community a special, sustainable place to live and work. Concern that the requirement may be cut to save on costs.</li> <li>• This project should incorporate the latest low carbon technology; some of it developed by local businesses and the Eco-Island project and be an "Eco village" model for future developments in other parts of Hampshire and the UK.</li> </ul> <p>Current national policy is that smart meters will be installed in all properties by 2020 and is therefore not specific to Welborne.</p>	
<p>Water Efficiency, Supply and Disposal WEL31</p>	<p>Portsmouth Water (PW) can supply the site with a sustainable source of water and this should be the least cost and lowest risk option. Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3/4 can be achieved with conventional potable supply. Portsmouth Water does not support the re-use of water for a number of reasons. They do not consider that it is necessary because further abstraction within current licenses will be possible without environmental damage. It may not be cost effective and can have higher carbon and energy costs. Rainwater harvesting is not resilient to climate change. Grey-water and black-water recycling require dual supply systems which risk cross contamination with potable systems. It can result in higher sewage flows which may cause problems for sewage disposal. Doubtful that Albion Water can discharge effluent into the River Meon without deterioration to its condition. Re-use of water may be more appropriate at non-domestic properties.</p> <p>The EA have replaced the CAMS documents with Abstraction Licensing Strategies and the one that is relevant to Fareham is the East Hants ALS. It has been published without the results of the investigation on the River Meon (completed Dec 2012) and without the results of PW's PIM/WFD Investigations completed March 2013). The PIM/WFD results will not change the water resource availability maps but will help to explain what happens next. PW do not agree that our larger licences in the Meon catchment have been time limited (the smaller Newtown licence is). It is unlikely that the larger licences will be reduced again because the River Meon is already in 'Good'</p>	<p>01, 02, 10, 13, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 35, 39, 98, 99</p>

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>condition. The licences in the Wallington catchment have not been time limited but the PIM/WFD Investigation did conclude that Maindell Source needs further work. We hope to complete this work prior to the WFD deadline in 2015. These changes are allowed for in our Draft WRMP which is out to consultation at the moment. Should make reference to Portsmouth Water's Water Resource Management Plan 2009. They are concerned that the IDP assumption about the cost of diverting existing on-site water mains may be insufficient as mains may require significant reinforcements due to the additional pressures required to serve Welborne.</p> <p>Southern Water supports the policy. Agree that off-site sewerage network needs to connect Welborne to Peel Common WwTW and this will involve crossing the M27. Also state that Peel Common WwTW may require additional investment to deliver treatment capacity. This infrastructure should be paid for by the development. Suggested detailed wording changes.</p> <p>Environment Agency advises more work on the deliverability of both wastewater options. For the Southern Water option the Council should explore whether there is sufficient capacity for additional flows at Peel Common and the viability of the required pipework upgrade to Peel Common. For the Albion Water option, evidence should demonstrate that the Sewage Treatment Works could accept the additional load and that the increase in flows will not affect the license conditions. Infrastructure would need to be funded and in place prior to development.</p> <p>BST Group agree with the broad principles.</p> <p>Buckland Development Ltd think the plan is too specific in outlining the two options for waste water as there may be alternatives.</p> <p>The Standing Conference, George Hollingbury MP and Winchester City Council are concerned the requirements for water efficiency do not have scope to be reviewed over the development period. The policy should include a trigger to raise standards at appropriate times in the development.</p> <p>The Standing Conference, Funtley Residents Society and George Hollingbury MP are also concerned that black-water recycling is an unproven approach and may not be practical.</p> <p>PUSH state the policy does not accord with South Hampshire Strategy policy 19 which requires non-residential development to meet BREEAM 'excellent' standard. Welborne should be encouraged to meet the highest standards possible subject to viability.</p> <p>Natural England supports the principle of reducing water demand and thus reducing the impacts on flow rates of designated watercourses.</p> <p>Local residents also raised a number of other points about water:</p>	

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p><u>Water supply</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan is contradictory because it says there is sufficient water but environmental capacity has been reached.</li> <li>• Water ultimately comes from an aquifer which may not be able to tolerate further abstraction due to its impact on local hydrology and water courses.</li> <li>• Concern that the demand for water arising from the development will result in short supply to the existing Portsmouth Water area.</li> </ul> <p><u>Re-use of water</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doubts whether rainwater can meet the additional water demand.</li> <li>• The plan needs to ensure there will be sufficient storage for rainwater harvesting in the development.</li> <li>• If harvested rainwater is allowed to remain in storage for any length of time quality will rapidly decrease and it can become a health hazard. Questions over how its quality can be ensured.</li> <li>• The dual infrastructure needed to support grey-water and black-water infrastructure will be costly overall and especially in the early phases. This could affect the ability to deliver affordable housing.</li> </ul> <p><u>Waste water treatment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The wastewater solution is a fundamental requirement for the project as there is no connection to mains sewage. The fact that it is omitted from the plan casts doubt over the credibility of the rest of the document.</li> <li>• Peel Common WwTW is operating at capacity so there is a big question about how sewage and wastewater infrastructure will be provided and paid for and the timing of delivery.</li> <li>• The Albion Water option may lead to lack of competition and higher prices for the consumer.</li> <li>• Connection to the Knowle Sewage Treatment Works could lead to an increase of HGVs transferring sludge from the STW on narrow rural lanes.</li> <li>• Crockerhill residents should be connected to the Welborne waste water system as they are currently served by septic tanks.</li> <li>• Titchfield Haven is a National Nature Reserve is heavily dependent on the waters of the River Meon. There is no evidence provided in LP3 of the effect of any increased chemical concentration on this important Reserve. We question whether an untested black-water system should be put in place upstream of such an ecologically important area.</li> </ul> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that water utilities infrastructure is not able to cope with additional pressure from the development as water mains burst in Funtley last year.</li> </ul>	

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water meters are already installed in all new properties so this this requirement should not be in WEL31.</li> </ul>	
Water Quality and Aquifer Protection WEL32	<p>Environment Agency and Portsmouth Water support the policy. BST Group agrees with the broad principles.</p> <p>EA would consider the discharge of surface water run-off to ground within groundwater SPZ1 provided that there is a suitable risk based approach used in designing and managing any scheme. Suggest addition of reference to water quality objectives in Water Framework Directive.</p> <p>PW highlight potential risks of groundwater direct connection in SPZ 2 and 3. SUDs techniques such as infiltration boreholes should be very carefully considered.</p> <p>Wallington residents concerned that water supplies may be at risk from pollutants soaking into aquifers.</p>	01, 10, 24, 99
Flooding and Sustainable Drainage Systems WEL33	<p>Environment Agency request paragraph 9.12 is amended as the correct definition of Flood Zone 1 is “a low probability of flooding”. There are no main rivers directly within the area of search, but there may be smaller ‘ordinary’ watercourses within the site which could have the potential to cause localised flooding. EA strongly support the aims of paragraph 9.13.</p> <p>EA Flood map should be used as evidence as it is updated more regularly than PUSH SFRA. They welcome commitment to delivery of SuDS and wish to ensure connectivity to other wetland areas. The SuDS system should follow the SuDS management train and the policy specification of locating large drainage ponds to the south of the site may compromise the most appropriate design at a later stage. Further information will be required at outline application stage and each phase will of development will need a detailed SuDS Strategy. Support for paragraphs 9.31-9.33. Some specific wording on the adoption of SuDS is required given the current uncertainty relating to the implementation of the SuDS Approval Body. Supporting text to WEL33 should also include some reference to the need to investigate the local flooding context in the Funtley area in developing appropriate mitigation as required by WEL5.</p> <p>PW support the policy but highlight potential risks of SuDS in chalk catchments. SUDs techniques such as infiltration boreholes should be very carefully considered. The effectiveness of soakaways in clay soils would need to be studied.</p> <p>Hampshire County Council supports the policy. It should refer to any other forms (non-fluvial) of flood risk on site. Groundwater status beneath the site may influence SuDS delivery. Clarify that there should be no net ‘increase’ in runoff. Large site-scale ponds to the south of the site may not be the most sustainable solution and could result in extensive pipe networks so the site should be seen as a number of sub-catchments each adopting an appropriate solution, of which strategic ponds could form a part. Ordinary watercourses may not always be suitable to incorporate into the SuDS strategy as this may affect their ecological value. As the SuDS Approval Body has not</p>	01, 02, 10, 16, 24, 26, 35, 39, 98, 99



# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>been enabled yet, it may be appropriate to remove the reference from the actual policy and place in supporting text.</p> <p>BST Group agrees with the broad principles. BST Group and Buckland consider that the plan should clarify all <i>additional</i> surface water should be contained within the site.</p> <p>A resident said the SuDS requirement for 'no net run off' may not be achievable. The only means of removing rainwater from the site can be through soakage into the water table and evaporation, meaning all rainwater is kept on the site. This may not be possible after a large rainfall event, and these are happening more frequently.</p> <p>Strong local concerns from residents and George Hollingbury MP that development could exacerbate flood risk, particularly in Wallington, and the plan does not demonstrate how this impact will be mitigated. The plan should include a specific reference to Wallington and improvements made to the watercourse.</p> <p>Funtley Residents Society is concerned that the development will result in flooding in Funtley, particularly at River Lane and properties along the northern edge of Funtley facing Funtley Common.</p> <p>A local resident is concerned that too much drainage of groundwater from clay subsoil could result in shrinkage of the clay with possible detrimental effects to the foundations of properties in Funtley.</p>	
Waste Management and Recycling WEL34	<p>The need for a waste transfer strategy is accepted and the Sawmills site is an option. If this facility is brought forward, the other major landowner should be required to contribute to the cost including land value.</p> <p>Considerable representation received as to the unsuitability of land at Crockerhill Industrial Park for the siting of a HWRC, due to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 16 adjacent houses;</li> <li>▪ a likely increase in the operational hours from the current workings (in particular working at weekends and inconsistency with other working hour restrictions);</li> <li>▪ noise impacts from site workings, queuing traffic, reversing alarms, smashing glass, skip changes, working practices all of which will cause unacceptable impacts upon the quality of life of adjacent neighbours;</li> <li>▪ odour impacts from any biodegradable waste (garden waste);</li> <li>▪ an overall loss in the quality of life for residents living adjacent to the site.</li> <li>▪ possible health impacts on adjacent residents.</li> <li>▪ a likely increase in vermin and pests;</li> <li>▪ it posing a danger to domestic pets;</li> <li>▪ an increased potential for fly tipping on Forest Lane (when HWRC is closed);</li> <li>▪ the generation of windblown litter and dust into neighbours gardens/gutters/drains.</li> </ul>	01, 16, 44, 98, 99

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the impact on local wildlife, particularly birds, foxes, pheasants and potentially bats;</li> <li>▪ road safety concerns on the A32, particularly for the site access which is on a blind bend with a high speed limit,</li> <li>▪ the potential for increased traffic congestion as a result of queuing traffic;</li> <li>▪ a decrease in air quality from exhausts of additional cars on the A32 and from queuing vehicles at the HWRC;</li> <li>▪ traffic concerns (safety, noise impact on houses) along Forest Lane;</li> <li>▪ the potential for unauthorised parking on the side of A32 as a result of unauthorised commercial waste disposal.</li> <li>▪ the location of Blakes Copse SINC near to the site.</li> <li>▪ visual impacts to Crockerhill residents due to the split-level type HWRC planned;</li> <li>▪ the risk of contamination to the nearby reservoir;</li> <li>▪ the impact on the Thai restaurant at the south of Crockerhill;</li> <li>▪ a lack of consideration of alternative sites elsewhere on the Welborne site at Dean Farm and near to the M27; both of which are away from residential properties, already have suitable road infrastructure, are closer to Fareham and the M27, and are within a higher noise area unsuitable for housing, but fine for a light industrial use like a HWRC.</li> <li>▪ A HWRC at Crockerhill would contradict its planning permission of needing to protect the local environment and amenity of neighbours.</li> <li>▪ Limited street lighting causing safety concerns.</li> </ul> <p>Locating the HWRC within the south of Welborne, near to the M27 would make it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ more convenient for Fareham/Welborne residents to access.</li> <li>▪ closer for Fareham residents and therefore more environmentally friendly by reducing emissions - one of the Welborne key objectives</li> <li>▪ fewer vehicles, of all types (including HGVs) using the length of the A32 between the M27 and Crockerhill making it safer for the new community/existing residents/other road uses;</li> <li>▪ a cheaper option as existing road infrastructure is already in place, requiring no new junction requirements as with Crockerhill.</li> <li>▪ Fairer on existing residents as new residents could decide whether to live near it or not</li> </ul> <p>Questions why capacity at existing HWRC sites in the vicinity cannot be increased in size?</p> <p>Whether acoustic protection will be provided between the proposed HWRC and Crockerhill properties.</p> <p>Many of the reasons for the HWRC at Crockerhill are identified in the Plan, but no reasons against are identified.</p>	

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
	<p>Clarity required as to the specific location of the HWRC within Crockerhill Industrial Park.</p> <p>Requirement to be specified for a full environmental baseline survey to be undertaken prior to any development of a HWRC, including air quality and noise, over a range of days, times and weather conditions.</p> <p>Additional flexibility required for WEL 34 to support potential for additional waste management facilities such as an anaerobic digestion facility for food waste which also produces heat and power.</p> <p>Crockerhill Industrial Park considered a suitable location for a waste management facility due to existing waste &amp; industrial uses on the site though there are significant traffic concerns which would need to be investigated.</p> <p>Principal of Welborne providing a HWRC is essential, but the facility could possibly be better suited elsewhere on site, possibly within the employment area in the south of the site – as such the policy should be revised to support a flexible location for the HWRC.</p>	

Chapter 10  
Landscape and Heritage

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
Landscape	<p>Additional green space immediately north of the M27 required before the start of building to provide more of a gap.</p> <p>0.5ha exclusion area around Dean Farm required.</p> <p>Reference to the historic landscape welcomed, however further wording to support the retention would be welcomed.</p>	11, 99
Structural Landscaping WEL35	<p>The Landscape &amp; Habitats Framework Plan advocates landscape screening for the proposed new housing, but does not propose any screening for existing Crockerhill residents.</p> <p>The policy as written is too prescriptive, and might not deliver the required response, NE therefore suggest additional wording to the policy to strengthen it and secure better outcomes.</p> <p>Reference should be made in this policy to the NCNF Landscape Study (LDA 2012), which included development considerations not currently included in the policy</p> <p>HCC specifically supports the requirement for the provision of significant tree cover</p> <p>The policy refers to the Landscape and Habitats Framework Plan, which will need to be revised in the light of anticipated changes to the concept masterplan, therefore references to this plan should be deleted from the policy</p> <p>The reference to a ‘detailed phasing and management plan’ should take out the word ‘detailed’ to allow greater flexibility at the outline stage, and suggest other policy rewording to ensure greater flexibility</p> <p>Totally inadequate buffer zone on A32 western boundary along entirety of the development – tree screening required to protect rural approach to Wickham and in particular alongside the district centre and high density housing surrounding it.</p> <p>Question why structural landscaping is not proposed to screen Crockerhill against the new development.</p> <p>Boundary planting around the Crockerhill Industrial Park is not substantial &amp; in parts consists of a few relatively young deciduous trees which have no leaf cover during winter months resulting in the site being almost totally visible at these times.</p> <p>No further screening provided to Crockerhill properties from landform (which slopes away) and as such makes</p>	01, 02, 11, 13, 16, 98, 99

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

	<p>any other screening difficult.</p> <p>Concern that green buffer between Welborne and Wickham is not large enough – it should incorporate plenty of green open/wooded space to accommodate wildlife, diversity, flora, fauna to protect the settlement gap and current landscape.</p> <p>Concern that landscaping between Knowle and Welborne will be inadequate to screen Welborne.</p> <p>Should be reference to the archaeology and its impact upon the understanding of the historic landscape.</p>	
<p>Detailed Landscaping WEL36</p>	<p>Reference to large gardens is inappropriate in a policy for detailed landscaping.</p> <p>Support for role of private gardens, but concern over how they will work for flats and two-bed houses.</p>	<p>02, 32, 97</p>
<p>Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment WEL37</p>	<p>The county is generally supportive of this policy but request certain minor changes to the wording.</p> <p>The listed building at Crockerhill, Mill House should be viewed the same as the other listed buildings and the installation of a HWRC at Crockerhill would impact severely on the character &amp; setting of this building.</p> <p>Insufficient protection of on-site heritage assets by WEL37, some wording amendments required.</p> <p>Buffer for Roche Court welcomed.</p> <p>Protection of heritage assets needs to be demonstrated and not assumed before the concept masterplan is finalised.</p> <p>The commitment that the development will provide an opportunity to draw upon the contribution made by the historic environment to create a unique sense of place using the historic environment as a catalyst requires further clarity.</p> <p>The requirement for a heritage strategy and historic environment management plan to be requires further clarification.</p> <p>Dean Farmhouse should be set within Green Infrastructure to conserve and enhance its significance.</p> <p>Clarity required over the relationship between archaeology and on-site green infrastructure.</p> <p>Archaeology finds should be made publically accessible.</p>	<p>11, 16, 32, 99</p>

Chapter 11  
Delivering the New Community

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
Phasing of Development	<p>There is concern that the landowners have not been involved in developing the phasing plan. The Council is urged to undertake this engagement. The approach on phasing offers only limited flexibility and ties phasing too strongly to the delivery of strategic infrastructure. Greater flexibility in phasing should be applied to maintain scheme viability.</p> <p>There needs to be a requirement for a minimum of infrastructure to be in place before the first house is completed.</p> <p>It would be far better to build out the development in smaller parcels over time so that the impact of construction traffic is not too overwhelming on surrounding areas.</p>	01, 02, 03, 26, 39
Draft Phasing Plan	<p>Although many aspects within the draft phasing plan are supported, it should reflect that employment development in the first and second strategic phases should be focused at the District Centre and between the centre and the M27. The employment east of the A32 should be phased later to reflect its isolated location.</p> <p>The expectation that the District Centre and retail offer will be developed in Strategic Phase 1 is challenged as delivery will only happen when there is a critical mass to make retail viable and this may take longer than envisaged in the draft plan.</p> <p>Clarity is sought over the phasing of land owned by Mr Hedges as this is unclear from the draft phasing plan.</p> <p>The phasing plan should include when highway improvements for Junctions 9-11 of the M27 will be required. It is not acceptable that the planned road improvements could be left until after some homes are delivered. The need to ensure that disruption for existing users is minimised is paramount so road improvements need to be in place prior to housing completions.</p> <p>Clarity is needed in the phasing plan that the measures to mitigate impacts on the protected sites on the Solent will need to be functionally in place prior to the occupation of each phase of development.</p> <p>The indication that development along the Knowle Road is likely to commence in Strategic Phases 1 and 2 is not supported. Development should commence near the M27.</p> <p>The phasing plan needs to be shared with the public so they know when the disruption can be expected and where. There also needs to be a transparent monitoring and review process over the life of the developments. Consultation and feedback from residents on the changes as the development progresses will be vital.</p>	01, 02, 03, 13, 15, 98, 99

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
Further Infrastructure Phasing and Prioritisation Work	<p>It is confirmed that both the 132kV double circuit steel-tower overhead lines in the north of the site and the 33kV wood-pole lines to the south of the site can be diverted/undergrounded, subject to this work being recognised as a developer cost. It is likely that the remaining 11kV wood-pole lines on the site could be progressively replaced / superseded as the development progressed.</p> <p>There needs to be some inclusion in the plan that fire service cover is unknown at present and that any alterations to BRT/Fareham Station may impact on the fire station.</p> <p>Welborne needs to be provided with fibre optic broadband capable of high speed internet access as it is built out. This would make the area more desirable and avoid having to dig-up roads later on.</p>	21, 28, 99
Housing Trajectory	<p>The housing trajectory amounts to delivery of 1,000 fewer homes over a period 10 years longer than that envisaged in the Core Strategy. Clarity is required on how this complies with paragraph 47 of the NPPF and what contingencies are in place in the event that the HRA conclusions prevents the level of housing delivery that is envisaged in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The commitment in paragraph 11.23 to refine the trajectory through evidence work and engagement with landowners is welcomed and ways need to be explored to accelerate housing delivery to achieve Core Strategy targets.</p>	01, 02
Development Deliverability	<p>Concern that the concept masterplan and Draft Welborne Plan have been insufficiently tested for viability, with no viability appraisals included in evidence base. Paragraphs 173, 174 and 177 of the NPPF have been insufficiently taken into account. There needs to be a transparent and open viability appraisal process that attaches greater weight to 'market demand' and that demonstrates how the plan will comply with Section 19(2)(i) of the Planning &amp; Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 by having regard to the resources likely to be available for implementing the proposals in the document.</p> <p>The requirement for phase-by-phase review of viability would have a serious negative impact on securing long-term investment funding critical for scheme delivery. Initial viability appraisals should recognise that whilst market conditions may improve, so might costs, not least in connection with sustainable construction/carbon standards. The viability model should not place undue reliance on uncertain sources of public sector funding or on future house price inflation, particularly during the first 10 years.</p> <p>The plan should consider the use of CPO powers or other public sector funding streams to secure necessary off-site infrastructure if it is not possible to deliver these by agreement.</p> <p>The Council should encourage the formation of a single delivery vehicle for Welborne as one of the largest strategic sites in the country. This will assist the Council by providing a single accountable party to deal with in</p>	01, 02, 03, 32, 98, 99

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section / POLICY	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>implementation and infrastructure delivery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Concern that the cost of delivering the necessary infrastructure will be prohibitive and lead to a lack of infrastructure provision. Concern as to whether necessary infrastructure will come forward as it is needed.</li> <li>▪ Too much weight given to early viability over long term sustainability.</li> <li>▪ Concern over the ability to deliver Welborne in a comprehensive manner whilst funding the range of very significant infrastructure.</li> <li>▪ The sustainability of the Welborne community is inextricably linked to a phased delivery over time of the infrastructure identified, but how and when the infrastructure is needed, phased and paid for is not shown.</li> <li>▪ Availability of Viability Appraisals.</li> <li>▪ It is not apparent anywhere in the documents what triggers the need for the highway improvements and how much of Welborne can be delivered, given the comprehensive approach needed without certainty on the costly infrastructure delivery and in relation to the appropriate commercial vehicle to deliver it.</li> </ul> <p>A public project of this magnitude should exhibit transparency in publicising estimates of public funds needed to be spent to ensure the project's viability.</p>	
Developer Contributions	<p>The Council should engage with landowners on the review of CIL and should provide clarity on the roles of CIL and s106 in securing funding to ensure that there is no 'double-charging' that could harm scheme viability. There is insufficient reference in the plan to Fareham's CIL and how the development will relate to that in recognition of the need for a site-wide s106 agreement.</p>	01, 02, 03
Developer Construction Strategy	<p>Wording should be included requiring consideration to be given to adding measures to ensure that flood risk is not increased during scheme construction.</p> <p>There needs to be an effective plan for handling construction traffic while development is underway as there will be lots of traffic impacts and delays. There also needs to be a mechanism to monitor and review progress of the development and keep the public informed at each stage of the development to avoid the disruption during the build-out. The Standing Conference should be kept going for 5 years to take a role in this monitoring of the impacts of construction on existing communities.</p> <p>Concern over the impact from construction vehicles on Knowle Road and residents.</p> <p>Careful thought is needed as to how construction traffic will access the site and this must avoid causing delays and nuisance for existing road users. This needs to consider effects on the wider network as far north as Bishop's Waltham.</p>	10, 26, 39, 98, 99



# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
Local Skills	Paragraph 11.34 and final paragraph WEL38 are strongly supported, but the policy should be moved into Chapter 5, as it is at the heart of the economic strategy for Welborne.	01, 02
Quality Control	Paragraph 11.35 should ensure that it does not pre-empt discussions with the landowners on the long-term objectives for the maintenance of common infrastructure. For example, statements in the Draft IDP that HCC will not allow on-site developers to construct schools and will require the adoption of local highways, are premature.	02
Implementation, Phasing and Construction WEL38	The linkage in WEL38 between developer contributions and the phasing/implementation is undefined and needs to be made clearer.  All infrastructure must be in place before any houses are built to stop residents using existing facilities in Fareham.	03, 99

Chapter 12  
Monitoring and Review

<b>Section / POLICY</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>
The Monitoring Framework	No comments received.	
Triggers for a Review	No comments received.	

## Appendices

Section	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
<p>Appendix A Review of the High Level Development Principles within Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy</p>	<p>The Fareham Society object to the change on pages 155-156 from” fully mitigate any environmental or traffic impacts” to “minimise the traffic impacts on the local and strategic road network and mitigate any environmental impacts”.</p> <p>The Highway Authority considered that the opportunity has been missed to provide a dedicated BRT bus/cycle route through the site to further encourage increased patronage.</p> <p>The Highway Authority objected to the location of schools to the east of A32 – and stated at-grade, controlled crossing on the A32 will not be acceptable due to the significant predicted traffic levels and the impact that such a crossing will have on queuing on the strategic network</p> <p>The Highway Authority also stated that the location of schools away from the district or local centres means that there are limited opportunities to share parking provision and link with the proposed BRT bus routes through the development, thereby losing the opportunity to promote sustainable travel between the residential parts of the development and the community facilities.</p> <p>The Highway Authority would like to see the schools relocated to land to the west of the A32, with the secondary school ideally adjacent to the district centre, or at the very least adjacent to one of the local centres.</p> <p>The Highway Authority also expressed some concern over the proposed location of the HWRC at Crockerhill Industrial Park due to a right turn manoeuvre into the site from the A32. The design of a suitable access will need careful consideration. An alternative site within one of the main employment areas to the south could be preferable.</p> <p>The Standing conference also raised concerns as to the location of the schools east of the A32.</p> <p>Local residents raised concerns regarding the location of the schools and the difficulty of crossing the A32. One pointed out that if schools are to the east of the A32 the pavements on that side must be improved. The close proximity of three schools east of the A32 may lead to local congestion at peak times.</p> <p>Local residents also objected to the location of the HWRC, concerned it would lead to congestion, noise and pollution in that area. It was suggested that the existing access arrangements for the site use Forest Lane, which is not suitable for such an increase in traffic and potential impacts should be modelled, and that HWRC will attract traffic down through Wickham to access the site.</p> <p>The Fareham Society considered the scale of the changes to the Pook Lane/A32 junction to accommodate freight movements (paragraph 5.20) will have a significant harmful impact on Roche Court, its Gate Lodge and historic</p>	<p>16, 26, 32, 44, 46, 48, 49, 94, 98, 99</p>

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>parkland</p> <p>Some local businesses wrote in confirming their view that employment sites should be clearly visible from the M27 and obvious to find.</p> <p>Financial reasons and changes to the high level development principles will reduce the ability of the development to be sustainable and have self-containment. Profit is being placed ahead of the environment.</p>	
Appendix B Masterplan Options: Summary of Evaluation	The other locations for the district centre are significantly less sustainable than the central location contrary to the statements in the Masterplan Options: Summary of Evaluation.	32
Appendix C List of Evidence and Background Documents	<p>Portsmouth Water's Water Resources Management Plan 2009 should be included. The draft 2014 WRMP is available for comment.</p> <p>Portsmouth City Plan and associated guide for developers would be a useful background document.</p>	24
Appendix D1 Constraints Plan	<p>Confusion over whether there is an Area of Ecological Importance at Funtley as the Concept Masterplan allocates the constrained land for residential and allotments.</p> <p>Pylons on site could put children living nearby at risk of cancer.</p>	99
Appendix D2 Concept Masterplan	<p>Land between Pook Lane and A32 should be identified as employment land rather than open space because it is not constrained by noise, air quality, the gas pipeline or the groundwater source protection zone. It has existing access off Pook Lane and is well located to the proposed employment east of the A32.</p> <p>All employment should be located to the west of the A32 making use of the parts of the site most affected by noise which are not suitable for the housing which is currently proposed.</p> <p>Concern that masterplan options for the Welborne plan have been developed prior to a full appropriate assessment being undertaken. As such this version of the draft Welborne plan is at risk of being found unsound as there is no certainty that these options will not lead to a likely significant effect on the International and national designated sites.</p> <p>It is not possible to determine whether the local, intermediate and medium pressure gas pipelines present on the site will need to be diverted until more detailed site layout and phasing plans are available.</p> <p>It is not clear from the Concept Masterplan that alternative routes for the water mains present on the site have been allowed for. The plan assumes they will be diverted but the £4.8M sum allowed for this [in the Draft IDP] does not</p>	01, 05, 21, 22, 24, 26, 32, 36, 98

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<p>allow for moving all of the existing mains to the A32.</p> <p>Land east of the A32 should be left as a reserve site for use in the final phase of development if required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Main infrastructure items for Welborne, such as the HWRC, should be located away from the existing surrounding communities.</li> <li>▪ The preferred solution for Junction 10 improvements is on land that is solely owner by one of the two mains landowners promoting Welborne. This will increase the commercial attractiveness of the planned employment area and District Centre, and as such significantly increase the marketability of the site.</li> </ul> <p>It is not clear from the “Welborne Concept Masterplan” that alternative routes for water mains have been allocated within the site. The existing routes appear to be covered with woodland, housing, shopping areas and the secondary school. It is important to understand that the provisional sum of £4.8m for mains diversion does not allow for moving all the mains into the A32. In addition to mains diversion costs there will potentially be mains reinforcement costs.</p>	
<p>Appendix D3 Combined Green Infrastructure Plan</p>		
<p>Appendix D4 Green Infrastructure Uses Plan</p>		
<p>Appendix D5 Pedestrian and Cycle Linkages</p>	<p>The County Council’s countryside service made the following comments on the Pedestrian and Cycle Linkages (Movement Framework Plan) D5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proposals for pedestrian and cycle links look sound overall, although it is not clear which of these are for cycling, pedestrians or both;</li> <li>▪ The crossing-points for the M27 are particularly welcomed as this is regularly identified as an issue for rights of way users;</li> <li>▪ Parts of the on-site network appear to be very direct and utilitarian; provision should also be made for more localised and attractive circular routes of varying lengths for recreation and exercise within the site;</li> <li>▪ Access to the west of the site is currently restricted to two public footpaths and we would strongly recommend upgrading and physically improving one of them to permit use for cycling. If upgraded to bridleway and improved, Wickham footpath 16 would provide a cycling link from Mayles Lane to Titchfield Lane and Botley;</li> </ul>	<p>16</p>

# FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Section	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Respondent(s)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is very limited provision of off-site links to the east of the site, other than existing rights of way and roads;</li> <li>▪ Fareham bridleway 83b/82, which leads south-west from the westernmost crossing of the M27, should also be identified as an offsite enhanced route.</li> </ul>	
Appendix D6 Landscape and Habitats Framework Plan	Encouraged to see that the draft plan is incorporating biodiversity and habitat planning. The green corridors should be planted with native, traditional hedgerows and other 'wild' plantings including wild foods that can be foraged.	99
Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)	<p>The Concept masterplan assumes that existing water mains on site will be diverted, but the £4.9M sum allowed for this does not allow for moving all of the existing mains to the A32. Equally, significant mains reinforcement work may be required, whether or not overall water usage is reduced through black-water recycling. This is not allowed for in the IDP.</p> <p>Portsmouth Water has not yet provided a quote to Albion Water for supplying the site. The costs quoted for the Albion Water options therefore may not be accurate.</p>	24