

Mr Nicholas Cunningham



19th February 2015

Dear Mr Hogger

My submission to you on the proposed amendments to the main modifications (MM-1 to MM-23) with regard to the Welborne Plan.

MM1

Policy

Par: Para 1.29

Modification

Commitment to a Review of the Local Plan

To meet Soundness Criteria

Consistent with national policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework

Submission

Nice to have a time frame. Will it happen? Does the Council have the resolve to keep to it? What are chances the time scale will actually be kept? Perhaps the answer can be found in the past history of Fareham Borough Council. Today we still have unanswered questions from previous plans.

Fails to meet Soundness Criteria due to the lack of credibility. More safe guards required - UNSOUND

MM2

Policy
WEL2

Modification

New first bullet point and amendment to the 6th bullet point (4th sub-bullet) in relation to emphasising the relationship between Welborne and Fareham to the south

To meet Soundness Criteria

Justified – the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence

Modification

New first bullet point and amendment to the 6th bullet point (4th sub-bullet) in relation to emphasising the relationship between Welborne and Fareham to the south

Submission

So many questions remain unanswered wrapped in mistrust and scepticism. This modification does nothing to address the public concerns on this important Relationship - Welborne / Fareham to the South.

I now accept no matter what we the public have say it will have no bearing on the outcome. We just have to wait for the calamity to strike and then convey to FBC those immortal words ‘told you so”

UNSOUND

MM-3

Policy
WEL-5

Modification

Clarification regarding consideration of settlement buffers

To meet Soundness Criteria

Justified – the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence

Submission

How Fareham Borough Council have the Mettle to say separation of communities can be achieved with a 50 metre buffer zone is beyond a joke. The 75 metre figure is just a fraud, given in the hope it looks like FBC are addressing the issue when they are not. We now have

Councillors using the phrase “ Urban Extension” in portraying Welborne. We have come along way indeed since the days of “Garden City” or “A New Town”.

The change is designed to vindicate FBC miserable stance on a 50 metre buffer zone. This is NOT what the existing communities were led to believe would be separation. After all the utterances over many years FBC still will not listen to the public. The message from FBC is one of - you will have separation on our terms. Where does that leave the public consultation? The answer may be; a meaningless process? UNSOUND

MM-4

Policy
WEL-6

Modification
Add a criterion relating to noise, light pollution and air quality

To meet Soundness Criteria
Justified – the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence

Submission

No submission

MM-5

Policy
WEL-6

Modification
Take measures to ease pedestrian/cycle movement across the A32

To meet Soundness Criteria
Justified – the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence

Submission

Thoughts are in the right place but again where is the plan to map out such thoughts. Oh - the planning committee can sort that out. Clearly FBC are still puzzling out how to achieve this goal - A plan without answers - just mere aspirations.

MM-6
Policy
WEL-7

Modification
Clarification regarding strategic design codes

To meet Soundness Criteria

Justified – the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence

Submission

May the Public have an input into these design codes? Would be nice.

MM-7

Policy
Para 5.17

Modification
Clarification regarding the Council's approach towards office development

To meet Soundness Criteria

Justified – the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence

Submission

Does FBC have a plan to deal with the current crop of empty office and industrial units we have in the area? Perhaps we could turn them into housing but then that would raise such an awkward question; what is the need for Welborne?

What is the justification for more Office space at Welborne? Two office blocks are presently being converted into accommodation here in Fareham. Does that say something?

MM-8

Policy
WEL-10 & WEL-11

Modification
Clarification regarding Impact Assessments for retail and leisure development

To meet Soundness Criteria

Justified – the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence

-

Submission

The report the Council keeps hiving back to in vindicating their thought process on Retail is outdated. Even Fareham is seeing a lowering of feet passing through the town shopping centre. The retail sector has moved on since the council's retail report. The vision FBC seems to have for retail at Welborne is outmoded and behind the times. Leisure is the key now.

MM-9

Policy

WEL-16

Modification

Allocate a single site for a secondary school close to the District Centre

To meet Soundness Criteria

Justified – the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence

-

Submission

Victory for common sense, although let us be honest not well received by FBC. I hope there's no going back and revisiting the old plans for the secondary school at any time in the future? The only question mark is one of the time scale when the school will open. 2026 is too late and if like all infrastructure it moves to the right, like most people expect, are we looking at yet another tale of sorrowful delivery. I like many have no faith in the delivery of infrastructure at Welborne.

MM-10

Policy

WEL-18

Modification

Clarification regarding affordable housing provision

To meet Soundness Criteria

Effective (deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities)

Submission

The bedrock of Welborne, affordable Homes.

Yes for years the residents have had this played back at them like an old fashion gramophone record needle stick its groove, repeatedly playing over and over again....We need Welborne to deliver affordable homes.

The latest from the Council, there is desperate need for affordable homes here in Fareham. Yet FBC write an amendment to MM-10 which opens the door to a grim delivery rate of affordable homes. It seems the corner stone of Welborne is very shallow indeed, in fact one may question has this corner stone already started to collapse and therefore undermining the very principle of Welborne. Affordable homes at Welborne needs some urgent underpinning to stop a total collapse. Not a good start for Welborne. UNSOUND

MM-11

Policy
WEL-23

Modification
Promote development that looks to the south

To meet Soundness Criteria
Justified – the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence

Submission

Do FBC have a clue in what they are suggesting. Do local concerns mean anything, clearly not. Is it no wonder residents have no faith in Welborne when the plan cannot even specify in any honesty what the local road network or using FBC expression Traffic box, is likely to look like or worst still unable to spell out with any degree of clarity the traffic implications for the future of North Fareham will be. Presently all we have is some data created on some hard disk with reality kept at arms length. Sorry, like many in Fareham I find the traffic modelling a joke and simply a visual art show, creative in thought but lacking in sanity Unsound.

MM-12

Policy
Para 7.24

Modification
Introduction of flexibility regarding access links to the A32

To meet Soundness Criteria

Justified – the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence Important

Submission:

Sorry this is just another example of FBC not listening yet again. Instead of asking residents who use the roads every single day for their thoughts they go off on some creative thought process which is far removed from the real world. FBC is just not listening. How much more evidence needs to be submitted to show the residents of Fareham are Not Happy.....What does this amendment do? Cosmetic ..playing with words. Unsound.

MM-13

Policy

Para 7.27

Modification

Clarification regarding traffic management on the A32

To meet Soundness Criteria

Justified – the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence Important

Submission

My submission on this modification is covered on MM-12.

MM-14

Policy

Wel-25

Modification

Clarification regarding principal access being from the south

To meet Soundness Criteria

Justified – the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence Important

-

Submission

My submission on this modification is covered on MM-12.

MM-15

Policy
Wel-29

Modification
Clarification regarding allotment provision

To meet Soundness Criteria – All Three below

Positively prepared: (based on a strategy that seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development)

Justified: the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence

Effective: (deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities)

-

Submission:

Green City principles =

0.32 acres for allotments. = 1295 square meters

Average size allotment is 250 square meters (size of a double tennis court)

= Not many allotments = We can do better than this surely.

MM-16

Policy
WEL33 (as set out in CD-46)

Modification
Structural planting including the protection of long-distance views including from Portsdown Hill

To meet Soundness Criteria

Justified – the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence Important

Submission

The views from the Hill are wonderful. The words the council have cobbled together does not do justice to the issue FBC are trying to address. What a disaster waiting to happen if we don't fully understand what needs to be done. Let us have some detail in how these magnificent views will be protected not only for the current generations but for future generations to come. The present generation have a responsibility to get this right. Have

FBC taken the time to go and validate and look at these views. We are the custodians of the landscape and therefore should take due care in what we do to protect it from sheer vandalism. Unsound - more detail required.

MM-17

Policy
WEL-36

Modification
Clarification regarding optimising energy efficiency

To meet Soundness Criteria

Positively prepared: (based on a strategy that seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development)

Justified: the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence

Effective: (deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities)

Submission

Yet another get out clause? The bar should be set higher. Are FBC serious on high energy efficiency homes or not. There should be a clear undertaking not this fudge.

MM-18

Policy
WEL-37

Modification
Clarification regarding water efficiency, supply and disposal

To meet Soundness Criteria

Justified – the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence

-

Submission

Lets hope not everyone flushes their waste systems at the same time. A proposed development of 6000 homes and we don't have a plan stating out how this major piece of infrastructure will be delivered other than its south facing. If this is an example of a modern planning system then there's something seriously wrong.

MM-19

Policy
WEL-39

Modification
Clarification regarding flood risk and sustainable drainage systems

To meet Soundness Criteria
Effective (deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities)

-

Submission

I have no confidence FBC even understand the problems the community are desperately trying to convey to them on this issue of flooding. The amendment does not do anything to address such concerns. What does this amendment do to address the public concerns?
Unsound

MM-20

Policy
WEL-40

Modification
Allocation of a site to the west of the A32 for a household waste collection centre

To meet Soundness Criteria
Effective (deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities)

-

Submission
No comment

MM-21

Policy
WEL-41

Modification
New phasing plan

To meet Soundness Criteria
Effective (deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities)

–

Submission

Personally I do not believe any of the infrastructure will be delivered in the time frame given. Its all just promises on sheets of paper. How such a major development can be given the green light without more detail clarification being set within the plan is beyond me.

MM-22

Policy
WEL-41

Modification
Remove references to the deferral of infrastructure provision

To meet Soundness Criteria
Justified: the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence

Effective: (deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities)

–

Submission
No comment

MM-23

Policy
Para 11.5 and 11.6

Modification
Clarification regarding monitoring and review

To meet Soundness Criteria
Effective (deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities)

-

Submission

Where is the full disclosure of all the necessary facts relating to the viability of Welborne?
Because is not in the public domain. Why not? So until the public have access to the data
then the plan cannot be considered Effective —Unsound

Yours Sincerely

Mr N. Cunningham