

***The Welborne Standing Conference – a consultation forum for local groups, organisations and partners established by Fareham Borough Council***

*From the independent chair: Henry Cleary OBE*

*Please reply to [REDACTED] or tel [REDACTED]*

To: Richard Jolley

Director of Planning and Development

8 March 2015

Dear Richard,

**Welborne Standing Conference – Comments on Fareham Borough Council proposed modifications to the Welborne Plan**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed modifications published by Fareham Borough Council in response to the Inspector's letter of 22 December following the Welborne Plan public examination. These representations are made on behalf of the Welborne Standing Conference, and in particular follow from a special workshop held on 26<sup>th</sup> February for this purpose and from the previous comments made by the Standing Conference.

As you know, the Standing Conference has a wide membership including Ward Members, local and residents groups for neighbouring settlements, local third sector, public service and business organisations, and develops its views independently without input from the executive or landowners and I am the independent Chair.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Henry Cleary, Chair, Welborne Standing Conference

## **Welborne Standing Conference representations on proposed modifications to the Welborne Plan following Inspector's letter of 22 December 2014**

Within the limited context of this consultation (modifications to the Welborne Plan rather than commenting on the project as a whole) the Standing Conference welcomes many of the proposed modifications to the Plan, although in a number of cases consider that without further text they will not achieve the objectives required. The following points reflect soundness concerns (on "justified" and "effectiveness" as set out in the Inspector's letter of 22 December) and were discussed at the special Standing Conference workshop for this purpose on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2015.

### **Issue 1 MM2 Page 20 - Policy WEL2; Purpose - To give greater emphasis to the south facing relationship of Welborne towards Fareham,**

The need to ensure that Welborne is well linked to Fareham and "faces south" has been a longstanding concern of the Standing Conference, reflecting the need to achieve a sustainable and attractive community from the outset as well as mitigating potentially harmful impact on Wickham and other adjoining areas. A key element is traffic flow along the A32.

SC propose additional wording on transport/south facing as follows:

MM 11, page 92, WEL 23, FBC Proposed modification: "*Achieves a development which is southwards-facing in transport terms through the masterplan, layout and delivery of access via the A32 and an improved junction 10 of the M27*"; **[SC proposed addition]** : "***and freer flowing traffic on M27 through the Managed Motorway Initiative using hard shoulder running, junction control and improved signalling (ref M27 Jc 4-11 scheme included in "Investing in Britain's Future" HM Treasury June 2013 Cmnd 8669).***"

MM 13 pages 94-5 **[SC Proposed Replacement]** for FBC's proposed criterion iii "***To discourage additional traffic movements north through Wickham, the transport plan to be submitted in support of any outline planning application for the site should include options for traffic management measures within Welborne and along the A32 which are sufficient to have the effect of achieving a 90:10 south: north flowing distribution of traffic leaving Welborne***"

### **Issue 2 MM3 page 38-9 Policy WEL5 Clarification to decision makers and applicants on when a settlement buffer of more than 50 metres may be required**

This issue – the inadequacy of the proposed buffers - has been a "red line" concern for the Standing Conference since its first representations on the Plan. Further detail on the SC concerns on buffering was set out in its representations on the publication draft plan, at the public examination and in commentary of 3 December on the further material published by the Council following the examination. All of these sought a minimum 100 metre buffer strip although several of the neighbouring communities would like to see that distance increased.

In the proposed modifications some progress has been made in that the separation to the north to Wickham is more acceptable through use of green infrastructure features and the secondary school is no longer sited next to the Knowle Triangle. The use of new green infrastructure needs to be extended to other locations, for example through the use of a mature tree belt (via early planting) to help separate Knowle and Welborne at Knowle Road.

However to the west and south more serious problems remain, particularly given that there is no road or other physical link (beyond a footpath/cycleway) proposed between Welborne and the neighbouring community at Funtley which has its own distinctive character as an older settlement linked to the activities of one of Fareham's greatest historical assets, the site of the works of the pioneering 18<sup>th</sup> century ironmaster, Henry Cort. A further factor is that in this area the adjacent development at Welborne will be 5 metres or more higher in terms of ground level in comparison with the adjoining settlement and added differentiation is needed to reflect that. As a more general point the Standing Conference feels that the definition of the buffer zone should be between properties rather than buildings.

The following Standing Conference proposals are the minimum, taking the text of the plan as proposed, that the SC would see as acceptable to meet its concerns.

FBC Proposed modification/new text. *“Planning applications will be accompanied by site sections through the respective settlement buffers to demonstrate that the visual and physical separation will be achieved. The width of the settlement buffers in each case shall be no less than stipulated below and should be increased to a width of no less than **[SC proposed amendment] 100 metres** in the following circumstances: i. Where development located immediately adjacent to a settlement buffer is greater than 2-storeys or 8.5 metres in height **[SC proposed addition] or there is 5 metres or more difference in ground height contours**; ii. Where noise-generating uses **[SC proposed addition] including spine roads** are proposed to be located immediately adjacent to a settlement buffer or; iii. Where a 50 metre wide settlement buffer would not enable a **[SC proposed amendment] 100 metre** separation between buildings in Welborne and buildings within a neighbouring settlement.” **[SC proposed addition] “or iv. where Welborne and the neighbouring settlement remain separate developments with no road connection”,***

### **Issue 3 MM4 pages 44-5 WEL 6 To ensure noise, light and air quality are sufficiently considered**

The impact of Welborne on the wider area has been a longstanding concern particularly in relation to North Fareham as well as the neighbouring communities.

Additional FBC criterion for planning applications *“The issues of noise, light pollution and air quality have been considered in developing proposals, and shall set out the measures necessary to mitigate any likely impacts”. **[SC proposed addition] “ both within Welborne and in adjoining areas including North Fareham”***

### **Issue 4 MM 16 page 114 WEL 33 Structural Landscaping** (protection of sensitive areas/ long distance views)

For most Fareham residents (and a high proportion of travellers along the M27) the principal view of Welborne will be from the south looking on to mainly employment space – with the potential for sheds, large block buildings etc. This needs to be mitigated by imaginative and strong landscape features and identified explicitly in the policy.

FBC proposed modification, new para *“Structural landscaping schemes will show how they respond positively to areas of high landscape quality to the north and east of the site and take into account any material impact on long distance views of the site from Portsdown Hill to the east and across the site from the south” **[SC proposed addition] “and include***

***features of sufficient scale to help mitigate an intrusive visual impact of new industrial development when viewed from North Fareham”.***

**Issue 5** MM18 and 19 WEL 37,39 pages 120-123 **Clarity on waste water and flood risk/sustainable drainage** requirements

Again a major and long running concern for many Standing Conference Members. The proposed texts respond to these concerns but the SC is looking for further assurance through independent review and explicit inclusion of viability and delivery assessment.

FBC proposed amended text *“Planning application(s) for development will only be permitted where they include details of a comprehensive waste water conveyance and treatment solution for Welborne, including details on the phasing of new waste water infrastructure.”*

***[SC proposed addition] “which has been independently assessed including its financial viability/affordability and deliverability”.***

**Issue 6 Phasing – Revised Phasing Plan** MM23 pages 138 11.5 To address the Inspector’s concerns on Monitoring and Review

The Standing Conference welcomes the inclusion of a phasing plan and the provisions for regular review and reporting (including the future role of the Standing Conference) but is concerned at how delivery of infrastructure will be enforced – in effect how can Fareham residents be assured that development will only occur when infrastructure commitments have been met. Tighter definitions of infrastructure and works in the Phasing Plan are needed to avoid token compliance eg foundations for a project rather than its completion.

FBC Proposed new text. *“The Phasing Plan contained within Chapter 10 of this document sets out the key outcomes and critical infrastructure identified for each of the main phases of development. This has been produced to inform the understanding of the Plan, using the best information available. It should be recognised that the mechanism which will deliver Welborne, including critical infrastructure, will be the phasing plan, infrastructure delivery plan and s106 planning agreement approved alongside planning application(s) for the site. Nonetheless, the phasing plan in Chapter 10 provides a useful guide to the Council’s expected outcomes, including infrastructure. “ ***[SC Proposed addition] The Council will include a revised phasing plan with the s106 planning agreement approved alongside an approved planning application for the site and this would include Grampian conditions and trigger points to ensure that development of a further phase could not commence until infrastructure required in the preceding phase had been delivered.”****

**Issue 7 Monitoring and Review** MM23 page 138 and **Appendix B Changes to chapter 11 on monitoring and review**

The Standing Conference welcome the new chapter on monitoring and review. The indicators listed are useful but to ensure delivery of a successful and sustainable community will need to include quality of life indicators, which can be adopted as the project develops.

***Para 11.12 of Monitoring chapter [SC proposed addition] at end add: In addition to the monitoring indicators listed in Table 11.1, a further set of Quality of Life indicators should be developed using both existing service data from police, health, education and local ONS together with wider community well-being indicators.***