

FAREHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL
- 9 MAR 2015
PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Ref:
(official use only)

FAREHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

Local Plan Part 3: The Welborne Plan Modifications Consultation

Please return to Fareham Borough Council by 5pm on Monday 9 March 2015

This form has three parts:

Part A – Personal Details.

Part B – Comment section for Main Modifications.

Part C – Comment section for Minor Modifications.

Part A: Personal Details

Title

MR.

Name

ADRIAN R SAUNDERS

Address

[Redacted]

Email Address

[Redacted]

Telephone No.

[Redacted]

Organisation
represented*

[Redacted]

* Only agents need complete organisation box.

Part B – Comment section for Main Modifications

You will need reference to the following document to make a comment:

- Schedule of Main Modifications proposed to the Welborne Plan

Representations should relate only to the Main Modifications and should not seek to repeat previous representations or request further changes to the published plan. Representations on Main Modifications need to focus on the grounds of soundness and legal compliance as set out in National Planning Policy Framework – namely that it is:

- **Positively prepared** – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which 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 plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- **Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

Which Main Modification(s) do your comments relate to?

MM1	<input type="checkbox"/>	MM9	<input type="checkbox"/>	MM17	<input type="checkbox"/>
MM2	<input type="checkbox"/>	MM10	<input type="checkbox"/>	MM18	<input type="checkbox"/>
MM3	<input type="checkbox"/>	MM11	<input type="checkbox"/>	MM19	<input type="checkbox"/>
MM4	<input type="checkbox"/>	MM12	<input type="checkbox"/>	MM20	<input type="checkbox"/>
MM5	<input type="checkbox"/>	MM13	<input type="checkbox"/>	MM21	<input type="checkbox"/>
MM6	<input type="checkbox"/>	MM14	<input type="checkbox"/>	MM22	<input type="checkbox"/>
MM7	<input type="checkbox"/>	MM15	<input type="checkbox"/>	MM23	<input type="checkbox"/>
MM8	<input type="checkbox"/>	MM16	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Please provide comments on why you consider the Council’s proposed Main Modification(s) to the Welborne Plan (as you have specified above) to not be legally compliant or unsound.

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED SHEET.

100 Funtley road

Fareham PO175EE

RESPONSE TO WELBORNE MAIN MODIFICATIONS

MM 3 (Settlement Buffers)

Having studied the Topography of the fields around my village (Funtley) I have in relation to the document, Issue 3 Site, Setting, Allocations, Design principles and character area (WEL3-WEL8)

I have many concerns relating to the above document as it is not based on proportionate evidence that has been confirmed by actual site surveys. The only evidence, used to compile the drawings contained on page 9 of The Welborne Plan Issue 3: Site, Setting, Allocations, Design Principles and Character Areas (WEL3-WEL8) has been the Ordnance survey map containing 5m contours. An extract is shown at appendix A where it plainly shows the 20m contour passing through Funtley playing fields. The next available contour is at 25 meters which looking at the map is positioned to the north of the wooded depression a distance in excess of 500m. The topography of the site in this area dips down which can be plainly seen by photographs (shown at appendix B). How can this information be used to generate cross sectional drawings without a proper site survey?.

I carried out my own survey of the local proposed buffer zone shown at Appendix B (I have been a design engineer and draughtsman for 30 years) as what I was seeing on the drawings did not confer with what I was seeing on the ground. My calculations show that the site slopes away at 2.5 degrees from the drawn diagram which over 100m gives a fall of 4.3 meters. The diagram shows only a slight incline of 1 degree which would only give a fall of 1.74 meters. This is plainly misleading.

I requested further information from Fareham Borough Council by email on the 17th of February 2015 (shown in Appendix C) On not receiving an answer by the 3rd of March I followed this up with another email (shown in Appendix D). Further to this I also sent an email to my local Ward Councillors Mr and Mrs Bryant (shown in appendix E) as time was running out I followed up with a call to the planning department.

I received an email reply from Mrs Bryant on Thursday 5th of March (shown in Appendix F) which backed up the conversation I had with Mr Ayling from Fareham Borough Council saying that the reason it had taken so long for me to receive a reply was that Fareham Borough Council had to send someone out to look at the site prior to a reply being given. My question regarding checking document's still remains unanswered at this present time. A reply from Mr Ayling at (Appendix G) confirms that no site survey was carried out prior to the report being published as this is why they would have to send someone out to check site.

I feel that a document of this nature where the local identity of FUNTLEY will be destroyed if this development is allowed with only a 50M buffer especially at the bottom of Funtley hill where houses are located close to their own boundary. Remembering the modification now states the distance between 'buildings' could be as little as 50m! A full site survey and review of third party documents should have been carried out-this plainly has not happened. I therefore find MM3 **unsound**.



16/2/15

Appendix B



AS DRAWN
 1° PER 100M
 $\therefore 100 \times \tan$ of $1^\circ = 1.74m$
 (0.0174)
 DRAWN AS 1.74m !!

ACTUAL
 $2 \frac{1}{2}^\circ$ PER 100M = DIP of 4.3M
 $\therefore 100 \times \tan 2.5 =$
 (0.04366)
 $100 \times 0.04366 = 4.366$
 ACTUAL FALL OF SLOPE = 4.3M
 OVER 100M.

Appendix C

From: [REDACTED]

Date: 17 February 2015 21:28:46 GMT

To: planningpolicy@fareham.gov.uk

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Issue 3: Site, Setting, Allocations, Design Principles and Character Areas (WEL3 – WEL8)

Good morning,

I have been reading a number of the Welborne evidence documents over the last week and I have a question regarding, Issue 3: Site, Setting, Allocations, Design Principles and Character Areas (WEL3 – WEL8). Could I ask if the illustration contained within appendix 2 of the documents are subject of review prior to publication and are they compared to actual topography of the land? And who signs off the documents?

As the diagram shown at section 1 of the document bears no actual resemblance to conditions on the ground.

I look forward to your response.

Regards

Adrian Saunders

Appendix D

From: Adrian Saunders [REDACTED]

Date: 3 March 2015 16:43:36 GMT

To: planningpolicy@fareham.gov.uk

Cc: info@funtleyvillagesociety.org.uk

Subject: Fwd: Issue 3: Site, Setting, Allocations, Design Principles and Character Areas (WEL3 – WEL8)

Good afternoon, I wonder if it would be possible to get an answer the question below, which was submitted on the 17th of February, would like to clear up the points made for my submission.

Best Regards

Adrian

Appendix E

Email to Mr & Mrs Byrant ward councillors

From: Adrian Saunders <[REDACTED]>

Date: 3 March 2015 17:19:40 GMT

To: pbryant@fareham.gov.uk

Subject: Welborne submissions

Good afternoon Mrs Bryant,

Really sorry to bother you but I have put some questions to the planning department on the 17th of February, and to date have not received any response. The questions directly relate to my submission response to the latest round of Welborne amendments and directly questions the credibility of data contained in :- Issue 3: Site, Setting, Allocations, Design Principles and Character Areas (WEL3 â WEL8).

My questions to planning department below :-

Good morning,

I have been reading a number of the Welborne Evidence documents over the last week and I have a question regarding:-

Issue 3: Site, Setting, Allocations, Design Principles and Character Areas (WEL3 â WEL8).

Could I ask if the illustration contained within appendix 2 of the documents are subject of review prior to publication and are they compared to actual Topography of the land? And who signs off the documents?

As the diagram shown at section 1 of the document bears no actual resemblance to conditions on the ground.

I look forward to your response.

Regards Adrian Saunders

What would be the normal time for response's from the department? I am alarmed as I carried out my own survey of the playing field slope with a theodolite. My rough calculations attached (the advantages of being an engineer for 30 years) and there is quite a difference between what is shown in diagram in the above document and actual ground conditions. I will of course be putting all my calculations drawings and photographs within my submission. This directly effects the effectiveness of the 50m buffer zone which we all know is such a short distance and could be seen as misleading to the Government inspector if these documents have not been correctly verified!

Many thanks for your time, Regards Adrian

Appendix F

From: "Bryant, Cllrs" <cllr Bryant@Fareham.Gov.UK>

Date: 5 March 2015 15:25:44 GMT

To: 'Adrian Saunders' <[REDACTED]>

Subject: RE: Welborne question to planning department

Hello Adrian

We were given the impression yesterday that a reply would be sent to you before the end of the day. However, having just spoken to Toby Ayling he informs me you contacted to him this morning and were given reasons why you haven't received a reply. Is this the case? He has now told us someone has had to go out on site prior to a reply being sent, but assures us you will receive a reply before the week-end.

As time is running out, and you probably have other commitments over the week-end, we sincerely hope you can continue to prepare your submission and enter the relevant information when it is received.

Sorry we can't be more helpful, but independently we have both tried to expedite the reply on your behalf.

Kind regards

Councillors John and Pam Bryant.

Appendix G

From: "Ayling, Toby" <[REDACTED]>

Date: 6 March 2015 09:12:37 GMT

To: "Adrian Saunders" ([REDACTED])

Cc: "Bryant, Cllrs" <cllrbryant@Fareham.Gov.UK>, "Jolley, Richard" <[REDACTED]>, "Burnett, Claire" <[REDACTED]>

Subject: FW: Issue 3: Site, Setting, Allocations, Design Principles and Character Areas (WEL3 – WEL8)

Dear Mr Saunders,

Thank you for your email regarding document CD-38: "Issue 3: Site, Setting, Allocations, Design Principles and Character Areas (WEL3 – WEL8)". I understand that you consider a response is necessary prior to you making your representations to the Proposed Modifications to the Welborne Plan.

The illustrations contained within Appendix 2 of the document CD-38 have been prepared to illustrate the Council's position regarding whether the settlement buffers set out in the Welborne Plan are appropriate. The diagrams were prepared by the Council's masterplanning consultants LDA, drawing upon typographical information drawn from the Ordnance Survey 5m contours. This represents the best information available regarding the layout of the site and is consistent with the observed typography on site.

I hope this helps clarify your query. Please do let me know if you wish to discuss this further. I am out on site this morning but will return to the office at 2pm.

I am copying in Cllrs Mr and Mrs Bryant to this response.

Regards,

Toby Ayling

Infrastructure Project and Delivery Officer (Welborne)

Fareham Borough Council

[REDACTED]