

Part A Personal Details

Title :- Mrs Elaine Tower

Address:- [REDACTED]

Email:- [REDACTED]

Tel No:- [REDACTED]

I wish to respond with my comments for the Main Modifications to the Welborne Plan

Part B Main Modifications

They are as follows:-

Response to Modifications

MM2

The New development is now listed as the first bullet point - but Welborne has been described in many guises as “a New Town”; “Eco Town” and “an Urban extension of Fareham”, by none other than FBC’s Executive Member for Planning & Development. I find that this wording which is now being offered as an “Urban Extension” under this modification only serves to contradict and confuse us rather than to clarify the issue.

On the self containment of Welborne, there is no revised transport strategy as this has been deleted in the modifications. There is no confidence in the output of the traffic model and this is therefore to be considered as incomplete, and flawed on many aspects mainly due to the fact that the traffic will head north from Welborne onto the A32 and through into Wickham and beyond to avoid the M27 and the daily delays that ensue in rush hours.

There is no definite agreed option being promulgated for the redesigned layout of J10 of the M27 – What is the impact on the SANGS that were being discussed? How are these to be evaluated? Questions we have asked but alas the answers have been rather lacking in information. No consultation has been effective in this area and I therefore consider that Fareham Common should not be included as part of the SANG provision

How can ‘carefully designed transport interventions’ minimise an already overloaded, choked up 2 lane road (A32 leading up North Hill or into Wickham Road towards Fareham) – There is no room for manouvre, or to widen any road to allow for the increase in the traffic flow – and yes there will be increased traffic flow - 6,000 houses will bring in some 12,000 cars - what roads do you think they will be using? The A32, the A27 and the M27 - These roads are already at bursting point. To have the idea that Welborne will be self contained for Jobs, schools etc is not realistic.

I therefore feel that above paragraphs demonstrate that the Plan fails to meet the requirement in terms of justification. I feel that it is not based on appropriate or proportionate evidence and should therefore be considered ‘unsound’.

MM3

I feel that the current proposals of the settlement buffers completely fail to satisfy WEL 5 (prevention of coalescence between Welborne and existing settlements). This view was shared by the FBC Councillors whose Wards are closest to Welborne At a Council Meeting held on 21st Jan these Councillors raised a number of requests to attempt to “strengthen” this Welborne Plan by asking that the size of the Settlement buffers be increased from 50 metres to 150metres or 200metres. I am sorry to say that these requests were rejected by the other FBC Councillors, who in the main have Wards which will not have such an impact on them. How can this be democracy? The Councillors should be voting for ALL residents of Fareham not just for their little pockets of ‘local idealism’.

We have raised many concerns over the settlement buffers since this new development was first mentioned way back in 2002 and it is becoming more apparent that we have NOT been listened to at all over the years.

There has been no proper consultation with local residents by FBC of whether 50, 75, 100 or even 200 metres would be acceptable as a settlement buffer. This 50 / 75 metre limit has wholly been decided by FBC - Where is the democracy in this decision? Even the Welborne Standing Conference has raised this issue but this current draft has failed to take on board the views, issues or concerns raised. There has been no evidence of FBC meeting its "Duty to Co-operate".

Based on this MM3 in this current form does not meet the "Duty to Co-operate" and is therefore not justified and is also 'unsound'

MM6

With regard to this modification the second paragraph needs more definition "Planning permission will be granted for subsequent applications which are broadly in accordance with the design principles set out in the Welborne Strategic Framework" There is no definition to the word "Broadly". What does FBC declare as "Broadly"? This is too ambiguous a word to be used here in this context. Based on this ambiguity I feel that this is 'unsound' and 'not viable' at this time.

MM10

This relates to WEL18 Affordable housing and the amendment is removing the word "expected" to "required" for the target of 30% affordable housing provision unless a robust and transparent viability appraisal proving this not to be possible is accepted by the council. Then the modification states "any phase will be 10%but will not normally exceed 40%".

If the 30% is not met on any phase what guarantee is there that the total number of affordable houses delivered at the end of all phases being completed ie. within the whole of Welborne in its entirety be the 40% that FBC have been 'stating' to us all along over the years? If the figures can be manipulated from the start - how is this legally viable? How can this development be considered in the first place beggars belief that on one hand FBC are 'promising the following "Here is the nn% of affordable homes but we can change that as the development progresses".

I find this totally unacceptable and I was under the impression that this amendment requires FBC to ensure that the number of affordable homes is relevant to the number of houses being promulgated for Welborne - 40% of 6,000 homes is 2,400 and that should be the stipulated figure from the outset.

This amendment is 'not viable' and therefore 'unsound' on the basis of the ability to change numbers of affordable houses at each phase and there is no guarantee that the 40% will ever be delivered.

MM18

WEL 37 - There is no definite provisions here as to how, nor when the details of a comprehensive waste water conveyance and treatment solution for Welborne will be instigated or even considered. How can this only be done at the planning stage? The nearest water treatment works is at least 7 miles away in Gosport. How will the sewage get there? How much disruption will there be to get the sewage pipes upgraded and inserted for Welborne?

This is all VERY reliant on Portsmouth and Southern Water companies to finance this – how do we know they have the capacity and the funds to do this huge task? There must not be any detrimental adverse effects on water quality to current residents of Fareham or Gosport.

The lie of the land is uphill from Funtley towards Welborne even though the Welborne plan does not show this explicitly or correctly. The water runoff into Funtley from Welborne is a major concern and must be addressed. We have already had flooding in Funtley whereby 1 house had to be demolished and rebuilt due to water flooding.

In para ii “Control run off etc for up to a 1 in 100 year rainfall event” This is not a substantial statement anymore and climate change is occurring we have had very wet winters over the last ‘few’ years with flooding occurring a lot more than usual so it is not 1 in 100 years event anymore.

Therefore this amendment to the Welborne plan bears no resemblance to current climate events and is therefore ‘unsound’.

MM20

To wait for 1000 households to be built before the recycling unit is delivered is madness. Where will the 1000 households take their garden waste, recycling items to? They will use the current waste recycling unit at Barnes Wallis Road, which has just had the hours CUT for opening by HCC. What a ridiculous decision. How will the residents of Welborne get to Barnes Wallis Road – they will use the A27 to Titchfield or Funtley Road leading to Segensworth Road - The A27 is already congested and the road though Funtley is at times very narrow and has a traffic light operated railway bridge for single carriage traffic. Too much traffic through Funtley is already affecting local residents as it is used as a RAT RUN when there are road closures or accidents elsewhere in Fareham or on the M27.

This makes the amendment here ‘unsound’ and ‘not viable’ as the recycling centre is required as soon as the first house is occupied to prevent over congestion on other routes.

MM21

Phases of development are not meeting the requirements of the new residents as they move onto the site starting with the first 500 houses at para 10.6 (Phase 1 2015-2019) the amendment states “An early start of employment space for small businesses, including the incubation centre is envisaged, which will help self containment. This is Not Viable as there is no mention of health facilities like a doctors surgery, there are no schools to be built at this stage.

Provision of a Primary Care Centre is not envisaged until the end of Main Phase III (2026); this should be advanced in the Phasing Plan. By Phase III some 2,800 homes will have been completed and there is no evidence being produced at any stage that the existing Surgeries within North Fareham and Wickham can cope with demand on this level.

FBC have neither sought nor received any assurances, that QA can cope; not only with the 6,000 homes being proposed for Welborne and the further 4,000 across the Borough in line with their Core Strategy, but also, there is a lot of other developments being planned within the QA Catchment area. (QA Hospital has just failed to meet its’ A & E targets again!!!! It has just been named as being the 3rd worst performing

Trust in the entire Country. Existing FBC Residents have every right to be very concerned. There has been very little, if any, attendance at Standing conference of the NHS. FBC again have failed in their 'Duty to co-operate'. The QA hospital has been permanently on Black alert for last 6-9 months so how is it going to cope with an extra 6,000 houses within the area? There has been no consultation with the CQC (Care Quality Commission), no responses or even attendance at the Standing conference from this body so how can this be Viable or Sound?

On a personal note I have to wait on average 4-6 months for a consultation at QA and there is a lead time of 2 weeks for an appt with the drs surgery. With these extra houses my health and that of many others will be put at risk!!!

Within this amendment is the J10 proposal(s) upgrade of the M27 access routes which are to be deferred for completion around 2022 and a provision of a Secondary School in about 2026 these are believed to be not only fundamentally flawed, but will also generate wholly unacceptable traffic impacts. There is no evidence being shown that traffic will only go North through Wickham at an increase of 2% - The traffic modelling has already been mentioned see MM2.

The M27 is at full capacity 24/7 - how will the ambulances on an emergency call get through when there is already talks going on of the hard shoulder being used at very busy times? How will the NHS fund the extra cover for 6,000 houses? How will the NHS deal with the aged population in their homes in these 6,000 houses? All questions that could have and should have been asked if the NHS had actually turned up at the standing conferences or if FBC had followed their 'duty to co-operate' and obtained the answers in the first place.

MM21 is therefore not only 'not viable' and 'unsound' but also 'not justified' as there is no evidence that the health of Fareham residents will not be jeopardised

MM23

There does not seem to be any mention, within this amendment to the Welborne Plan for monitoring and review, any form of contingency planning or a fallback plan with a viability risk register.

All references to the delivery of the proposed development and any risks, delays, contingency plans and viability risks must be readily available to the wider public if requested.

This is a major project with major impacts, risks and strategic aims so should follow a project timetable and structure - so where is the viability risk register and the contingency plans which do not seem to be evident within this modification.

As there is no evidence of these strategic and necessary documents within MM23, therefore, this is 'not viable' and is 'unsound' as it stands. It is 'not justified' as a project as it has missing 'critical path' project plans.