

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 February 2015 13:19
To: Planning Policy
Subject: CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO FBC MODIFICATIONS TO

Consultation response to the Main Modifications by Fareham Borough Council to the Welborne Plan

From: Anton Hanney

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

MM 3 (Settlement Buffers)

The current plan to observe a 50m minimum buffer between Welborne and existing settlements, and the decision taken at a meeting of Fareham Borough Council to ignore local concerns by refusing to increase that minimum, makes the assertion that the new community will be "south facing" risible. Communities to the north such as Wickham and Knowle will effectively lose their village character as a result and will be swallowed up by Welborne which FBC is now describing as an "urban extension of Fareham". This leaves the Welborne Policy to deliver "visual and physical separation" as words on paper which lack all credibility and do not reflect the reality of the serious impact that the plan will have on neighbouring settlements, particularly to the north. The situation highlights evidence that there is an unstated agenda which foresees a greater City of Fareham sprawling into the countryside of South Hampshire and an ultimate boundary change which will formalise that reality. In conclusion, MM 3 is based on misleading statements and that, together with the fact that FBC has not fulfilled its duty to take into account local community opinion on this issue, makes it unjustified and unsound.

MM 11 (South facing development) & MM 12-14 (Traffic Management)

The lack of a detailed traffic assessment in relation to Welborne, and a HCC modelling assertion that only two per cent of the traffic generated would add to the northern flow, amounts to flawed guesswork. It has little relation to common sense, but much to do with getting the "facts" to fit a determination to forge ahead with a plan that has insufficient regard to infrastructure. As a result there are likely to be dire consequences for communities lying on the A32 and A334 to the north. There is an absence of an agreed layout for the proposed Junction 10 on the M27, which the Welborne plan sets great store by as a transport panacea. Far from a panacea, the J10 plan has the hallmarks of a placebo: Even if the proposed J10 work proceeds on schedule (which is open to question), it will not be completed until 2022 at the earliest, years after hundreds of Welborne homes have been built and transport habits have become entrenched. This will be intolerable for Wickham in particular which currently is straining under the weight of up to 20,000 vehicle movements a day on the A32 and A334 which run through the village. Air quality and road safety will inevitable suffer. Traffic generated by Welborne will potentially increase movements on the A32 and A334 by thousands as it heads for destinations north or to access the M3 using back roads to avoid actual or anticipated delays on the M27, certainly before and probably after the promised J10 upgrade.

The first phase of the Welborne plan foresees hundreds of homes being built to the north of the development area, bordering the communities there. As well as further exposing the nonsense of the HCC traffic modelling, this also adds to the lack of credibility of the statement that Welborne will be "south facing".

The absence of proper traffic assessment and the patent lack of credible transport infrastructure, in the first phases, at least, of the Welborne plan, is evidence that MMs 11-14 are unjustified and unsound.

Yours sincerely

Anton Hanney