



FAO Claire Jones-Hughes Programme  
Officer  
c/o Banks Solutions 6  
Brading Road  
Brighton  
BN2 3PD

December 2nd 2014

Dear Claire,

**Ref: Funtley Village Society's representation to the post Examination in Public (EiP) consultation for the Fareham Local Plan Part 3 – WP630**

Following the recent publication of the documents by Fareham Borough Council as requested by the Inspector in relation to the hearings, please see below our considered response. This is in addition to the representation made on behalf of the local community groups by David Walton, and individual representations made by Ruth Saunders (Funtley resident), Caren Ransom (Funtley resident), Stuart Tennant (Fareham resident), Shaun Cunningham (Fareham resident) and Mike Parsons (Wallington resident). The Funtley Village Society fully endorses the local community groups' representation submitted by David Walton.

**ISSUE 1: The duty to Co-operate, Legal Requirements and the Relationship between LP3, LP2, the Core Strategy and other Planning Documents CD34**

Ruth Saunders, David Walton and Stuart Tennant cover most of the points here in their respective submissions, which we concur with. It is worth stating however that we are unhappy with the current monitoring process and Fareham Borough Council (FBC) cannot currently demonstrate its robustness.

We strongly recommend that there be an independent member on the scrutiny panel and not merely allow FBC and the Landowner Developers report to the Standing Conference when they deem it in their interest to.

We also have severe misgivings about the role of the Standing Conference and cannot foresee what future role it will play in monitoring this development. We are particularly uneasy about the monitoring role being carried out by FBC and the Landowners Developers. How will their accountability be demonstrated, when they have a vested interest in Welborne being built?

### **ISSUE 3: Site, Setting, Allocations, Design Principles and Character Areas (WEL3 – WEL8) - CD38**

Maintaining settlement separation both physical and visual is of paramount importance to the residents of Funtley Village. Whilst this document clarifies in certain areas the council's policies on this matter, it is still far too vague on clear specific proposals. On page 5 of CD38 it states that *'the size of the buffer adjacent to Funtley or the planting within it may be varied along its length, to take account of the different land uses within the site.'* As the Inspector is aware, we do not believe that a minimum of a 50 meter buffer zone or more accurately a **'strategic gap'** has been adequately evidenced and justified so far and that the **'strategic gap'** should be significantly more. CD38 regrettably does not address these points. The **'strategic gap'** is of vital importance in that it clearly demonstrates the inviolability of the **'strategic gap'** and that Funtley Village maintains its character and identity and that we are not seen as 'South Welborne'.

To allay the reservations and concerns of Funtley residents, we wish to make the following proposals:

- A planting mound is raised at the outer edge of the **'strategic gap'**, which will be planted with trees. By outer edge we mean the edge of the **'strategic gap'** that is furthest away from Funtley Village. This will reinforce the physical barrier between Funtley and Welborne, but also the visual barrier as Welborne is situated on higher ground above Funtley, as the topography of the land slopes downwards to Funtley. This feature has been successfully adopted in the neighbouring village of Burrige regarding local housing development there.
- The **'strategic gap'** is fully planted with trees creating a community woodland to the benefit of both communities, creating an additional SANG and further enhancing the physical and visual separation of Funtley and Welborne. This will also help to prevent any further encroachment or development on this land.
- There are absolutely no permanent structures or buildings of any kind within the **'strategic gap'**.
- The planting should also be incorporated into the first phase of the Welborne Plan to allow the trees time to grow and to ensure that by the time the last phase of Welborne is being built, there would be an established community woodland for all residents and local wildlife to enjoy.

We believe these reasonable suggestions would satisfactorily meet the Welborne Plan's principles of 'settlement separation' and 'maintaining existing communities'.

### **ISSUE 6: Education, Community and Health Facilities (WEL14 -WEL16) – CD39**

The response by the council in CD39 shows that adequate consultation was NOT undertaken with regard healthcare provision - CD39 documents a

woeful situation.

National Planning guidance says ... *"the first point of contact on population health and well-being issues, including health inequalities, should be the Director of Public Health for the local authority or at the County Council..."*

However Appendix A of CD39 shows the Director of Public Health (Hampshire County Council) was only contacted in March 2014, by email, and there was NO RESPONSE WAS RECEIVED - this is not adequate consultation.

With regards to engagement with Fareham and Gosport Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) - contact with regards the Draft Plan was by email May 2013 - and again NO RESPONSE was received and contact with regards the Publication Plan in Feb and Apr 2014 by email - again NO RESPONSES RECEIVED!

The CCG only made sporadic Standing Conference attendance between 2010 and 2014, with the minutes showing they made little or no contributions.

With regards to the engagement of other bodies, Appendix A shows that Fareham & Gosport Drug and Alcohol Service, Fareham & Gosport Mind (Community Mental Health), Fareham Health Centre, Fareham Practice Based Commissioning Patient Group, Hampshire Community Health Care, Hampshire County Council, Health & Safety Executive, NHS Property Services, Portchester Health Centre, Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust, Stubbington Natural Health Clinic were all contacted just once by email, then by post in 2013 and 2014, without ANY RESPONSES BEING RECEIVED from these organisations! This does NOT constitute adequate consultation.

With regards to the Emergency Service contact, Appendix B shows Hampshire Police & Crime Commissioner, the South Central Ambulance Service, and Maritime and Coastguard Agency, were all contacted just once by post or email in 2013 and 2014 - without ANY RESPONSES BEING RECEIVED! Again this is NOT adequate consultation.

### **ISSUE 7: Transport, Access and Movement (WEL23 -WEL28) -CD40**

We refer to Mike Parsons erudite response to this particular document. The Inspector asked the Council for a note to explain the workings and impact of the Local Economic Impact Model, which forms part of the Sub-Regional-Transport-Model and was used by the Council and the Highways Authority to assess the likely transport impacts of Welborne. The Council responded by including a note from Systra, the consultants who carried out the modeling, in Appendix B of CD-40. We do note that no version number was stated in the note re the SRTM used. Was it version 5.4 or a later version 6.2 that was used to provide the data? As stated on the [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk) website, an earlier version of the SRTM model contained an error in the planning data. This therefore could bring into question the validity of the data used.

Mike clearly shows in his response the significant shortcomings in the

modeling used. David Walton in his response on behalf of the local community groups to this issue covers all of our reservations and concerns.

**ISSUE 8: Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and Landscape (WEL29 - WEL35) - CD41**

We do not believe this document adequately addresses the SANGS deficit. We contend that Fareham Common is not suitable as a SANG in that a SANG is meant to encourage people to use and visit it as an alternative to going to the coast. As it is by the motorway, very noisy, choked with fumes and has limited access, we do not think this would encourage residents to use it as it is intended.

Our proposal for a community woodland in the buffer zone would be suitable as an alternative site as a SANG.

Therefore on balance along with all the other issues addressed by David Walton on behalf of the local community groups, we do not believe that Fareham Borough Council has fully addressed the significant shortcomings in its Welborne Plan, as highlighted in our original response dated 5<sup>th</sup> April 2014. It cannot, in our opinion, be considered sound at this point in time.

Yours sincerely

Edward Morell

Chair, Funtley Village Society

[www.funtlevillagesociety.org.uk](http://www.funtlevillagesociety.org.uk)

[www.facebook.com/funtlevillagesociety](https://www.facebook.com/funtlevillagesociety)

Email: [info@funtlevillagesociety.org.uk](mailto:info@funtlevillagesociety.org.uk)