## Welborne development

### Key Issues:
In January 2017, the Government announced that the Welborne development has new ‘Garden Village’ status, reflecting its importance for the delivery of vital housing, employment, highways improvements and amenities of regional and national importance, in addition to its local importance to the borough of Fareham.

An EIA was required to be prepared in support of the outline planning application to Fareham Borough Council. This EIA was required to be robust but sufficiently flexible to meet the Applicant’s aspirations for the proposals.

Therefore, the preparation and assessment of the parameter plans submitted with the planning application were critical to ensuring a robust submission.

### Purpose of the project:
To provide an EIA to support an outline planning application to Fareham Borough Council. The site formed part of a strategic development area for a new mixed-use sustainable development identified in the Council’s Core Strategy. A subsequent site specific plan setting out how the new community of Welborne should take shape was also adopted by the Council, establishing the appropriateness of the project’s location and uses. The outline planning application with all matters reserved except for highways works allowed the Applicant to establish the general principles of how the site could be developed.

### Description of the project:
A new community of up to 6,000 dwellings, together with a district centre [comprising food store retail, non-food retail and other non-convenience/comparison retail use]; a village centre [comprising food store retail, non-food retail, a public house and other non-convenience/comparison retail use]; commercial and employment space; general industrial use; warehousing space; a hotel; community uses; ancillary nursery, health centre and veterinary services; retention of Dean Farmhouse and Dean Farm Cottages; a secondary school and 3 primary schools; green infrastructure including - formal and informal open and amenity space; retention of some existing hedgerows, grassland, woodland areas, allotments, wildlife corridors; all supporting infrastructure; household waste recycling centre; requisite sub-stations; sustainable drainage systems including ponds and water courses; a remodelled M27 J10 including noise barrier(s); works to the A32 including the creation of three highway junctions and new crossing(s); distributor roads (accommodating a Bus Rapid Transit network) and connections to the surrounding cycleway and pedestrian network; car parking to support enhanced use of Dashwood; ground remodelling; any necessary demolition; with all matters reserved for future determination with the exception of the works to M27 J10 and the three highway junctions and related works to the A32.
EIA Learning Outcomes

Lessons learnt:

The first key lesson was to understand that given the project’s 18-year construction programme, the parameter plans needed to be sufficiently flexible to allow the project to evolve over this period but that this flexibility needed to be balanced with clearly defined parameters.

The second key lesson was to carefully consider any sensitive receptors located at the site or in the surrounding area, which needed to be taken into account in the emerging parameter plans as part of an iterative process. These included sensitive views into the northern and eastern parts of the site, which were taken into account by limiting the proposed building heights and densities in these areas. In addition, a probable Neolithic long barrow was located in the central part of the site, which necessitated the proposed green infrastructure in this part of the site to ensure its protection from built development.

The third key lesson was ensuring that the EIA reflected the likely significant effects of the parameters so that appropriate mitigation could be developed accordingly. There was a risk that if the EIA assessed illustrative proposals of the scheme, rather than defined parameters, any resulting planning permission could be opened up to scrutiny on the basis that the EIA had not assessed the realistic ‘worst case’. Prior to consent, this could also result in additional information having to be submitted to the Council, which could require material changes to the application, as well as potential cost, timing and viability implications for the Applicant.

Lessons learnt continued:
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For access to more EIA case studies and hundreds of non-technical summaries of Environmental Statements visit:
https://www.iema.net/eia-quality-mark/eia-quality-mark-case-studies