

# GOSPORT BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN REVIEW PUBLIC LOCAL INQUIRY REPORT OF THE INSPECTOR Sept 2005



# **GOSPORT BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN REVIEW**

## **PUBLIC LOCAL INQUIRY**

### **REPORT OF THE INSPECTOR**

#### **Preface**

From March to July 2005 a Public Local Inquiry was held into the representations made in respect of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review the Revised Deposit version of which was published by the Borough Council in June 2004. At this Inquiry representations were also considered by the Inspector on the Proposed Pre Inquiry Changes to the Revised Deposit version of the Local Plan Review published by the Borough Council in November 2004.

This document is the Inspector's Report on that Inquiry and was submitted to the Borough Council on 12 September 2005. It contains the Inspector's recommendations to the Borough Council on the modifications he considered should be made to the Local Plan Review, in the light of the representations made, before the Local Plan Review is finally adopted by the Borough Council.

#### **Availability of this Document**

Copies of this Report are available for inspection during normal office hours at Development Services Reception on the Third Floor of Gosport Town Hall and during opening times at the following public libraries:

Gosport Discovery Centre  
Bridgemary  
Elson  
Lee-on-the-Solent.

Further copies can be purchased:

- (i) At the Town Hall at a cost of £7.50 for residents, amenity groups and businesses located in the Borough of Gosport and £20.00 to other purchasers.
- (ii) By writing with appropriate payment to the Head of Forward Planning, Gosport Borough Council, Town Hall, High Street, Gosport, Hants, PO12 1EB; including an additional £5.00 to cover return postage and packing.

(Cheques should be made payable to Gosport Borough Council.)

The Inspector's Report will also be available on the Borough Council's Website [www.gosport.gov.uk](http://www.gosport.gov.uk).

### **Guidance Notes to the Inspector's Report**

The Inspector's Report has been reproduced here as received from the Planning Inspectorate (PINS). Minor typographical errors have not been corrected as these do not alter the meaning or recommendations of the report.

The Inspector has used the allocated response numbers for reference throughout his report.

Detailed information referred to in the Appendices to the Report may be inspected at Gosport Town Hall during normal office hours.

\*\*\*\*\*

If you have any questions regarding the Inspector's Report, or the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review, please contact the Borough Council's Forward Planning Unit: Telephone 023 92 545461.



# The Planning Inspectorate

Room 3/25 Hawk Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

Direct Line 0117-372 8906  
Switchboard 0117-372 8000  
Fax No 0117-372 6298  
GTN 1371-8906  
e-mail: [chris.pritchard@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:chris.pritchard@pins.gsi.gov.uk)  
<http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk>

---

Mr I C Lycett  
Chief Executive  
Gosport Borough Council  
Town Hall  
High Street  
Gosport  
Hampshire  
PO12 1EB

Your Ref: LO17

Our Ref: DP 569

Date: 31 August 2005

---

Dear Sir

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan**

I was appointed by the First Secretary of State to hold a Public Inquiry into objections to the Revised Deposit of the Gosport Local Plan. The Inquiry commenced on 30 March 2005 and I formally closed the Inquiry on 4 July 2005. My Report, including recommendations, is appended.

The Plan has been based on the need for sustainable communities in accordance with Government advice and I generally concur with the approach made in respect of strategy and development principles. I received no objections to the Council's decision to follow the advice of Government Office South East in extending the period of the Plan to 2016; accordingly I make no recommendations on that matter. However, I suggest that the Council should make sure that other Local Authorities in Hampshire have followed the same advice and then decide upon the strategy for Gosport Borough. Should the Council decide to revert to the original date for the expiry of the Plan, then the statistics and calculations for housing allocations should be amended. Gosport Borough is perhaps unusual in that due to Ministry of Defence brownfield land becoming available, there is unlikely to be a problem in any future supply of housing land whether or not the Plan period is extended to 2016.

I have not accepted the revised line for the urban boundary suggested by Defence Estates under Policy R/DP1 because the opportunities to use Ministry of Defence land is regularly under review and discussions held with the Council. It seems to me that rather than attempting to amend the boundary prior to the availability of the land, it would be better for discussions to be held and any changes agreed as exceptions to the Plan. But as I do not agree with the way in which Appendix B has been worded, I have suggested changes to Policy R/DP1. Paragraph 3.30 of the Plan relating to planning obligations should be amended to clearly indicate the method, formulae and purpose of such contributions; also



that repayment would be made if such contributions were not used. That must also apply to any contributions that have been passed onto the County Council.

I do understand the pride and strong feelings of residents of Lee-on-Solent in respect of the need to protect Marine Parade area and the Council's consequent Policy R/DP10. While I agree that there should be special consideration given to that area, I disagree with the approach suggested by both the Council and local people. Rather than trying to replicate the character of buildings, which in many cases do not have a very attractive appearance, the Council should seek to achieve a much higher standard of design and layout that reflects townscape qualities and the visual appearance of the seafront. Furthermore, one should not be fearful of change or different designs, because to attempt to restrict new development to the "domestic scale" suggested by the Council officers may well stifle innovative design. I commend the re-worded policy I have suggested, which I hope will guide developers into achieving improvements in design and a more attractive appearance to new development along the seafront.

I concur with the basic approach to transportation in the Plan and given the severe and difficult traffic access problems in the peninsula, it would be inappropriate to encourage transport related industries to the Borough. Accordingly, I have supported Policy R/EMP7 in avoiding low employment industries.

As far as the Housing Land Supply figures are concerned, I agree that they are reasonable. Given the evidence that I received as to the likely shortfall for such accommodation, I do support the Council's intention to set the figure for affordable housing at 40%. Although the amount of affordable homes provided by that figure will not meet demand, providing the Council make affordable homes a priority within negotiations with developers, at least a substantial amount of that type of housing will be possible.

However, I have commented upon what I have perceived to be limitations put upon the type of tenure and the number of social landlords used by the Council for affordable housing. The Council must ensure that there is a mix of both rented and homes for purchase in order to meet the demands and aspirations of local people. Furthermore, as Policy R/H5 is a planning policy, it should be administered by planning officers and they should take the lead in negotiating and determining the different tenures of affordable housing from developers.

I am aware that the issue of the Rowner Centre still causes concern. But I am satisfied that the amended policy and supporting text should assist in providing that much needed type of community facility for the area. The Council should omit criterion (vi) from Policy R/ENV9 as it is contrary to national planning advice. There should also be no unnecessary duplication of policies intended to restrict new development. I have suggested that the Council should review the extent of policies such as Urban Gaps, Open Space and Coastal Zone designations in order to ensure that they are all necessary in the locations to which they have been applied. It only needs one policy to stop development taking place on any particular site; to have several policies that are all attempting to achieve similar outcomes only results in confusion and duplication of controls. But there should be a quick and comprehensive review to check that situation before the Plan is adopted. The Council should also make further use of the Open Space Monitoring Report by determining its status and publishing regular statements of changes or improvements to open spaces mentioned in the Report.

At the request of the Council, my Report is the shortened version in that I have listed and considered the objections to the Plan supplied by the Council and my response to what I considered to be the main issues. However, I do confirm that I have read all submitted objections and letters of support.

I do urge the Council to consider carefully its response to the recommendations I have made. The format or retention of some policies suggested by the Council could undermine public confidence and both reduce the effectiveness of an otherwise commendable Local Plan and the ultimate objective of improving the quality of life for all sectors of the Gosport community.

I wish to place on record my thanks to the Council and its Officers for their assistance to me both prior to and during the Inquiry sessions. The Council's Officers made a concerted effort to keep to the programme and provide all relevant documents on time; their high level of commitment and professional expertise was a credit to the Council and the residents of the Borough. I would also pay tribute to the many people who made representations whether from large Companies or as individual residents. Without the effort and interest expressed, the policies would not have been properly tested, to the detriment of the final version of the Plan. Finally, I offer my sincere thanks to Mrs Carter, the Programme Officer for her commitment and dedication in ensuring that the programme was properly organised and the relevant information provided to all participants in an efficient manner.

A copy of this letter has been sent to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Government Office for the South East.

I commend my Report to your Council.

Yours faithfully

David G Hollis

Inspector

**GOSPORT BOROUGH**

**LOCAL PLAN**

***REPORT INTO OBJECTIONS***

***TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN***

**Inspector:** David G Hollis BA DipTP MRTPI

**Programme Officer:** Christine Carter

**Local Inquiry:** 30 March 2005 - 4 July 2005

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### PART 1 THE INSPECTOR'S REPORT

Chapter		Pages
	Background and Introduction	I
1	General comments and introduction to the Review	1 - 2
2	The Strategy	3
3	Development Principles	4 – 19
4	Transportation	20 – 25
5	Housing	26 – 44
6	Employment	45 – 50
7	Retail and Town Centres	51 – 55
8	Community and Built Leisure Facilities	56 – 66
9	Ministry of Defence	67 – 69
10	Built Heritage	70 – 74
11	Open Space and Nature Conservation	75 – 92
12	Coast and Harbour	93 – 96
13	Environmental Controls	97 – 102
14	Monitoring and Resources	103 – 104
15	Appendices	105 – 110
16	Proposals Map	111 – 113
17	Glossary of terms	114



## PART II APPENDICES

1. List of objectors
2. List of supporters
3. List of appearances for Gosport Borough Council and objectors at Inquiry sessions
4. Lists of attendances
5. Schedule of accompanied site visits
6. Lists of Inquiry proofs, written representations and core documents

## **BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION**

The Revised Deposit Local Plan covers the whole of the Borough of Gosport, including areas of water which fall within the administrative boundary. It is intended to show how the Council believes the Borough should develop and the planning policies, which will be used to encourage and guide future development and regeneration to the benefit of local residents and businesses. The Local Plan also includes proposals for conservation and environmental improvement and once adopted will replace the current Borough Local Plan adopted in April 1995.

The Council has decided, after representations from the Government Office South East (GOSE), to extend the period of the Plan from 2011 to 2016 in order that there should be a 10 year time frame from the likely time of adoption in 2006. For the future, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 has introduced fundamental changes to the development plan system and in due course, the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review will be replaced by a Local Development Framework for the Gosport Borough area.

The main functions of the Borough Local Plan Review will be to develop the policies and proposals of the approved Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996-2011, to address new and emerging issues since adoption of the previous Local Plan and take account of Government advice relating to sustainable development, community involvement and integration of land use planning with housing, economic development and transportation issues. Also to provide a land use policy framework for co-ordinating development with service providers through the development control process, as well as involving as wide a cross-section of the local community as possible.

A Sustainability Appraisal of policies and proposals, an Urban Capacity Study and an Open Space Audit have been undertaken, up-dated and published in accordance with Government advice. The Local Plan policies will be continually monitored and the Council will prepare periodic reports to ensure the success and relevance of those policies. Where necessary, those reports will be supported or enhanced by Supplementary Planning Guidance.

At the request of the Council, I have produced a shortened version of the Report. It is one in which I have listed and considered all submitted representations supplied to me by the Council and responded to what I have perceived to be the main issues raised in the objections. However, I do confirm that I have read in full all submitted objections and representations of support.

# **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

## **1. General Comments and Chapter 1: Introduction to the Review**

### **FORMAT OF THE POLICIES:**

#### **Objections:**

1/67 - Government Office for the South East

#### **Main Issues:**

- Policies do not make clear if all or only one of the criteria listed should be complied with, in order for planning permission to be granted.
- PPG12 states that policies should be clearly and unambiguously expressed.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 1.1 In general, I concur with the changes made by the Council in the Second Deposit of the Plan and to those changes suggested in the Council's Proposed Further Amendments (PFA) document dated April 2005. The changes in the various places throughout the Plan should assist in the interpretation of the policies. Where I consider the policies or criteria need further clarification, I have recorded my views against each individual policy or paragraph of the Plan. Although no comment of objection has been received by the Council in respect of the extension of the period of the Local Plan up to 2016, I suggest it would be sensible if the Council make sure that it has achieved consistency with other Local Authorities in Hampshire. If the Council decide to keep the date at 2016, it would be better to include an explanation and reason for the extension in time period within paragraph 1.1. If the Council decide to revert to the original date, then the statistics under Policy RH/1 should be amended.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 1.2 That the Plan be amended in accordance with my comments.

### **PARAGRAPH 1.4, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 1: THE PROCESS OF REVIEWING THE LOCAL PLAN**

#### **Objections:**

CO/75/02 - Mr Brian Hart, Brian Filmer Hart Ltd

# Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

## Main Issues:

- The original wording 'in accordance with' should be re-inserted because it emphasises that the Local Plan shall be in the public interest (75/02)

## Conclusions:

- 1.3 Although I use the expression mentioned by the objector regularly in my comments upon the various aspects of the Plan, when anyone seeks to interpret the policies of the Plan, there is very often a need to balance the requirements of one policy against those of another. Accordingly, the use of "in accordance with" in paragraph 1.4 would introduce a rather prescriptive overtone. I suggest that the objection may be resolved, as well as retaining some flexibility, by the introducing "which generally reflects" to replace "reflecting" in the second sentence of this paragraph.

## Recommendation:

- 1.4 That paragraph 1.4 be amended to add the words "which generally reflects" instead of "reflecting" in the second sentence.

That PIC 1 be not adopted.

## **PARAGRAPH 1.10, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 2: THE PLANNING & COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004**

## Objections:

No representations received.

## Conclusions:

- 1.5 As the proposed change is intended to up-date the reference to legislation used in the Plan, I concur with the amendment.

## Recommendation:

- 1.6 That PIC 2 be adopted.

# Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

## 2. Chapter 2: The Strategy

### **PARAGRAPH 2.2 including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 3: NATIONAL PLANNING GUIDANCE**

#### **Objections:**

No representations received.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 2.1 As the proposed change is intended to up-date the reference to legislation used in the Plan, I concur with the amendment.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 2.2 That PIC 3 be adopted.

### **PARAGRAPHS 2.3-2.7A, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Changes 4/5: REGIONAL PLANNING GUIDANCE**

#### **Objections:**

1/04 - Government Office for the South East

#### **Main Issues:**

- The Plan should fully accord with Policy Q2 of Regional Planning Guidance 9 (RPG9) and set out an overall strategy for enhancing the quality of life in each urban area, making optimum use of existing buildings.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 2.3 I agree with the Council that paragraph 2.5a and PIC 5 adequately demonstrates the sentiments of Policy Q2 of the Regional Planning Guidance. As PIC 4 is intended to up-date the Plan in accordance with new legislation, I concur with that amendment.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 2.4 That paragraph 2.5a and PICs 4 and 5 be adopted.

# Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

## 3. Chapter 3: Development Principles

### **PARAGRAPH 3.2: INTRODUCTION TO DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES**

#### **Objections:**

22/06 - Lee Residents' Association

#### **Main Issues:**

Development Briefs and Action Plans are not obligatory and consequently their status needs clarification.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 3.1 Development Briefs, Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance do not form part of the adopted Plan; they are intended to act purely as guidance. The only policies that are able to be statutorily adopted are those within the Plan. However, the objection does make a reasonable point and I see no reason why an explanation should not be included within paragraph 3.2. I suggest the words “Although not part of the adopted Local Plan ...” be added to the beginning of that paragraph. For ease of reading and consistency I suggest that the first sentence of paragraph 3.1 should read “The implementation of the Local Plan Review proposals ...”

#### **Recommendation:**

- 3.2 That the words “Although not part of the adopted Local Plan ...” be added at the start of the first sentence of paragraph 3.2.
- 3.3 That paragraph 3.1 be amended to replace “Review’s” with “Review”.

### **PARAGRAPHS 3.11-3.12A, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 6: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS AND APPROPRIATE ASSESSMENTS**

#### **Objections:**

22/10 - Lee Residents' Association

8/09 - English Nature

10/01- RSPB

# Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

## Main Issues:

- Assessments commissioned by a developer lack credibility ( 22/10).
- Reference should be made to Strategic Environmental Assessments (8/09).
- Further clarification is required regarding the definition of Ramsar Sites (10/01).

## Conclusions

- 3.4 The requirements of Environmental Impact Assessments are clearly set out in national planning regulations; developers are required to provide clear and proper information and it is then for the Council to carry out consultations with the various relevant national organisations. It would not be appropriate for a further body to be part of that assessment process. I support the changes made in the Second Deposit of the Plan, as well as PIC 6, as they clarify the status and requirements regarding Environmental Assessments and Ramsar sites.

## Recommendation:

- 3.5 That paragraphs 3.11-3.12a and PIC 6 be adopted.

## POLICY R/DP1:

### GENERAL STANDARDS OF DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE URBAN AREA (*OMISSION SITE*)

## Objections:

13/01 - Defence Estates

## Main Issues:

- Include part of the site at DM Gosport within the Urban Area Boundary, as defined on the Proposals Map.

## Conclusions:

- 3.6 I have inspected the areas referred to by the objector and do not accept the basis of the suggested changes. The areas consist of a mixture of buildings and open areas. To my mind the Council's suggested amendments would

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

produce a consistent and reasonable urban area. The land referred to by the objector are locations used by the Ministry of Defence for specific purposes; if there is a further review, it will be a matter of negotiation with the Council in the future. Proposals or policies should relate to the draft Plan and be implemented within the Plan period. As the objector has not stated to what use the areas proposed to be included would be used, or when the land would be available, there is little point in changing the Plan at this time.

### **Recommendation:**

- 3.7 That the urban boundary be amended on the Proposals Map in accordance with Plan 1 of proof GBC/R/DP1/B.

### **POLICY R/DP1: GENERAL STANDARDS OF DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE URBAN AREA (*OMISSION SITE*)**

#### **Objections:**

35/01 - Abbey Developments Limited

#### **Main Issues:**

- Include land at Stokesmead Field, Alverstoke within the Urban Area.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 3.8 For my comments and conclusions, see Policy R/OS3.

### **Recommendation:**

- 3.9 That land at Stokesmead Field be not included within the Urban Boundary.

### **POLICY R/DP1: GENERAL STANDARDS OF DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE URBAN AREA AND APPENDIX B: DESIGN GUIDANCE FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.**

#### **Pre-Inquiry Changes 7, 8 and 9.**

#### **Objections:**

CO/82/04 - Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited



# Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

## Main Issues:

- The proposed deletion of the 'test' of materiality and significance in terms of the effect/harm of development proposals.
- The stringent application of the design guidance at Appendix B. There needs to be recognition of the particular circumstances relating to the site and other competing needs, such as the objective to achieve higher densities.

## Conclusions:

- 3.10 In their proof of evidence, the Council contend that Appendix B is only intended to provide guidelines and not rigid standards to be applied to all new developments. Whilst I support guidelines, it should remain as such and not be elevated to planning policy as proposed in criterion (ix). To complicate matters, guidance for landscaping is included within paragraph 3.16 of the Plan, but not in Appendix B. I suggest that reference to the guidelines in Appendix B should be within the text, but that it be made very clear they are only given as examples and not to be followed slavishly to the exclusion of innovative design or higher densities.
- 3.11 As far as Appendix B is concerned, the advice in section 1(i) is quite acceptable. But sections 1(ii), (iii) and (iv) are far too prescriptive. The advice in Appendix B states that it is not intended as rigid standards, but then sets out criteria which read precisely as rigid standards. If all new developments are required to follow that advice, it could result in poor standards of design, the prevention of innovative layouts and low density developments.
- 3.12 Section 2 of Appendix B also sets out what appears to be rigid standards. Reference to the length of gardens being the minimum necessary and the setting of a specified area for amenity purposes is likely to be seen as rigid formulae and contrary to national planning guidance. It again becomes confusing in section 2 (ii) when the Council suggests it may not always be appropriate to provide the very level of communal open space that it has set out in detail. Again, in section 2(iii) the Council seeks to impose a rigid formula for private amenity space.
- 3.13 It is my advice that the Council substantially revise Appendix B to make sure it does not attempt to impose rigid standards or formulae that could stifle innovative design and proper density levels. In both Policy R/DP1 and Appendix B, the Council should rely far more on the ability of officers to negotiate proper and satisfactory development schemes rather than try to set rigid standards.

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

- 3.14 The word “significantly” in paragraph 3.21 should be re-instated as the present wording would allow no flexibility. I also recommend the insertion of that word within parts of the various criteria in the policy. I concur with the Council’s request to replace “standards” with “guidelines” in paragraph 3.20 for the very reasons I have given in the preceding paragraphs of my conclusions. I support PICs 7, 8 and 9 as they comply with Government advice; although there is usually no need for cross-referencing in policy wording as the Plan should be read as a whole, such content in the supporting text can be helpful.

### **Recommendation:**

- 3.15 That Policy R/DP1 be amended as follows:

Development proposals will be permitted within the urban area as defined on the Proposals Map provided that:

- i) the scheme does not cause significant harm to the character of the surrounding area in terms of scale, setting, design, layout, materials, landscaping and retention of important views;
- ii) significant harm is not caused to the historic environment, including buildings and structures of national and local importance, nature conservation interests and important landscape features;
- iii) as per PIC 7;
- iv) there is no significant loss of amenity in terms of traffic generation, noise, vibration, smell and pollution;
- v) there is no significant loss of residential amenity, any new scheme does not prevent the ability in appropriate circumstances to obtaining the proper comprehensive development of adjoining land and any layout is designed to reduce the potential for criminal activity and anti-social behaviour;
- vi) appropriate infrastructure, safe access and parking arrangements are provided or are available to the site and
- vii) it can be demonstrated that the risk of flooding both to the proposed development and arising from the development has been appropriately considered and that the proposal incorporates relevant on-site or off-site flood prevention measures as appropriate.

- 3.16 That the supporting text be amended to refer to Appendix B and reflect my comments.

- 3.17 That Appendix B be substantially revised to reflect my comments.

- 3.18 That PICs 8 and 9 be adopted.

# Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

## **POLICY R/DP2: DEVELOPMENT BRIEFS AND ACTION PLANS**

### **Objections:**

13/03 – Defence Estates

### **Main Issues:**

- The term ‘historically sensitive locations’ is ambiguous. Further clarification is required including the designation of such sites on the Proposals Map.

### **Conclusions:**

- 3.19 I do not oppose the Council preparing Development Briefs or Action Plans, but should a developer approach the Council in accordance with the advice in paragraph 3.29, it will be necessary for the Council to prepare such a scheme promptly and within a specified time span. The alternative is that the developer would have to do the work. I suggest that at the end of the first sentence to paragraph 3.28, the Council gives a reasonable time span for them to undertake the work. In the Second Deposit of the Plan, the Council has amended criterion (ii) of the policy to clarify which sites are covered by the policy. I concur with that clarification. Given the likely situations where a Development Brief may be required, it would not be practical to designate each site on the Proposals Map. I also support the changes made to the text.

### **Recommendation:**

- 3.20 That Policy R/DP2 and the text be adopted subject to my comments regarding paragraph 3.28.

## **POLICY R/DP3, AND PARAGRAPHS 3.30 AND 3.33: PROVISION OF INFRASTRUCTURE, SERVICE AND FACILITIES**

### **Objections:**

22/13- Lee Residents Association  
2/05 - Hampshire County Council: Estates Practice

# Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

## Support:

Sup/8/14 - English Nature  
Sup/11/08 - Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust  
Sup/14/03 - Southern Water  
Sup/22/12 - Lee Residents' Association  
Sup/22/14 - Lee Residents' Association

## Main Issues:

- Developer contributions should also deal with existing deficiencies (22/13).
- No reference is made to key worker housing, waste management and recycling facilities, libraries or the Police and Fire Services (2/05).

## Conclusions:

- 3.21 I do not agree with the suggestions made by the Lee Residents Association; the inference made in the objection is that all existing deficiencies in an infrastructure should be made good by a developer, even if it is unrelated to a proposed development scheme. That would be quite unreasonable and contrary to High Court rulings. I support the amendment suggested by the Council in PFA 4.
- 3.22 Regarding the comments raised by the County Council to paragraph 3.33, I suspect that in order to be helpful, the Borough Council have complicated matters by listing some examples, but inevitably missing some that objectors consider should be included. I suggest that the first sentence of the paragraph should include the words “the following list is intended to contain examples, but the list is not exhaustive”. As far as key worker housing is concerned, the future of such housing is not yet clear and it may be that such provision will have to be a political or corporate initiative for Local Authorities rather than one that is part of the affordable housing list. I do not advise that paragraph 3.33 should contain a reference to key workers.
- 3.23 Although paragraphs 3.31/32 refer to planning obligations, no mention is made of formulae by which assessments for contributions would be made or the length of time financial contributions would be retained and the circumstances under which such monies would be repaid with interest by the Borough Council. The precise amount or circumstances of the contributions would depend on which category was required. But a clear method of assessment, provision or method of payment, as well as time limits for retention of contributions prior to the work being carried out, should be

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

included in this section as it refers to development principles. Also, repayments if the work is not done within a specified period.

- 3.24 It would also be appropriate to include these matters within Appendix P, paragraph 9, but that process also needs further clarification relating to the points I have mentioned earlier. At the Inquiry, it was suggested that some developer contributions would be transferred to the County Council to pay for work that comes under their jurisdiction. However, it would still be the responsibility of the Borough Council, as Planning Authority, to ensure by way of a legal agreement with the County Council that either the work was done or monies spent for the purposes intended within a specified time or it would be returned by the County Council with interest to the developer.

### **Recommendation:**

- 3.25 That paragraph 3.30 be amended in accordance with PFA 4.
- 3.26 That amendment be made to paragraph 3.33 in accordance with my comments.
- 3.27 That an additional paragraph be added that sets out the process and procedures relating to planning obligations in accordance with my comments; that Appendix P be amended in accordance with my comments.

### **POLICY R/DP4 AND PARAGRAPHS 3.36-3.53, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 10: MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT**

#### **Objections:**

1/06 - Government Office for the South East (GOSE)  
19/05 - Environment Agency  
19/07 - Environment Agency

#### **Support:**

Sup/22/15 - Lee Residents' Association

#### **Objections to proposed Pre-Inquiry Changes 26 & 30 to Policy H3 and 5.24b with links to Policy R/DP4:**

PIC/83/02 - Mr R V Perry

# Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

## Main Issues:

- It is not clear how the provision of shopping and leisure at the mixed use sites accords with the advice in the Caborn Statement (1999) with regard to establishing the needs for the development and adopting a sequential approach to identify sites (1/06).
- Similarly, office development at Daedalus and Priddy's Hard does not appear to fully accord with the advice in PPG6, which states that the sequential test should also apply to all key town centre uses, such as offices (1/06).
- PPG13 indicates the importance of accessibility for mixed use schemes (1/06).
- The Plan should require the phasing of sites being released for development in order to co-ordinate growth, particularly with the introduction of SHRT (1/06).
- Further information is required with regard to the Coldharbour site concerning landfill and flood defence considerations (19/05).
- Further information is required with regard to the Priddy's Hard Heritage Area concerning flood defence considerations (19/07).
- Policy R/H3 in combination with Policy R/DP4 would have the effect of permitting the loss of the present ferry workshop and associated quayside area at Coldharbour to alternative uses, particularly residential development. Conversion of the site and the surrounding area to non-industrial and residential uses would create relocation problems for other industrial/boat type uses (PIC/83/02)

## Conclusions:

- 3.28 As far as the objections from GOSE are concerned, I agree with the Council that the changes made in the Second Deposit of the Plan have dealt properly with a number of those matters. I consider that in general, the sites referred to and intended for mixed-use developments are in accessible locations and in keeping with the advice in PPS1. I also note the principle that retail areas are intended to serve the needs of local residents and employees and would therefore be small scale. Accordingly, the text to the policy should give a clear indication of those circumstances and the reasons for the allocations, including the tests set out in Policy R/S2.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

3.29 Dealing with the issue of the phasing of development and the South Hampshire Rapid Transit (SHRT) are concerned, I have concluded that it is sufficient to rely upon the continuing discussions with Defence Estates and other Government Agencies to phase the release of land. The introduction of PICs 16, 17 and 18 should overcome the uncertainty still associated with SHRT. But all of these matters should be explained in detail within this section of the Development Principles Chapter rather than rely on the references given in Chapters 4 and 7.

3.30 I have already accepted PICs 7, 8 and 9 and that should overcome the objections from the Environment Agency. The Council have also proposed further amendments to paragraph 6.19 in response to the objection to development at the Coldharbour area (PIC 83/02). I agree with those changes as they would allow for those circumstances related by that objector. Again, such details should be included within paragraph 3.40 as this Chapter deals with development principles. I agree with the factual up-date in PIC 10.

### **Recommendation:**

3.31 That the text be amended to refer to the matters raised in my comments.

3.32 That paragraph 3.42 be amended in accordance with PIC 10.

### **POLICY R/DP7: ADDITIONS, EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS**

#### **Objections:**

19/10 - Environment Agency

#### **Main Issues:**

- The Policy does not give the appropriate level of consideration to the risk of flooding for extensions of existing buildings.
- There is concern that the policy does not make reference to land contamination, particularly to prevent the re-mobilisation of contamination through alterations to sites' drainage arrangements.
- In its supporting text, this Policy should also include a further paragraph that makes clear cross-reference to both PPG25 and Plan Policy R/ENV1.

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

### Conclusions:

- 3.33 I have already concurred with PICs 7, 8 and 9 earlier in the Report as they properly respond to the objection. Under Policy R/DP1, I have commented upon Appendix B; the Council should also re-consider the wording of Policy R/DP7 and the text, particularly criterion (iv) and paragraph 3.60 in the light of my earlier comments.

### Recommendation:

- 3.34 That Policy R/DP7 and the text be revised in accordance with my earlier suggestions.

### **POLICY R/DP8 AND PARAGRAPH 3.61, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 11: PROTECTION OF TREES**

### Objections:

1/08 - Government Office for the South East  
CO/20/06 - Gosport Society

### Main Issues:

- The Policy does not fully accord with Section 198 of the Act relating to dead, dying or dangerous trees (1/08).
- Consent from the Local Authority should still be required even if a protected tree is dead, dying or dangerous (CO/20/06).

### Conclusions:

- 3.35 The changes made in the Second Deposit of the Plan are reasonable and should overcome the objections made by GOSE. It is not legally possible to include the suggestions made by the Gosport Society; the Council's amendments in PIC 11 do clarify the situation.

### Recommendation:

- 3.36 That Policy R/DP8 and the text be adopted subject to PIC 11.



## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **POLICY R/DP10, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 12, PARAGRAPHS 3.65 TO 3.70 AND APPENDIX E, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 73: MARINE PARADE AREA OF SPECIAL CHARACTER**

#### **Objections:**

1/09 - Government Office for the South East  
22/18 - Lee Residents' Association  
22/19 - Lee Residents' Association  
CO/36/07 - McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd  
57/01 - Ms Kay Blank  
60/01 - Mr Brian Smith  
71/01 - Mr & Mrs A B Vernon  
CO/77/01 - Mr R G Wallace  
CO/79/02 - Youngs Developments Ltd

#### **Support:**

Sup/22/42 - Lee Residents' Association  
Sup/48/01 - Tourism South East  
Sup/53/01 - Ms Kathleen Roast  
Sup/68/03 - Mrs S George

#### **Main Issues:**

- Detailed design guidance should be the subject of Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), not a Local Plan policy (1/09, 79/02).
- Policy R/DP10 should be strictly adhered to, including that no roof level should be beyond what the Plan states (57/01).
- The Policy needs to be strengthened and refer to criteria relating to storeys and metres (22/18).
- Policy needs to be strengthened to limit the number of flats along the seafront (57/01 & 71/01).
- Ancillary roof structures should be within the height limit specified in metres (22/18).
- Future development should not raise the roof level on any plot above the height of the present building (60/01).

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

- There should be specific reference ruling out attempts to justify large buildings on the grounds that equally large buildings already exist (22/18).
- Appendix E para 3 should be amended to specify a maximum width for any one block (22/18).
- The spacing distances given in Appendix E, para 5, for a 4.5 storey block seems less than would be afforded by Appendix B. The spacing for 3.5 storeys should be given (22/18).
- Policy R/DP10 places onerous requirements on developers (CO/79/02).
- It is considered unreasonable to designate Marine Parade as an Area of Special Character and consequently it would not be appropriate to place extra controls on development (CO/79/02).
- Policy R/DP10 is overly prescriptive and therefore contrary to the requirements of PPG3 which endorses a more flexible approach to development plan standards (CO/79/02).
- The Policy places an effective moratorium on "high density flatted development" which is not adequately justified and runs contrary to PPG, RPG and Structure Plan Guidance (CO/36/07).
- The Policy is over prescriptive with regard to the exact height of buildings, it should seek to encourage high quality design that respects the local townscape (CO/36/07).
- Modern construction standards allow reduced ceiling heights and therefore more storeys to be achieved at a reduced overall building height. The construction of "rooms in the roof" allows three-storey units to be constructed at the same height as two-storey (CO/79/02).
- The insistence upon access from the service road is considered inappropriate if an alternative means of access is capable of being provided without detriment to highway safety or the pursuit of other planning objectives (CO/36/07).
- The demarcation line between "Central Section B" and "Western Section C" is in the wrong position. It is considered inappropriate to only permit The Drift to have up to two floors when it is flanked by No.31, built on 3 floors and No.30 built to 4.5 floors (CO/77/01).

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

### Conclusions:

- 3.37 At the Inquiry session dealing with the Marine Parade area, it was said that this policy was not intended to be restrictive, but to reflect the domestic scale of parts of the frontage development, as well as those sections that have higher buildings. The Council has no objection to the demolition of any specific building along Marine Parade, as none have individual merit; the attractiveness was said to be in the overall group value of buildings and the character they produce. The amended policy wording, and that in Appendix E, is intended to accord with the detailed design criteria set out in CD 3/1 – the Marine Parade Area of Special Character Supplementary Guidance. In practical terms, where reference is made for example to 2-storey development, it does allow for accommodation within the roof space; this would in effect produce a 3-storey building.
- 3.38 I have given this policy particularly careful attention and walked the area several times. Given the prominent location of the Marine Parade area and the importance placed upon it by the Council and local people, I do agree that a designation is justified. However, that does not mean that all new development need replicate the existing built form. In my opinion, the overriding objective should be to obtain a high standard of design and for the scale and form of new development to improve the general appearance of the frontage buildings and the locality.
- 3.39 I do not consider that most buildings along the frontage have a particularly attractive character and I really do not agree with the suggestions of the Conservation Officer and the Council that there is a need to retain a “domestic” scale to development; simply because a scheme exceeds the height of existing buildings does not seem to me to be a valid reason to oppose such development. However, I do agree that it is necessary to protect the amenities of residential properties at the rear of the Marine Parade, but that may be covered by ensuring a designer takes full account of such a matter when preparing a new scheme. Given the position and bulk of some existing buildings, it seems to me that little account was taken of these matters when permitting development in the past.
- 3.40 The proposal to extend the designation in a western direction would be correct as it would include the few remaining buildings. But I am concerned at the extension to the east. If it is the Council’s intention to raise the design and standard of new schemes in that area, then I see little harm. But if it is simply a mechanism by which the Council seek to restrict the height and scale of new development, then I do not consider the Council is justified in such a change. The Council has sufficient powers under its development control procedures to assess whether a scheme would cause significant harm to the character of the area or to the amenities of local people.

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

- 3.41 In my opinion, the policy, text and Appendix E are framed and worded in a manner that would be far too restrictive and likely to stifle a proper standard of innovative design. That would reflect poorly on the Borough and Lee-on-Solent in particular. I agree there is a need to retain “local distinctiveness”, but that does not mean the policy should be unnecessarily restrictive or attempt to replicate existing, often poor, designs.
- 3.42 I suggest that Policy R/DP10 is re-worded to enhance the objective of improved designs for new buildings, the standard of materials used and to reflect the general character of the Marine Parade frontage. Also, that the design and layout of any new development pays careful attention to preserving the residential amenities of adjoining dwellings. I recommend that Appendix E be deleted. I concur with the comments of GOSE that the wording of the policy and Appendix E is far too detailed; such detail could be in Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). If that approach is taken I can see little objection to the Council giving examples of good design, but it should be made very clear that the Council is looking for good innovative design that improves the character of the designated area. It should also be made clear that the SPG is intended as guidance and is not prescriptive.
- 3.43 Regarding vehicular access, I agree with the Council’s suggested changes made in PFA 5 in respect of paragraph 3.70, including the deletion of reference to commuted payments. However, I recommend the word “seek” rather than “require”. Where a new development is proposed, the Council should seek to improve and widen rear access areas in order to provide a proper and safe access for vehicles serving existing properties. Where it is shown that it would be preferable to have a direct access onto Marine Parade, which would not be at the expense of maintaining a high standard of design or detriment to highway safety, then that could be permitted.
- 3.44 I agree with the Residents Association that it should be the Council’s long-term aim to remove all “pinch-points” and widen access areas to make them acceptable and safe for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. As far as the other matters raised by objectors, given my earlier comments, I do not agree there should be an additional criterion that excludes the issue of precedence. It would be neither proper nor practical, particularly when there is a need to improve the overall design and character of buildings along the Marine Parade frontage.
- 3.45 Neither do I accept the need to put excessively restrictive limitations on new development schemes that unnecessarily restrict the ability of future designers to up-grade and greatly improve the appearance of this part of Lee-on-Solent. Residents, objectors and the Council are right to be proud of the sea front area, but they should seek to achieve better standards of design rather than to limit innovation. National planning advice urges Local Authorities to adopt a

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

flexible approach when applying development plan policies; to be excessively prescriptive would be contrary to national, regional and Structure Plan guidance.

- 3.46 There should be an amendment to the definition in the Glossary, as this designation does not have as high a status as a Conservation Area. I concur with PIC 12 as it corrects a typographical error.

### **Recommendation:**

- 3.47 That Policy R/DP10 be re-worded as follows:

“Within the Marine Parade Area of Special Character development proposals will be permitted subject to the following criteria:

- i) new development schemes reflect the scale and layout of nearby development:
- ii) a high standard of design and layout is achieved that reflects the townscape qualities and visual appearance of the seafront:
- iii) there is proper and adequate protection given to the residential amenities of adjoining properties:
- iv) vehicular access is achieved via rear service areas, except where it has been demonstrated that it would be preferable to gain access from Marine Parade in terms of maintaining road safety, there would be no significant increase in traffic flow or detriment to the overall character and design of the new scheme”

- 3.48 That the text be revised to reflect the re-worded policy, set the factual and historical background to the area and the overall objectives of the policy.

- 3.49 That Appendix E be deleted.

- 3.50 That the Marine Parade Area of Special Character SPG be revised to reflect a detailed explanation of the revised Policy R/DP10 and its text. Examples may be given to demonstrate how new development schemes could achieve both innovative design and the objectives of the policy. It should be made clear that the SPG is intended only as guidance and not a restriction upon new development schemes.

- 3.51 That the Council re-assess the need to extend the designation eastwards.

**4. Chapter 4: Transportation**

**PARAGRAPH 4.6, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 13:  
POLICY BACKGROUND**

**Objections:**

No representations received

**Conclusions:**

- 4.1 As the change is a factual up-date, I concur with the amendment.

**Recommendation:**

- 4.2 That PIC 13 be adopted.

**PARAGRAPH 4.7, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 14:  
OBJECTIVES FOR TRANSPORT**

**Objections:**

8/17 - English Nature

**Support:**

Sup/25/02 - Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group  
Sup/9/09 - The Countryside Agency

**Main Issues:**

- Paragraph does not refer to nature conservation and biodiversity enhancement.

**Conclusions:**

- 4.3 PIC 14 contains changes that properly respond to the objection.

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

### **Recommendation:**

- 4.4 That PIC 14 be adopted.

### **POLICY R/T2, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 15, PARAGRAPHS 4.9-4.12 AND PROPOSED NEW PARAGRAPH 4.12A: NEW DEVELOPMENT**

#### **Objections:**

8/18 - English Nature

#### **Main Issues:**

- Justification text does not adequately refer to nature conservation and biodiversity enhancement.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 4.5 I concur with PIC 15 amendment to the policy and the additional paragraph 4.12a as they respond properly to the objectives suggested by English Nature. I suggest that the wording in PIC 15 be slightly amended to read “new development will need to take full account of nature conservation interests ..”.

### **Recommendation:**

- 4.6 That the amended PIC 15 be adopted.

### **PARAGRAPH 4.15: LAYOUT OF NEW DEVELOPMENT**

#### **Objections:**

13/05 - Defence Estates

#### **Main Issues:**

- If there is a frequent and regular quality bus service people may be prepared to walk further than 400 metres.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **Conclusions:**

- 4.7 Paragraph 4.15 indicates that the reference to 400 metres is intended as a general guide as to the reasonable distances people will walk. I do not accept that the objector's suggested changes are necessary.

### **Recommendation:**

- 4.8 That paragraph 4.15 be adopted without further amendment.

### **POLICY R/T5, PARAGRAPHS 4.17- 4.20, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 16: PUBLIC TRANSPORT - SOUTH HAMPSHIRE RAPID TRANSIT**

#### **Objections:**

CO/1/68 - Government Office for the South East  
25/08 - Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group  
58/01 - Mr Andrew Shaw

#### **Support:**

Sup/13/06 - Defence Estates  
Sup/17/01 - Network Rail

#### **Main Issues:**

- Policy and accompanying paragraph should be amended to reflect the current position with regard to the SHRT scheme (CO/1/68).
- The Plan should safeguard a route for a possible future extension of the SHRT scheme to Lee-on-the-Solent (25/08).
- The proposed depot area contains an area of mature oak woodland and it is inappropriate for it to be developed for any other use except in connection with the SHRT scheme (58/01).

### **Conclusions:**

- 4.9 As there has been a change in the likely implementation of the SHRT scheme since the publication of the Second Deposit of the Plan, I concur with PIC 16; those changes also properly respond to the objections from GOSE. However,



## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

I suggest PIC 16 be amended by omitting the words “after a period of some time” as those words are unnecessary. The changes suggested by Mr Shaw are very relevant and I support the Council’s further amendments to paragraph 4.19 in PFA 6.

- 4.10 Given the doubt regarding the implementation of the SHRT scheme, I do not support the suggestions made by the Gosport and Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group; any proposal within the Plan should have a reasonable expectation of implementation within the period of the Plan. Furthermore, the Local Transportation Plan is a document prepared by the County Council and Policy R/T5 seeks to safeguard a route that has already been determined by the County Council under their Plan. Accordingly, it is not for this Local Plan to seek to change something over which the Borough Council has no control.

### **Recommendation:**

- 4.11 That PIC 16 be adopted subject to the amendment I have suggested.
- 4.12 That PFA 6 be adopted.

### **PARAGRAPHS 4.22/4.23, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 17: PUBLIC TRANSPORT INTERCHANGE**

#### **Objections:**

25/11 - Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group

#### **Main Issues:**

- The cost of the ferry is a disincentive to many people. The Council is urged to consider subsidising the ferry, and possibly even making it free at the point of use.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 4.13 While I applaud the sentiment in this objection, such a matter is not a land use planning issue and should not be included in the Plan. I concur with PIC 17 as it would reflect the current situation.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **Recommendation:**

- 4.14 That PIC 17 be adopted.
- 4.15 That no further change be made.

### **POLICY R/T8 AND PARAGRAPH 4.26, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 18:**

#### **HIGHWAY NETWORK – SAFEGUARDING**

### **Objections:**

25/12- Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group  
58/02 - Mr Andrew Shaw

### **Support:**

Sup/4/06 - Fareham Borough Council

### **Main Issues:**

- The two identified schemes are not needed. Bypass type solutions are not justified in Gosport, given the lack of through traffic resulting from the peninsular nature of the Borough (25/12).
- The Newgate Lane Improvement Scheme will take up open space between Bridgemary and Newgate Lane. The proposed new road will bring the pollution of this main route closer to residents. It will also facilitate the filling-in of the Brookers "Green Space" with developments (58/02).

### **Conclusions:**

- 4.16 The Cherque Farm Link Road is already under construction; except for a small section of highway, the Newgate Lane Improvement Scheme is within the Fareham District and that Authority has already adopted that highway scheme. Furthermore, both schemes are of long-standing and the Structure Plan Review has safeguarded both proposals. I concur with the Council that both schemes are relevant and needed in the interest of a proper highway system for the peninsula. I concur with PIC 18 as it reflects the current situation.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **Recommendation:**

- 4.17 That PIC 18 be adopted.
- 4.18 That no further change be made.

### **POLICY R/T9: CYCLEWAYS AND FOOTPATHS**

#### **Objections:**

50/03 - Mr John Jones

#### **Support:**

Sup/25/13 - Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group

#### **Main Issues:**

- Cycle tracks reduce the width of the roads which is potentially unsafe to other users, particularly motorcyclists.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 4.19 Whilst I generally support Policy R/T9, the Council as Planning Authority has a duty to ensure that all policies in the Plan are proper and practical. In this case there is a duty to ensure that cycle tracks, particularly those that form part of the public highway, are safe for cyclists and do not cause significant harm to the interest of other road users. Provided the Council is able to confirm in the text that such a check has been made, I see no reason to amend the policy.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 4.20 That Policy R/T9 be adopted.
- 4.21 That confirmation regarding the safety of cycle tracks be included within the text.

**5. Chapter 5: Housing**

**PARAGRAPH 5.7, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 19:  
POLICY BACKGROUND**

**Objections:**

1/17 - Government Office for the South East

**Main Issues:**

- The Housing Chapter does not fully reflect the advice in RPG9 Policy Q2, which states that the quality of life in urban areas should be raised through significant improvements to the urban environment.
- Development plans should set out an overall strategy for enhancing the quality of life in each urban area.

**Conclusions:**

- 5.1 I concur with the Council that the changes made in the Second Deposit of the Plan and PIC 19 contain a proper response to the objection. However, the reference in PIC 19 to an Action Plan does need further explanation of the content of that Plan and where it may be found.

**Recommendation:**

- 5.2 That paragraph 5.7 be adopted.
- 5.3 That PIC 19 be adopted subject to an elaboration of the content and location of the Action Plan.

**PARAGRAPH 5.10, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 20:  
OBJECTIVES FOR HOUSING**

**Objections:**

8/19 - English Nature

**Main Issues:**

- Paragraph does not cross refer to nature conservation policies.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **Conclusions:**

- 5.4 PIC 20 responds properly to the objection.

### **Recommendation:**

- 5.5 That PIC 20 be adopted.

### **POLICY R/H1, PARAGRAPHS 5.11 TO 5.16 AND TABLE 1, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Changes 21 AND 22: ALLOCATION OF LAND FOR HOUSING**

#### **Objections:**

22/24 - Lee Residents' Association  
26/01 - CPRE Hampshire  
CO/82/05 - Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited

#### **Support:**

Sup/22/46 - Lee Residents' Association

#### **Objection to Proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 22**

PIC/82/13 - Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited

#### **Main Issues:**

- It is important that housing provision does not run ahead of the allocation of 2980. Allowing more housing without equivalent job creation will make congestion worse (22/24).
- The number of dwellings built plus outstanding permissions exceeds the Structure Plan Review requirement to 2011 (26/01).
- The Council has provided no justification for the windfall allowance or for the previously proposed rates (PIC/82/13).
- Policy should take account of the potential additional housing at the St George Barracks North and Royal Clarence Yard Site (CO/82/05 PIC/82/13).

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

### Conclusions:

- 5.6 Because the Council has decided to extend the period of the Plan from 2011 to 2016 in order to provide a ten year period, it has not had the benefit of a base allocation figure from the Structure Plan beyond 2011. This has resulted in the Council having to revise the housing allocations and a windfall allowance based on a reasonable assessment. The latter figure has been based on a re-evaluation of the Urban Capacity Study and past trends for small site completions. As I have mentioned in paragraph 1.1 of this Report, the Council should try to achieve consistency in the extent of the Plan period with other Local Authorities in Hampshire.
- 5.7 I would usually suggest to a Planning Authority that such a supply of small sites is likely to reduce considerably over the Plan period. But having looked closely at the urban areas, particularly along the A32, I have concluded that there are many opportunities for a small sites supply. The additional allowance for housing land supply for the extra period is set at 1,700 units. When that figure is added to the Structure Plan period figure of 2,980, there is an allowance of 4,680 units. The Council have now shown in Table 1 a revised figure amounting to 4,875, which would result in a surplus of some 195 units in the Plan period. I accept that would be a reasonable assessment of the housing land supply. Accordingly, I endorse the revised figures shown in CD 1/17a of 538 units for windfall sites and a figure for the housing land supply of 4,875 units.
- 5.8 I do suggest that the Plan would benefit from a full explanation of the basis for the Council's calculations, including the Structure Plan figure up to 2011 and the additional allowance to take the housing land supply up to 2016. Also the fact that the Council will carry out and publish annual surveys of completions in order to have up-to-date figures.
- 5.9 As far as the reference to the allocations at St George Barracks North and Royal Clarence Yard are concerned, I am satisfied that the Council's figures are a reasonable estimate at this time in order to provide a proper housing land supply for the Borough. Should the figure be found to change in the future when detailed schemes have been provided or following the pending Public Inquiry in respect of a refusal for a housing scheme, then it is likely that the housing supply figure would increase slightly rather than decrease. That is a proper and acceptable position for the Council to take as it allows flexibility in the overall supply of homes for local people. I see no reason to amend the figures at this stage.
- 5.10 I note the objection from the CPRE, but am satisfied that as the Plan period has been extended, the increased housing land supply is justified. The

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

addition to paragraph 5.15 is a satisfactory response to the Lee Residents Association objection. I concur with PIC 21 as it is a factual up-date.

### **Recommendation:**

- 5.11 That Policy R/H1, paragraphs 5.11-5.16 and the revised figures in Table 1 of the Appendix to CD 1/17a be adopted.
- 5.12 That PIC 21 be adopted.
- 5.13 That PIC 22 be not adopted.
- 5.14 That the additional sentence suggested in the Council's proof of evidence be added to paragraph 5.15

### **POLICY R/H2 AND PARAGRAPHS 5.18-5.20, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Changes 23, 24 AND 25: MAJOR HOUSING PROPOSALS**

#### **Objections:**

19/14 - Environment Agency  
35/04 - Abbey Developments Limited  
52/01 - Mr R M Lane  
CO/82/06 - Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited

#### **Objection to Proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 23**

PIC/82/14 - Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd

#### **Main Issues:**

- Too much development land has been identified. Gosport already has high density housing and associated vehicle/road traffic and social problems. Quality of life is being diminished. (52/01).
- Clarification is required regarding whether the reduced allocation reflects an allowance for completions (CO/82/06 PIC/82/14).
- Land at Stokesmead Field, Alverstoke should be allocated for housing development and open space (35/04).

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

- Details relating to landfill considerations at Cherque Farm need to be included within the justification text (19/14).

### **Conclusions:**

- 5.15 Regarding the objection from Abbey Developments Limited, I see no reason to include the Stokesmead Field land within Policy R/H2. The objector has not questioned the Council's claim that their housing land supply would satisfy demand. Furthermore, the proposal was for a development amounting to 30-35 dwellings and at the Inquiry the objector accepted it would have little effect upon the overall housing figures. Although the Council has included within its allocations several large sites, they were able to demonstrate at the Inquiry that development was either under construction or imminent. I am satisfied that those developments are likely to proceed within the Plan period. Indeed, the Council is confident that their on-going discussions with the Ministry of Defence are likely to result in even more land being released for housing in the future.
- 5.16 Elsewhere in the Report, I have suggested the land at Stokesmead Field should be designated as Open Space under Policy R/OS3. Accordingly, I do not accept that land should be allocated for housing purposes. I do not accept the arguments put by Mr Lane; the Council is required to provide adequate homes for local people and that is what they have done, as well as justifying the number and type of allocation. I am also satisfied from the Council's submissions that they have made a proper and up-dated allowance in respect of completions. But the footnote to the table suggested in PFA 7 would assist. I agree with the Council that PIC 7 properly addresses the objection from the Environment Agency. I concur with PICs 23, 24 and 25 as they are factual up-dates.

### **Recommendation:**

- 5.17 That Policy R/H2 be adopted subject to the additional footnote.
- 5.18 That PICs 23, 24, 25 and PFA 7 be adopted.



## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **POLICY R/H3, PARAGRAPHS 5.21-5.24A AND PROPOSED PARAGRAPH 5.24B, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Changes 26, 27, 28, 29 AND 30: MAJOR HOUSING PROPOSALS AS PART OF A MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT**

#### **Objections:**

18/02 - House Builders Federation  
CO/82/07 - Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited

#### **Objections to Proposed Pre-Inquiry Changes 26 & 30**

PIC/82/15 - Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd  
PIC/83/01 - Mr R V Perry  
PIC/84/01 - Breamore Properties  
PIC/84/02 - Breamore Properties

#### **Support for Pre-Inquiry Change 30**

Sup/2/35 - Hampshire County Council

#### **Main Issues:**

- It is unreasonable to count MOD dwellings as part of the housing land supply when these dwellings are not available to the public (18/02).
- Policy should take account of the potential additional housing at St George Barracks North and Royal Clarence Yard (CO/82/07 PIC/82/15).
- Redevelopment of the Coldharbour site would create relocation problems for industrial/boat type uses. (PIC/83/01).
- There is concern regarding the suitability of the previously reclaimed land adjacent to Mumby Road to accommodate new development (PIC/83/01).
- Until detailed design, assessment and viability work has been completed it is not possible to determine the level of residential development at Coldharbour (PIC/84/01).
- Paragraph 5.24b as proposed by PIC 30 does not provide sufficient flexibility to allow for the most appropriate scheme to come forward at Coldharbour (PIC/84/02).

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **Conclusions:**

- 5.19 As I mentioned under my conclusions for Policy R/H1, I am satisfied that the Council's assessment relating to St George Barracks North and Royal Clarence Yard sites are reasonable. Should there be any change in housing provision, it would not significantly detract from the Council's overall housing land supply estimates. Given the fact that the Ministry of Defence has radically changed its approach to married quarters accommodation, I accept that such housing on the private market should count towards the local housing supply.
- 5.20 I support PICs 26, 27, 28 and 29 as they provide factual up-dates. I concur with PIC 30 which properly addresses objection PIC/84/01; it also allows flexibility for further housing if a suitable scheme is brought forward. In the interests of consistency, paragraph 6.19 should be amended in accordance with PFA 10 which addresses the objection from Mr Perry.

### **Recommendation:**

- 5.21 That Policy R/H3 and PICs 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 be adopted.
- 5.22 That paragraph 6.19 of the Plan be amended in accordance with PFA 10.

## **POLICY R/H4 AND PARAGRAPHS 5.25 - 5.27: HOUSING DENSITIES**

### **Objections:**

1/11 - Government Office for the South East

### **Support:**

Sup/20/04 - Gosport Society  
Sup/35/05 - Abbey Developments Limited

### **Main Issues:**

- Policy and accompanying text refer to higher density housing at certain locations but these are not shown on the Proposals Map.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **Conclusions:**

- 5.23 The amendments made to the Second Deposit of the Plan should be sufficient to ensure the Plan accords with national planning advice.

### **Recommendation:**

- 5.24 That Policy R/H4 and paragraph 5.25-5.27 be adopted.

### **POLICY R/H5, PARAGRAPHS 5.28-5.33 AND APPENDIX G, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Changes 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37 and 38: AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

#### **Objections:**

1/12 - Government Office for the South East  
1/14 - Government Office for the South East  
CO/1/69 - Government Office for the South East  
2/15 - Hampshire County Council: Estates Practice  
5/02 - Department of Health, Director of Health and Social Care, South  
13/09 - Defence Estates  
CO/13/23 - Defence Estates  
18/03 - House Builders Federation  
CO/18/07 - House Builders Federation  
30/01 - BT PLC  
36/02 - McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd  
58/03 - Mr Andrew Shaw  
CO/81/01 - Fairview New Homes  
CO/81/02 - Fairview New Homes  
CO/82/08 - Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited

#### **Objections to Proposed Pre-Inquiry Changes 31, 37 & 38**

PIC/22/47 - Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association  
PIC/30/04 - BT PLC  
PIC/81/03 - Fairview New Homes  
PIC/82/16 - Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd  
PIC/82/17 - Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd  
PIC/82/18 - Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd

#### **Support:**

Sup/9/10 - The Countryside Agency

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

### Main Issues:

- Local Plan policies should identify suitable areas and sites on which affordable housing is to be provided, and the amount of provision which will be sought (1/12).
- Amendment to Policy R/H5 refers to "requiring" affordable housing. This does not accord with the advice in Circular 6/98. (CO/1/69 CO/18/07 CO/81/01 CO/82/08).
- By changing the word 'require' to 'negotiate' will make the policy ineffectual. If this policy is to be effective then it is necessary for it to be a requirement (PIC/22/47).
- The proposed threshold of 15 dwellings is contrary to Government guidance in Circular 6/98 and has not been properly justified (18/03 30/01 36/02 CO/81/02 PIC/30/04 PIC/82/16).
- The exceptional circumstances for lowering the threshold are not defined (58/03).
- Regional Planning Guidance requires local circumstances to be taken into consideration when considering the need to adopt lower thresholds. LPAs must demonstrate that local circumstances are justified. Affordable housing provision should not make developments unviable (PIC/82/17).
- The approach of requiring 40% affordable housing provision on all suitable sites is too high, too rigid, unjustified and contrary to the advice in Circular 6/98 (18/03, CO/13/23, 30/01 CO/81/02 PIC/30/04).
- The Policy should refer to the other factors which will be taken into account when assessing a site's suitability for affordable housing including the economics of provision and the need to achieve a successful housing development (36/02).
- The circumstances in which it may be appropriate to change the percentage of affordable housing being sought should be retained (CO/82/08).
- A policy should be included within the Local Plan, seeking an element of affordable housing on suitable sites (1/14).
- This policy and its associated text includes no specific reference to the provision of appropriate housing for 'key workers' (2/15 & 5/02).

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

- There is a need to recognise the special circumstances applying to NHS related developments when applying affordable housing quotas (5/02).
- Armed forces personnel should be considered as 'key workers' and married quarters and other accommodation for service personnel excluded from the requirements of the Policy (13/09).
- Reference to subsidy in PIC 38 does not clarify the Council's attitude. Who should make subsidy and how large should it be? (PIC/82/18).

### Conclusions:

- 5.25 Dealing firstly with the policy wording as amended by PIC 31, I agree with GOSE that the use of the word "require" would be too inflexible. However, I recommend the use of the word "seek" rather than the suggested "negotiate". The Council have already stated that they would negotiate the level of affordable housing dependant upon the circumstances of each site. But the use of the word "seek" would indicate to developers that the 40% level is a clear objective of the policy. This change would allow flexibility in the policy, but give the Council the ability to consider whether any other provision should affect or outweigh the level of such housing within any scheme.
- 5.26 As far as the Council's suggestion to set the level of affordable housing at 40% is concerned, I note that during the Inquiry session into objections from Berkeley Homes Limited and McCarthy and Stone, objection was not raised to the principle of affordable homes, indeed, it was said that a level of up to 30% had worked in the past and should be adopted again. The Council was also criticised for using a discredited survey upon which to base their 40% figure and then to up-date that survey and use the new conclusions to justify the same policy.
- 5.27 It seems to me that whether the objector's criticisms are correct or not, the fact remains that there is likely to be a very substantial demand for affordable homes in the Borough up to the end of the Plan period in 2016. As far back as the 1998 Gosport Borough Housing Needs Survey, the Council found that of households requiring new accommodation, 75% would not be able to access the open housing market because their income would be insufficient. Some 3,190 households needed affordable housing between 1998-2003. It was upon this background that the Council established their policy of seeking the higher level of 40%.
- 5.28 Although the 2002 South East Hampshire Housing Market Study may have been found to be flawed, the Council were correct in establishing via a new survey (2003) whether their policy regarding affordable homes was justified. I disagree with the objectors that consider this approach to be wrong,

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

particularly as the results confirmed the conclusions of the previous survey. The conclusions were that Gosport Borough has a significant problem in providing sufficient low cost housing whether it be in the rented sector or for those persons wishing to buy their homes.

- 5.29 The survey indicated that there is likely to be a shortfall of around 312 units of accommodation annually, which projected over the eight years of the period up to 2011, amounts to 2,496 dwelling units. This compares with the Structure Plan total requirement for housing in the same period of an additional 2,980 dwellings. When that figure is taken over the extended period of the Plan to 2016, it shows an increase far beyond the total amount of housing that would have been sought in the Borough.
- 5.30 Clearly, for the Council to seek to provide all new housing in the Borough up to 2016 in the form of affordable homes would be impractical and not in the best interests of the community; it is also likely that landowners would not release the land. To my mind, regardless of the objectors detailed criticisms of the Council's survey, the strong likelihood is that the Borough will need at least a 40% level of affordable homes on suitable sites. That would still not be sufficient to meet demand, but at least it is a reasonable start. I strongly recommend that when the Council carry out negotiations with developers, the provision of a 40% level is a top priority, otherwise the gap between demand and provision will get wider. That would not be in the best interests of the local community.
- 5.31 Criticism was made of the Council's 2003 survey, including the basing of results upon "custom and practise". If that had been the only basis for the consultant's conclusions, I would also find that approach questionable. But a quite proper approach and basis for the survey was used by the consultants. Although they did quote from their own experiences elsewhere in the country, I see nothing wrong with specialist consultants using the expertise they have acquired over many years. Furthermore, as a result of the survey, the Council were able to take proper account of local circumstances and produce a policy best suited to the needs of the local community in accordance with Government advice.
- 5.32 I am satisfied that the 2003 survey up-dated the earlier 1998 survey and provided robust and up-to-date data in accordance with the advice in Circular 6/98. For example, the survey showed that flats and terraced housing had increased in price over the period 1997-2004 by 253% and 175% respectively; that amounted to a 25% increase annually. As a contrast, incomes have generally only risen by inflation levels, which for some years now have been quite low. The Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings data suggest that in Gosport incomes may have actually fallen by 10% in real terms over the last two years. Another unfortunate statistic is that some 660 households may

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

have to leave the locality because of a lack of affordable housing, although that figure was not included within the consultant's final calculations.

- 5.33 In my opinion, this scale of problem in the Borough is likely to outweigh any perceived deficiencies in the methodology used or conclusions reached by the Council in setting a level of 40% affordable housing. Such a level would be both practical and reasonable by satisfying a significant demand in this sector of the housing market and allowing sufficient incentive to persuade landowners to dispose of sufficient land at a realistic figure to satisfy housing demand in the Borough. Although other arguments were advanced by the objectors to support a lower figure for affordable homes, none were sufficient to outweigh my conclusions on the local circumstances in the Borough and that 40% would be the proper and correct level.
- 5.34 I do not suggest that reference to the 2002 survey should be deleted because it does provide an historical background even if some criticisms have been made; in any case, the Council's conclusions were not solely based on that survey. I note the suggestion to delete the last sentence of paragraph 5.31, but I read that as being a matter that would be part of the planning process as suggested by the objectors. Nevertheless, it would be better to clarify that matter in the text.
- 5.35 I turn now to the question of threshold levels. Given the fact that most of the larger sites allocated for housing have already commenced or have planning permission, I accept that much of the new affordable housing would have to come from smaller sites. Policy H4 of the Regional Planning Guidance (RPG9), confirms that Local Authorities should assess local need and where necessary seek lower thresholds down to the 15 dwelling level in urban areas. In view of the likely demand for affordable housing that I have already commented upon, I support the lowering of the threshold in Policy R/H5 of the Plan to 0.5 hectares or 15 dwellings.
- 5.36 I agree with the objectors that in judging the suitability of a site for affordable homes, there should be flexibility in the policy wording to allow matters other than size to be assessed. But to my understanding that is why the Council have included the word "suitable" in this policy. It is a "target" rather than a "requirement". As there does appear to be concern and perhaps confusion, I agree that the matter should be clarified within the text and I recommend that additional wording be included within paragraph 5.31 setting out the circumstances of negotiations. However, I also suggest that the Council makes clear in the same paragraph that the provision of a 40% level is a priority for the Borough. Unless the Council obtain higher levels of such housing in the Borough than has been achieved in the past, the problems identified in the surveys will only increase.

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

- 5.37 Dealing now with the definition of affordable housing, I do agree that there is a need for the Council to be flexible and explicit in stating the type of housing that would be provided under Policy R/H5. The Council has sought to justify the level of affordable dwellings in terms of the relationship between prices and incomes and that should be reflected within the text of the policy. But the text should also mention the whole range of affordable housing tenures that would be sought.
- 5.38 At the Inquiry session, I did gain the impression that much of the basis for assessing tenures was promoted by the Housing Department. Of course, part of the need for affordable homes for residents in the Borough will come from lists compiled by the Housing Department of the Council, including social rented accommodation and housing for the homeless. But Policy R/H5 is a planning policy and not a Housing Department policy. The pursuance of affordable homes should not just satisfy housing lists, but seek the provision of the full range of housing tenures, including low cost market properties. I have a similar concern over the control exercised by the Housing Department in that they seem to have tight control over the occupation of the affordable housing and only use four Registered Social Landlords.
- 5.39 I suggest that PIC 38 be expanded to refer to the link between prices and incomes, as well as an increased emphasis upon the provision of low cost market housing, rather than the current impression that the only type of affordable housing that would be acceptable would be low cost social rented accommodation. I acknowledge the points made by the Council in respect of the 2004 SEERA Good Practice Guidance, but to my mind, PIC 38 and the remaining text of paragraph 5.32a does not adequately encourage the need for some low cost market housing for purchase. As far as social rented accommodation is concerned, I agree that the Borough does have a particular problem. That is why I accept that the Council is justified in retaining that reference in paragraph 5.32a.
- 5.40 At the Inquiry I asked for clarification over the question of retaining low cost market housing at value levels established when occupied as affordable housing for as long as the demand exists. As a result, the Council have suggested a further change to paragraph 5.32a in PFA 20. I accept that the general approach is correct, but the wording should be strengthened to indicate that the Council will seek legal agreements with a developer to ensure that low cost market housing is retained at stated percentage levels when set against the current level of other market housing for as long as local circumstances indicate such housing need exists.
- 5.41 I also acknowledge the points raised by objectors relating to the level of public subsidy. Should the national economic situation become such that grant funding becomes scarce, then the ability to pursue low cost market



## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

housing should help. It would not of course help the need the Council have currently identified in respect of social rented accommodation. I have concluded that the Council have achieved a reasonable flexibility in setting the target figure of 40% in order to sustain a flow of affordable housing. Given the numbers likely to come forward from allocations, I do not consider the matter of public subsidy to be a significant problem at this stage.

- 5.42 Perhaps the area where I do have concerns is the impression I gained that affordable housing provision should only be by way of the four Registered Social Landlords that have been approved by the Housing Services Unit. That is far too inflexible and even the Council's suggested changes made as a result of discussions at the Inquiry session fail to adequately address the point. Again, it seems to me that the approach has been determined by the requirements and practices of the Housing Department rather than for the matter to be treated as planning policy.
- 5.43 I am aware from the proof of evidence submitted on behalf of the Housing Services Unit that the Council's Housing Strategy has been judged "fit for purpose" by GOSE and, as a Housing Authority, the Council has statutory duties that it must meet. But that does not mean that the Council's Housing Department should interpret or implement the affordable housing policy of this Plan. Policy R/H5 and its text are planning issues and not practices that should be established by the Housing Department. The Council should ensure in future that in both practice and theory, the implementation of affordable housing policy under the Local Plan is carried out by the Planning Department and not the Housing Department. Of course, there will inevitably be some overlap in working practices, but compliance with Policy R/H5 is for the Planning Department to administer.
- 5.44 Accordingly, I recommend that Appendix G be amended to delete the inference that Policy R/H5 is determined by the Housing Services Unit or that the Council intends to dictate which Registered Social Landlord or any other form of rented or low cost market housing provider can operate in Gosport Borough. I understand that the Council have a high regard for the four Registered Social Landlords that they work with at the present time and it is not my intention to disparage the achievements of those particular organisations. However, the proper implementation of planning policy for the provision of affordable housing should not be restricted by limiting or dictating which providers should be used or indeed, attempting to restrict all affordable housing to that of social rented accommodation. There does need to be some low cost housing available for purchase. Any other situation would be an unreasonable restriction on other authorised providers and limit the ability of the Council to provide as wide a base of providers for all forms of tenure in the interest of the whole community.

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

- 5.45 In additional representations submitted after the Inquiry session, the Council have suggested that Appendix G should be variously amended. However, I consider any reference to the inclusion of the words “strong preference is for ...Registered Social Landlords” to completely miss the point of affordable homes for all sections of the community. Reference should be made to Registered Social Landlords and other affordable housing providers in both rented and purchased sectors of the housing market which have been found by the Council to be able to provide and maintain this type of housing in accordance with planning policy. Reference should not be made to the approval or otherwise of the Housing Services Unit.
- 5.46 Reference in Appendix G to seek discussions with the Council’s Housing Services Unit should be deleted and replaced with a need for early discussions with Officers of the Planning Department to secure a proper level of affordable housing of different tenures. Appendix G has been amended in reference to commuted payments in a manner that seeks a sum that would provide serviced plots elsewhere in the Borough. To my mind that seems quite acceptable. As with my comments elsewhere in the Report, the Council should specify a time span within which it would ensure the affordable housing would be provided and in the event that such monies are not spent that it would be returned to the developer with interest. I would hope that such circumstances would not occur in the interest of those persons seeking such accommodation.
- 5.47 I see little problem with the Council’s approach to off-site provision in Appendix G. At the Inquiry, the objectors considered the explanation of precisely where services were required to be too vague. It seems to me that Appendix G states that services are to be provided to the perimeter of the site upon which the affordable housing would be built. I read that as meaning the services would be provided to the edge of a large development site or to the middle of that site, dependant upon where the affordable homes were to be constructed. I consider that to be a proper approach for the Council to take in obtaining plots for affordable homes without the added expense of providing the services to serve the new dwellings.
- 5.48 I now turn to the Inquiry session in respect of the objections from the Hampshire County Council. Based on the representations presented to me, I do not have sufficient evidence to persuade me that the provision of key worker accommodation should be considered as a special case and specifically mentioned in the type of tenure intended to be included under Policy R/H5. While I accept that in some areas key workers do have difficulty in finding accommodation, I note that the County Council is still selling off its own housing stock which presumably could be used for that purpose. If that Authority find there is such a problem, as a Corporate Body, it may be better for them not to sell off their own housing stock, rather than seek special measures in the Borough Council’s Local Plan. Furthermore, such residents

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

could apply to be considered either on the Housing Register or on lists held by providers. I support the Council's suggested additional paragraph in PFA 9 to follow paragraph 5.32a and intended to clarify this situation.

- 5.49 As far as objections from GOSE are concerned, I am satisfied that the amended policy and text make the need for specific allocations of affordable homes sites unnecessary; the threshold and percentage sought by the Council would achieve the maximum number of affordable homes that would be reasonable in the circumstances. I agree that the word "require" in the policy would be unreasonable, but I have suggested the word "seek" as an alternative in PIC 31. For the reasons I have given earlier in this section of the Report, I do not accept the objections made by the Department of Health; the objections from Defence Estates has a similar objective and accommodation needed for ex-servicemen should be part of the housing lists rather than accorded special status under a planning policy. Neither do I accept the objection from the same objector in respect of the level of affordable housing set by the Council in the policy, for the reasons I gave earlier in this section of the Report.
- 5.50 The objections made on behalf of Fairview New Homes, the House Builders Federation and BT plc are addressed in my responses to PIC 31 and the justification for threshold levels given by the Council in evidence to the Inquiry. The objection by Mr Shaw is addressed by the changes to paragraphs 5.30 and PICs 34 and 36. The Lee Residents Association object to the changes made to the policy wording in PIC 31. However, it is necessary for the Council to negotiate with developers in providing a range of planning obligations including affordable housing. Clearly, there is a need for a balance to be achieved with each site producing its own circumstances. To use the word "require" would tie the hands of the Planning Department and reduce the chances of achieving other planning benefits.
- 5.51 I concur with PICs 32, 33, 34, 35, 36 and 37 as they are intended to provide factual up-dates, reflect guidance in RPG9 and correct a typographical error.

### **Recommendation:**

- 5.52 That Policy R/H5 be adopted subject to the amended PIC 31.
- 5.53 That PICs 32, 33, 34, 35, 36 and 37 be adopted.
- 5.54 That paragraph 5.31 be amended to reflect the comments that I have made.
- 5.55 That the text be amended to clarify the intentions regarding the suitability of each site to accommodate affordable housing.
- 5.56 That the Council amends the text to record the fact that they will seek to obtain legal agreements with developers to secure affordable housing for that

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

purpose, and with low cost market housing, at a percentage value level that reflects the level at the time the housing was constructed, for as long as the demand for such accommodation exists.

- 5.57 That Appendix G and the supporting text to the policy be amended to delete reference to the Housing Services Unit being responsible for determining which type of tenure and the particular provider and for that responsibility to be that of the Planning Department.
- 5.58 That paragraph 5.32a be amended to reflect the changes suggested by the Council in response to the objections by the County Council (PFA9).
- 5.59 That PIC 38 be amended to expand the link between prices and incomes, as well as to make clear that the policy is to encourage all tenures of accommodation, including low cost market housing.

### **POLICY R/H8A AND PARAGRAPHS 5.39A AND 5.39B, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 39: ACCOMMODATION FOR THE ELDERLY**

#### **Objections:**

5/01 - Department of Health, Director of Health and Social Care, South  
CO/18/08 - House Builders Federation  
22/28 - Lee Residents' Association

#### **Main Issues:**

- There is a need to make provision for "lifetime" dwellings which are suited to the needs of residents throughout their lives (5/01).
- The justification text should not refer to 15% target (CO/18/08).
- Car parking needs to take account of visitors, doctors, nurses, carers, hairdressers and meals on wheels (22/28).

#### **Conclusions:**

- 5.60 Policy R/H8a should satisfy the objection from the Department of Health. There is no justification for increasing the parking standards set in Appendix F of the Plan as they are intended to be overall standards to apply in most situations. Given the Gosport Housing Needs Survey and the evidence from the Department of Health, I consider the 15% level for lifetime homes is

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

reasonable. PIC 39 provides the basis for the guidelines.

### **Recommendation:**

- 5.61 That Policy R/H8a and the supporting text be adopted.

### **POLICY R/H10 AND PARAGRAPHS 5.41-5.42, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 40:**

#### **SITES FOR GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS**

### **Objections:**

1/16 - Government Office for the South East

### **Main Issues:**

- The Plan does not reflect the advice given in Circular 1/94 and PPG12 that local authorities should make a quantitative assessment of the amount of accommodation required. In deciding the level of provision, Authorities should have up to date information and take account of the 6 monthly counts.
- Circular 1/94 refers to the 3 types of site, which is not clarified in the policy and accompanying text.

### **Conclusions:**

- 5.62 Policy R/H10 and the supporting text provide a reasonable basis upon which the Council could assess any new proposal for locating a gypsy or traveller site. But the policy does not go far enough. Circular 1/94 and PPG12 require Local Authorities to be far more pro-active in Local Plan policies than the procedures set by Policy R/H10.
- 5.63 I note that the Council is part of a sub-group in Southern Hampshire intended to identify suitable sites for temporary or short-stay purposes. I suggest that the Council introduces a further policy which commits it to identifying one or more suitable sites within the Borough or as part of the sub-groups deliberations. Also, that the Council includes within the supporting text a commitment to seek to expedite the formulation and agreement for such land within the County sub-group; it is not acceptable for that work to be allowed to continue over a significant period of time in the way suggested in PIC 40. The supporting text should also set out the types of site given in Circular 1/94 and the conclusions of the type of site to be provided and the basis for such

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

conclusions.

### **Recommendation:**

- 5.64 That Policy R/H10 and the supporting text be adopted.
- 5.65 That an additional policy be adopted which states that the Council will urgently seek to identify one or more gypsy or traveller site based on the criterion set out in Policy R/H10 either within the Borough or as part of the conclusions of the County sub-group.
- 5.66 That the supporting text to the additional policy sets out the requirements of Circular 1/94 and PPG12 and gives the reasons and basis for the conclusions as to the type of site that needs establishing.
- 5.67 That PIC 40 be not adopted.

**6. Chapter 6: Employment**

**PARAGRAPHS 6.5-6.6, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 41:  
INTRODUCTION TO EMPLOYMENT CHAPTER**

**Objections:**

1/19 - Government Office for the South East

**Main Issues:**

- The Plan does not assess the need for office development in accordance with the advice in RPG9 Policy Q5.

**Conclusions:**

- 6.1 I am satisfied that the changes made in the Second Deposit of the Plan satisfy this objection and provide in paragraphs 6.5a-6.5b a proper assessment of the need for office development in accordance with the advice in RPG Policy Q5. PIC 41 is a factual up-date.

**Recommendation:**

- 6.2 That paragraphs 6.5 – 6.6 and PIC 41 be adopted.

**PARAGRAPH 6.11:  
OBJECTIVES FOR EMPLOYMENT**

**Objections:**

37/03 - Littman and Robeson

**Support:**

Sup/48/02 - Tourism South East

**Main Issues:**

- The emphasis of this objective should be placed on providing a diverse employment base that will then generate a number of benefits including new job opportunities.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **Conclusions:**

- 6.3 I concur with the changes made in the Second Deposit of the Plan which address the objection.

### **Recommendation:**

- 6.4 That paragraph 6.11 be adopted.

### **POLICY R/EMP1: ALLOCATION OF LAND FOR EMPLOYMENT**

#### **Objections:**

33/01 - B & Q

#### **Support:**

Sup/3/01 - Portsmouth City Council

#### **Main Issues:**

- Retailers are an important employer of local people and as such it is appropriate that retail uses are recognised as an employment/business use.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 6.5 In common with the Council, I acknowledge the contribution made by the retail sector in respect of employment opportunities. However, Policy R/EMP1 is intended to identify a primary source of employment opportunity; unlike the retail sector, such employment development would not be located within town centres or on retail parks. I see no reason to change this policy.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 6.6 That Policy R/EMP1 and the supporting text be adopted.



## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **PARAGRAPHS 6.19/ 6.20, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 42: LAND ALLOCATED FOR EMPLOYMENT USE AS PART OF A MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT**

#### **Objections:**

1/22 - Government Office for the South East

#### **Main Issues:**

- Sites should be included that are likely to come forward within the Plan period.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 6.7 The situation regarding the Daedalus site has changed yet again with the Ministry of Defence now declaring the land surplus to their requirements. I support PIC 42 which up-dates the situation and should satisfy the objection. In their PFA 10, the Council have suggested changes to paragraph 6.19 in order to recognise and establish the importance of marine based services at the Coldharbour site. I support this amendment which records the important employment opportunities available on this land.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 6.8 That amended paragraph 6.19 be adopted.
- 6.9 That paragraph 6.20 and PIC 42 be adopted.

### **POLICY R/EMP3 AND PARAGRAPH 6.24, including proposed Pre- Inquiry Change 43: PROTECTION OF EXISTING EMPLOYMENT SITES FROM INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT**

#### **Objections:**

33/02 - B & Q  
36/01 - McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd  
37/05 - Littman and Robeson  
37/06 - Littman and Robeson  
38/01 - DS Smith PLC

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **Support:**

Sup/3/03 - Portsmouth City Council  
Sup/4/14 - Fareham Borough Council  
Sup/22/29 - Lee Residents' Association

### **Main Issues:**

- The intention not to permit non-employment uses on existing employment sites, as shown on the Proposals Map, lacks flexibility (33/02, 36/01, 37/05, 38/01).
- Sufficient flexibility should be incorporated within the Policy to allow alternative uses to be considered favourably against other relevant policies within the Plan, where it can be demonstrated that employment allocations remain unutilised (33/02, 36/01).
- The Local Plan does not define what is meant by "efficient use of existing employment sites".

### **Conclusions:**

- 6.10 Given the historical dependence upon the Ministry of Defence for employment and the loss of that traditional sector of employment, I accept that there is a significant need to diversify, as well as attracting new forms of employment to Gosport Borough. To my mind, it would be quite wrong to then allow sections of existing employment areas to be used for non-employment uses. Adequate housing allocations have been made and it is likely that further housing developments will take place following further releases of land by the Ministry of Defence in the future.
- 6.11 Out-commuting has increased by 41% since 1991 and Gosport only provides employment opportunities for 51% of its workforce. I accept that the Council is correct in seeking to retain its existing and newly allocated employment land; particularly as it is within an Economic Regeneration Area. I concur with the change to omit the words "efficient use of existing employment sites" from the Second Deposit of the Plan and PIC43, which includes a reference to RPG9.

### **Recommendation:**

- 6.12 That Policy R/EMP3, the supporting text and PIC 43 be adopted.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **POLICY R/EMP5 AND PARAGRAPHS 6.30 AND 6.31: EXTENSION OF EXISTING EMPLOYMENT USES AND REDEVELOPMENT OF REDUNDANT EMPLOYMENT SITES**

#### **Objections:**

37/07 - Littman and Robeson

#### **Support:**

Sup/3/05 - Portsmouth City Council

#### **Main Issues:**

- This Policy is considered to be unnecessary and should be deleted as these sites are already allocated for employment uses.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 6.13 I see no reason to delete a policy that seeks to set environmental and highway criteria for development proposals and would allow existing companies to expand their business.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 6.14 That Policy R/EMP5 and the supporting text be adopted.

### **POLICY R/EMP7 AND PARAGRAPHS 6.35-6.38: LOW EMPLOYMENT GENERATING USES**

#### **Objections:**

37/08 - Littman and Robeson

37/09 - Littman and Robeson

#### **Support:**

Sup/3/07 - Portsmouth City Council

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

### Main Issues:

- The Policy fails to set out opportunities for accommodating storage and distribution businesses and could deter potential businesses from locating within the Borough.
- The Policy is also inconsistent with the adopted Hampshire Structure Plan Review, which seeks to provide a diverse range of employment opportunities to facilitate the growth and development of existing businesses and encourage appropriate new investment in urban areas.
- The requirement that employment sites should accommodate at least 40% of B1 and B2 uses is overly prescriptive and will limit the potential of businesses to utilise floorspace to meet its needs and could therefore have a detrimental impact on the marketability of vacant units within any employment development.

### Conclusions:

- 6.15 Given the particular and severe traffic access problems that exist in the Gosport peninsula, I agree with the Council that it would be quite inappropriate to encourage transport related industries to the Borough. Those uses are better located where there are good national highway networks. Policy R/EMP7 does allow flexibility and low employment uses such as warehousing could be permitted, but it must be shown that they are most appropriate for a particular site, as well as having a transportation assessment. Ancillary warehouse uses to an existing employment activity would be permitted.

### Recommendation:

- 6.16 That Policy R/EMP7 and the supporting text be adopted.

**7. Chapter 7: Retail and Town Centre**

**PARAGRAPH 7.7:  
OBJECTIVES FOR RETAIL AND TOWN CENTRES**

**Objections:**

1/23 - Government Office for the South East

**Main Issues:**

- It is not clear if the town centre strategy has been incorporated within the development plan.

**Conclusions:**

7.1 The addition of paragraph 7.7a addresses the objection.

**Recommendation:**

7.2 That paragraphs 7.7-7.7a be adopted.

**PARAGRAPH 7.8A, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 44:  
SHOPPING HIERARCHY**

**Objections:**

No representations received.

**Conclusions:**

7.3 I concur with PIC 44 as it is intended to up-date the Plan in accordance with the latest Government guidance.

**Recommendations:**

7.4 That PIC 44 be adopted.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **PARAGRAPHS 7.22-7.25A, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 45: RETAIL STUDY FOR GOSPORT**

#### **Objections:**

33/03 - B & Q

#### **Main Issues:**

- The findings of the retail study, undertaken by Hillier Parker, on behalf of the Borough Council in June 1998, are not necessarily accepted.
- Any retail assessment should consider specific sectors within retail business (e.g. the DIY sector) and not just broad-brush product categories.
- The text should state that the findings of the retail study are only to act as a guide to the Council in assessing retail proposals allowing each scheme to be assessed on its own merits in accordance with Policy R/S2, having regard to the need identified.

#### **Conclusions:**

7.5 The Council's retail study and paragraphs 7.22-7.25a are intended to set the background to the policies that follow. Based on the submissions from the objector, I see no reason to disagree with the Council's statements. I give my detailed comments upon the various retail policies in the following paragraphs. PIC 45 addresses the latest Government guidance.

#### **Recommendation:**

7.6 That paragraphs 7.22-7.25a and PIC 45 be adopted.

### **POLICY R/S1 AND PARAGRAPHS 7.29 and 7.32, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 46: SHOPPING AND COMMERCIAL ALLOCATIONS**

#### **Objections:**

1/24 - Government Office for the South East  
CO/1/70 - Government Office for the South East  
19/15 - Environment Agency

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

### Main Issues:

- While the shopping uses at R/S1 (a) i to ii are intended to be ancillary to the main use, consideration of scale would provide more clarity, in accordance with PPG12 (1/24).
- Policy R/S1 (b) iii to vi and paragraphs 7.30 to 7.32 does not fully accord with the advice in the Caborn Statement (1999) and PPG6. If there is no need for further retail developments, there will be no requirement to identify additional sites. Therefore, the justification for the sites at iii to vi is not clear(1/24).
- No consideration has been given to scale of the retail schemes as part of the mixed use sites (1/24).
- It is not clear how the mixed use schemes proposed at iv to vi fully accord with the advice in PPG13 (1/24).
- Reference should be made to landfill considerations at Cherque Farm (19/15).
- In relation to the Coldharbour site, regard should be had to the advice in draft PPS6 which states that regeneration and employment do not constitute indicators of need for additional floorspace, but are relevant matters that need to be taken into account when local plans are drawn up.

### Conclusions:

- 7.7 I am satisfied that PIC 46 properly addresses the objection relating to the Coldharbour site and the Caborn Statement. The Second Deposit of the Plan does address other objections raised. I also concur with the Council that the policy complies with national planning advice; studies have shown the need for some additional retail development, particularly in the light of the amount of housing development allocated and likely to occur with the release of further land by the Ministry of Defence. The mixed-development proposals are acceptable in the light of Government policy. PIC 9 showing changes to R/DP1 should satisfactorily address the points raised by the Environment Agency.

### Recommendation:

- 7.8 That Policy R/S1, the supporting text and PIC 46 be adopted.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **POLICY R/S2 AND PARAGRAPHS 7.33 -7.37, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Changes 47, 48 and 49:**

#### **LOCATION OF ADDITIONAL SHOPPING FLOORSPACE**

##### **Objections:**

1/25 - Government Office for the South East  
1/26 - Government Office for the South East  
CO/1/71 - Government Office for the South East  
33/04 - B & Q  
33/05 - B & Q

##### **Main Issues:**

- The policy and paragraph 7.36 do not take account of the advice in PPG6 which calls for developers and retailers to be more flexible about the format, design and scale of development (1/25).
- Policy does not make clear that need should be established first. Having established that need exists, local planning authorities should then adopt a sequential approach to identify suitable sites (1/25).
- The amendment to Policy R/S2 criterion iv does not fully reflect the advice in the Caborn Statement and draft PPS6. It is not necessary to assess the need for proposals located within existing centres. Need must be assessed for any retail or leisure application which would be in an edge of centre or out of centre location and which is not in accordance with an up to date plan (CO/1/71).
- In assessing need, draft PPS6 refers to quantitative need and qualitative need, which is not clarified in the Plan (CO/1/71).
- Policy should be re-worded to reflect more accurately the requirements of the sequential approach, as advocated within PPG6 (33/04).
- The requirement to demonstrate need should not be regarded as simply being fulfilled by showing that there is capacity or demand (33/04).
- Retail development proposals on land allocated for other uses will be subject to the relevant policies within the Plan. It is therefore not necessary to incorporate a further safeguard in Policy R/S2 (33/04).



## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

- Due to the floorspace requirements of retailing activity such as DIY it may be necessary to locate in out of centre locations if no suitable sites are available in either a defined centre or an edge of centre location (33/05).
- The intent of paragraph 7.37 is not clear, for example, is it meant to refer to non class A uses solely (1/26).

### **Conclusions:**

- 7.9 The Council have revised Policy R/S2 and paragraph 7.36 in response to objections from GOSE. In PFA 11, the policy is re-worded; paragraph 7.36 is also amended under PFA 12 to include reference to both quantitative and qualitative need for retail and leisure facilities. I accept that such changes are necessary and ensure that the advice in PPS6 and the Caborn Statement has been properly addressed. I support PICs 48 and 49 as they provide advice in accordance with PPS6. I consider all of these changes are also a proper response to the objections from B&Q as they reflect national planning advice.

### **Recommendation:**

- 7.10 That Policy R/S2 and paragraphs 7.33-7.37 be revised in accordance with PFA 11 and 12, as well as PICs 48 and 49.

## **POLICY R/S6, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 50: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AT GROUND FLOOR LEVEL**

### **Objections:**

No representations received.

### **Conclusions:**

- 7.11 I concur with PIC 50 which clarifies the policy.

### **Recommendation:**

- 7.12 That PIC 50 be adopted.

**8. Chapter 8: Community and Built Leisure Facilities**

**POLICY R/CF2:  
PROTECTION OF EXISTING HEALTH AND COMMUNITY  
FACILITIES**

**Objections:**

5/03 - Department of Health, Director of Health and Social Care, South  
36/03 - McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd  
65/01 - Mrs Catherine Ravvys

**Support:**

Sup/9/12 - The Countryside Agency  
Sup/20/02 - Gosport Society  
Sup/68/04 - Mrs S George

**Main Issues:**

- The protection of health care facilities is inappropriate. Such an assessment is more appropriately undertaken by the Strategic Health Authorities in conjunction with local NHS Trusts (5/03).
- Policy R/CF2 does not allow enough flexibility. Government guidance encourages the full and effective use of available land to meet the requirements for new housing (36/03).
- The policy could frustrate attempts by existing owners to find a suitable alternative and viable use for accommodation which is clearly no longer economically viable (36/03).
- Community facilities include hotel function rooms and consequently development of such facilities should not take place unless there are alternative facilities available or to be provided (65/01).

**Conclusions:**

- 8.1 In general terms I agree with the approach in Policy R/CF2 as in order to achieve sustainable communities it is necessary to retain a proper level of health and community facilities. I agree that it for the Strategic Health Authority to carry out assessments of health care facilities, but it is then for that Authority to consult with the Planning Authority to assess whether the loss of such facilities would cause significant harm to the need to achieve sustainable communities. Although the policy has a degree of flexibility, the

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

Council should include the qualification of a “significant” need, otherwise, it would only take one person to state their requirement for a particular facility to demonstrate it was needed. I am satisfied that in other respects the policy is sufficiently flexible and proper. The objection by Mrs Ravyts is more appropriately considered under amended Policy R/CF10.

### **Recommendation:**

- 8.2 That Policy R/CF2 and the supporting text be adopted subject to the inclusion of the word “significant” before “need” in the first sentence.

### **POLICY R/CF3 AND PARAGRAPH 8.12: PROVISION OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES ON MAJOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT**

#### **Objections:**

52/02 - Mr R M Lane

#### **Support:**

Sup/9/13 - The Countryside Agency

#### **Main Issues:**

- If intended residential development is removed from the Plan there will be a reduced need to provide community facilities.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 8.3 The objector’s suggestion is quite impractical and unfair on those persons in the Borough who need homes. The Council is making every effort to re-use formerly developed land and to ensure that adequate infrastructure and community facilities are provided. I support the policy.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 8.4 That Policy R/CF 3 and the supporting text be adopted.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **POLICY R/CF4 AND PARAGRAPHS 8.14 AND 8.15, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 51 AND PROPOSALS MAP, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 76: PROVISION OF NEW HEALTH AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES**

#### **Objections:**

No outstanding representations.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 8.5 As the proposed changes are intended to up-date the Plan in factual terms, I concur with the amendments.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 8.6 That Policy R/CF4, the supporting text, the Proposal Map and PICs 51 and 76 be adopted.

### **POLICY R/CF5: DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDCARE AND DAY CARE FACILITIES.**

#### **Objections:**

No outstanding representations.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 8.7 At the Inquiry session into Policy R/OS3, it was suggested by the Council that Policy R/CF5 would need to be amended to include an additional criterion that resisted the loss of significant areas of open space. I concur with such a change for the reasons I have given under my comments on Policy R/OS3

#### **Recommendation:**

- 8.8 That an additional criterion be added to Policy R/CF5 to ensure there would be no significant loss of open space.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **POLICY R/CF7 AND PARAGRAPHS 8.21 AND 8.22: LAND FOR THE PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL EDUCATIONAL ESTABLISHMENTS**

#### **Objections:**

1/30 - Government Office for the South East  
25/16 - Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group  
CO/76/01 - Learning & Skills Council, Hampshire and the Isle of Wight

#### **Support:**

Sup/9/17 - The Countryside Agency  
Sup/50/01 - Mr John Jones

#### **Main Issues:**

- The justification for the "safeguarding" of sites is not clear. It is important that the provision for development is realistic and likely to be implemented during the Plan period (1/30).
- Land within the Alver Valley is not needed for a new secondary school. This would seem to conflict with the spirit of Policy R/OS5 (25/16).
- Other options for a secondary school are available, for example, buildings on the Daedalus site (25/16).
- Post-16 provision should also be considered, rather than just the potential need for another secondary school (CO/76/01).

#### **Conclusions:**

- 8.9 I note the identification of a potential site for a new secondary school; given the limited and appropriately sited locations for such a facility in the Borough, I have accepted that it is reasonable to identify the site. I have also concluded from the submitted evidence that such a school is likely within the period of the Plan, but should that development not have started at the end of the period, the Council must review the allocation with the Education Authority.
- 8.10 The Daedalus site is intended to meet other very urgent requirements of the Plan, rather than to be used for a school site. I understand the concerns of the Friends of the Earth Local Group, but should the Alver Valley site not be needed for a school, it would remain as part of the Park and not be developed. The Council has made that clear in paragraph 8.22b. The Council's suggested

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

addition of a new paragraph 8.22c addresses the objection from the Learning and Skills Council.

### **Recommendation:**

- 8.11 That Policy R/CF7 and the supporting text be adopted subject to the inclusion of the Council's suggested new paragraph 8.22c.

### **POLICY R/CF8 AND PARAGRAPH 8.23, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Changes 52: PROVISION OF BUILT LEISURE FACILITIES**

#### **Objections:**

1/31 - Government Office for the South East  
1/32 - Government Office for the South East  
1/33 - Government Office for the South East  
CO/1/72 - Government Office for the South East

#### **Support:**

Sup/9/18 - The Countryside Agency

#### **Main Issues:**

- The Plan does not appear to accord with the advice in the Caborn Statement (1999). This advises local planning authorities to consider the need for leisure development in the Plan over its lifetime (1/31 1/32).
- Having established that such need exists, local planning authorities should then adopt a sequential approach, as set out in PPG6, to identify suitable sites (1/31 1/32).
- Paragraph 8.23 states that for larger schemes, a sequential test may be applied. PPG6 does not specify that the sequential test should only apply to large schemes (1/33).
- The amendment to Policy R/CF8 places reference to need and the sequential test at the end of the Policy, whereas these factors are of primary importance in accordance with PPG6 (CO/1/72).
- Policy and paragraph refer to "major generators of travel" though no definition of this is provided. The Caborn Statement (1999) and Draft PPS6 do not appear to set out the requirement of a needs assessment only

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

for "major generators of travel" (CO/1/72).

- In assessing need, draft PPS6 refers to quantitative need and qualitative need, which is not clarified in the Plan (CO/1/72).

### **Conclusions:**

- 8.12 While I consider that the Council's changes to the policy and text in the Second Deposit of the Plan and in PIC 52 generally satisfy the objections made, further changes should be made in reference to the term "major generators of traffic". One aspect of the sequential test must be to ensure that any new leisure facilities do not either singly or cumulatively, significantly add to levels of traffic or the need for users to travel unnecessary distances. That issue should relate to all levels of provision and not just "major" generators of travel. I suggest the matter would be properly addressed by omitting the words "major generators of traffic" from the last sentence of the policy and including a reference to the other matters I have raised; paragraph 8.23 should also be amended.

### **Recommendation:**

- 8.13 That Policy R/CF8, the supporting text and PIC 52 be adopted subject to my suggested changes.

### **POLICY R/CF9, POLICY R/CF10 AND PARAGRAPHS 8.25-8.29, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 53: ROWNER RECREATION CENTRE SITE, ST VINCENT COLLEGE SITE, RECREATION AND LEISURE ALLOCATIONS AND PROTECTION OF EXISTING BUILT LEISURE FACILITIES INCLUDING HOTEL SITES**

### **Objections:**

1/34 - Government Office for the South East  
1/35 - Government Office for the South East  
1/36 - Government Office for the South East  
20/05 - Gosport Society  
41/01 - A.P.L. Vine Esq Lloyd Vine Properties  
28/03 - St Vincent College  
45/01 - West Point Management Company  
61/01 - Mrs L Palmer  
63/01 - Mr & Mrs Peter Smith  
64/01 - Mrs Heather Scaife

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

66/01 - Mrs Margaret Edwards  
67/01 - Mr & Mrs Brian Wakeman  
68/01 - Mrs S George  
70/01 - Mr R Wilkinson  
71/02 - Mr & Mrs A B Vernon  
74/01 - Mr P Wilkinson  
65/01 – Mrs C Ravvys

### **Support:**

Sup/9/19 - The Countryside Agency  
Sup/9/20 - The Countryside Agency  
Sup/48/03 - Tourism South East

### **Main Issues:**

- In the absence of a needs assessment, the justification for the sites included within Policy R/CF9 is not clear (1/34).
- The Rowner Swimming Facility should be a recreation and leisure allocation (20/05).
- Gosport has inadequate provision of certain types of leisure provision, especially for swimming (20/05).
- Object to the protection of the Rowner Recreation Centre as a built leisure facility (41/01).
- Attempts to attract continued leisure uses on this site have continually failed (41/01).
- The existing buildings are falling into greater disrepair with problems associated with crime and anti social behaviour (41/01).
- The current facilities have very little quality or quantity and are only accessible to the surrounding area which fails to give the level of support required to substantiate such a facility (41/01).
- Adequate alternative facilities are already available within the locality (41/01).
- An alternative use such as a meeting hall or viable club could be provided on a smaller part of the site, if deemed to be required, allowing other development such as residential on the remainder of the land (41/01).



## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

- The Plan refers to the St Vincent Recreation Centre, and implies complete public access to the site. All the land (including open spaces) and buildings are privately owned, on both sides of the main road. The Proposal Map is inaccurate in that it considers much of the creekside area to be 'built leisure area', whereas in fact the majority of the area, and all of the area to the west and north of Forton Creek are used totally for educational uses by the College and Quayside (28/03).
- Paragraph 8.26 refers to providing adequate parking, which does not fully accord with the advice in PPG13. Local authorities should not require developers to provide more spaces than they themselves wish (1/35).
- Criterion ii refers to adequate and alternative facilities. In the absence of a needs assessment, it is not clear how this would be satisfactorily determined (1/36).
- R/CF10 would appear ineffective in providing protection to existing facilities (45/01).
- The Local Plan must include a policy to protect hotels in Gosport (61/01).
- There is a shortage of tourist accommodation. Lee-on-the-Solent needs a supply of good quality hotel accommodation, entertainment and dining facilities both for existing residents and also to attract visitors to the town (45/01 63/01 64/01 68/01).
- Gosport wishes to promote itself as an area attractive to tourists, which indeed it is, but few tourists will want to come to Gosport with so little accommodation available (67/01).
- The Belle Vue Hotel in Lee-on-the-Solent should be retained. It is an important facility for both visitors and residents (66/01 68/01 70/01 71/02 74/01).
- It should be necessary for permission to be required to demolish existing facilities without a proposal to rebuild a similar facility (45/01).
- Community facilities include hotel function rooms and consequently development of such facilities should not take place unless there are alternative facilities available or to be provided (65/01).

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

### Conclusions:

- 8.14 I see no need to omit Policy R/CF9; to my mind the explanation in the supporting text properly justifies the inclusion of such a policy. At the Inquiry session into objections by the Gosport Society, the Council offered further changes and they were sent to the Society for a response. However, the Society are still of the opinion that the Rowner Centre should be retained and refurbished. I accept that the Rowner area has suffered in the past from a lack of co-ordinated action to address community needs and recreation; the Council, together with a number of Government Agencies and other bodies are now seeking to overcome that problem and improve and rejuvenate the locality. An amendment to the policy and text would assist in guiding future development proposals towards the objectives sought by the Gosport Society and accordingly I support PFA 18 and 19; the latter should have a different paragraph number as it has been given the same number as PIC 53. However, I do not consider the suggestions made by the Society are appropriate for a Local Plan as I have no precise information as to the practicalities of retaining and refurbishing the Rowner Centre. I have concluded that it is far better for the policy to seek to retain such a provision in the locality rather than to refer to a specific building.
- 8.15 Dealing with the objections from Lloyd Vine Properties, I am aware of the difficult and complicated history of the Rowner Centre. The amended wording suggested by the Council should ensure that both open space and leisure facilities are retained; whether that is in the form of the present buildings will be a matter for negotiation and proper consideration at development control stage based on the policies of the Plan.
- 8.16 As far as the objection from St Vincent College is concerned, I agree with PIC 53 as it does provide additional information and guidance regarding development potential on this site. Given that there are unlikely to be significant areas available for development, I agree that it would be inappropriate to include the site under Policy R/CF9. However, I suggest that further explanation regarding ownership and the limited extent of available areas for development should be included within new paragraph 8.28a. I concur with the Council that the amendments in the Second Deposit of the Plan in respect of paragraph 8.26 satisfies national planning guidance.
- 8.17 In respect of Policy R/CF10, the Council has undertaken a survey of hotel accommodation in the Borough and concluded that there is a need to introduce a planning policy to retain such accommodation; that approach follows the advice in Policy TSR5 of the draft South East Plan. I therefore support Policy R/CF10 and the amendment contained in PIC 54. I note the objections regarding the Belle View Hotel at Lee-on-Solent, but that building has now been demolished. It is not appropriate to include within the policy the

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

requirement to obtain planning permission for the demolition of buildings because as the Council point out, except in Conservation Areas, such activities are permitted development under the Planning Acts. I also consider it is necessary to retain criterion (ii) of Policy R/CF10; it will be for the Council to assess any alternative facilities and determine whether existing facilities are adequate.

### **Recommendation:**

- 8.18 That an additional paragraph be included relating to the Rowner Centre and Village in accordance with PFA 19.
- 8.19 That the Rowner Centre be included within the wording for Policy R/CF9 in accordance with PFA 18.
- 8.20 That PIC 53 include a further reference to ownership and the limited areas likely to be available for development at St Vincent College and then be adopted.
- 8.21 That PIC 54 be adopted.

### **POLICY R/CF11, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 55 and PARAGRAPH 8.30: IMPROVEMENT OR DEVELOPMENT OF TOURIST ACCOMMODATION AND CONFERENCE FACILITIES**

#### **Objections:**

1/37 - Government Office for the South East

#### **Support:**

Sup/28/04 - St Vincent College  
Sup/48/04 - Tourism South East  
Sup/68/02 - Mrs S George

#### **Main Issues:**

- The Policy does not fully accord with the advice in PPG6 which states that the sequential approach should also apply to town centre uses which attract a lot of people.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **Conclusions:**

- 8.22 The Council's amendment under PIC 55 and the change to paragraph 8.30 addresses the objection.

### **Recommendation:**

- 8.23 That Policy R/CF11 and PIC 55 be adopted.

### **POLICY R/CF12, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 56: CEMETERY PROVISION**

#### **Objections:**

11/14 - Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust

#### **Main Issues:**

- There is insufficient certainty as to where the cemeteries are proposed to be located.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 8.24 I am satisfied that PIC 56 addresses the objection and is a reasonable change to the Plan.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 8.25 That PIC 56 be adopted.

**9. Chapter 9: Ministry of Defence**

**POLICY R/MOD1, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 57:  
DEVELOPMENT OF EXISTING ESTABLISHMENTS**

**Objections:**

13/18 - Defence Estates  
13/19 - Defence Estates

**Support:**

Sup/7/10 - English Heritage

**Main Issues:**

- Concern regarding the requirement that operational development should reflect the scale and respect the setting of existing development (13/18).
- New operational buildings will, by their very nature, be of a different scale to adjoining dwellings (13/18).
- Married Quarters may be developed at densities higher than those in surrounding areas (13/18).
- Concern regarding the term "established views". Criterion v does not adequately make the distinction between views which are worthy of protection, and those that do not (13/19).

**Conclusions:**

- 9.1 PIC 57 and the changes made in the Second Deposit of the Plan properly address the objections raised by Defence Estates. I consider the revised policy sets a reasonable basis for future development proposals on Ministry of Defence land.

**Recommendation:**

- 9.2 That Policy R/MOD1, the supporting text and PIC 57 be adopted.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **POLICY R/MOD2 AND PARAGRAPHS 9.10 and 9.12, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 58: DEVELOPMENT OF SITES DECLARED SURPLUS TO REQUIREMENTS**

#### **Objections:**

1/39 - Government Office for the South East  
8/22 - English Nature  
8/23 - English Nature  
10/02 – RSPB  
11/15 - Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust

#### **Main Issues:**

- Policy does not fully accord with PPG12 which makes clear that plan policies should not attempt to delegate the criteria for decisions on planning applications to Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) or to development briefs (1/39).
- PPG12 also makes clear that SPG must be consistent with the policies set out in the adopted Local Plan (1/39).
- It is considered that all the sites declared surplus to requirements which will be developed should be identified in the Plan Review (8/22).
- Concern that the policy will allow development in unspecified locations (11/15).
- There is substantial uncertainty regarding the release of MoD land for development (11/15).
- There does not seem to be a co-ordinated approach for the optimal management of the Ministry of Defence's existing built-up areas or the release of areas to the open market for potential development (11/15).
- Policy R/MOD2 does not make adequate linkages with the other relevant policies of the Local Plan Review (10/02).
- Bullet point 4 in paragraph 9.12 should read "...must comply with the policies..." rather than "...must have regard specifically to..."(8/23).

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

### Conclusions:

- 9.3 I have to say that in my opinion, neither the policy wording nor the suggested revision contained in PFA 14 are ideal as planning policy to deal with planning applications on surplus Ministry of Defence land because all matters seem to be delegated to supplementary planning guidance procedures. However, I do recognise that the Ministry of Defence seem to carry out regular reviews and changes to their requirements and that can alter any particular situation significantly. Given that the Plan period is until 2016, I agree that the policy wording and the clarification given in the amended paragraph 9.10 is as clear and detailed as possible in the circumstances; it would allow the Council to prepare a Development Brief or Action Plan for specific sites when the circumstances arise. I do not consider the proposed change of wording suggested by English Nature to criterion (ii) is acceptable as it would allow no flexibility. But I support the changes in PIC 58 in respect of paragraph 9.12 as it clarifies the links to international legislation for Nature Conservation.

### Recommendation:

- 9.4 That the revised policy wording and paragraph 9.10 suggested in PFA 14 and 15 be adopted.
- 9.5 That PIC 58 be adopted.

**10. Chapter 10: Built Heritage**

**POLICY R/BH3 AND PARAGRAPH 10.17, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 59:  
LISTED BUILDINGS**

**Objections:**

1/42 - Government Office for the South East  
CO/82/09 -Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited

**Main Issues:**

- Whilst Policy R/BH3 does not include detailed conservation guidance, paragraph 10.17 does refer to the treatment of internal alterations, etc. PPG15 advises that supplementary planning guidance is appropriate to provide this form of advice (1/42).
- The test of ‘materiality’ is absent (CO/82/09).
- Policy should be changed to read ‘... its setting will not be adversely harmed’ (CO/82/09).

**Conclusions:**

- 10.1 I agree with the Council that for the reasons given by them in their submitted proof of evidence, the change to the wording suggested by Berkeley Homes Limited would be inappropriate. There is no need to include the word “adversely” as the meaning of the word “harm” is quite clear. As far as materiality is concerned, the text contains sufficient circumstances or examples to clarify the policy. PIC 59 correctly addresses the concerns of GOSE.

**Recommendation:**

- 10.2 That PIC 59 be adopted.
- 10.3 Policy R/BH3 and the supporting text be adopted.



## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **PARAGRAPH 10.24: DEMOLITION OF A LISTED BUILDING**

#### **Objections:**

1/43 - Government Office for the South East

#### **Main Issues:**

- Paragraph 10.24 sets out the terms of a planning condition and how it would be used in determining a planning application. PPG12 states that the reasoned justification should not contain policies and proposals which will be used in themselves for taking decisions on planning applications.
- Circular 1/97 states that where a local authority is likely to seek planning obligations in connection with a particular type of development, they should make this clear by setting it out in their plan policies.

#### **Conclusions:**

10.4 The changes in the Second Deposit of the Plan correctly address the objection.

#### **Recommendation:**

10.5 That paragraph 10.24 be adopted.

### **POLICY R/BH5 AND PARAGRAPH 10.26: THE LOCAL LIST**

#### **Objections:**

1/44 - Government Office for the South East  
CO/82/10 - Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited

#### **Main Issues:**

- The test of 'materiality' is absent (CO/82/10)
- Policy should be changed to read '... its setting will not be adversely harmed' (CO/82/10).
- Paragraph 10.26 does not fully reflect the advice in PPG15. This reminds local authorities that policies relating to locally listed buildings do not

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

enjoy the full protection of statutory listing, for example reference is made to preserving or enhancing buildings or structures (1/44).

### **Conclusions:**

- 10.6 The Council's changes in the Second Deposit of the Plan satisfactorily address the objections from GOSE. For the reasons given under my comments to Policy R/BH3, I do not agree with the objections made by Berkeley Homes Limited. The content of paragraph 10.25 and Appendix M give guidance on the local list.

### **Recommendation:**

- 10.7 That Policy R/BH5 and the supporting text be adopted.

## **PARAGRAPH R/BH6 AND PARAGRAPH 10.28: HISTORIC PARKS AND GARDENS**

### **Objections:**

1/46 - Government Office for the South East  
44/01- Friends of Crescent Garden  
CO/82/11 - Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited

### **Support:**

Sup/21/01 - Hampshire Gardens Trust (Research Group)  
Sup/47/01 - Garden History Society  
Sup/48/05 - Tourism South East

### **Main Issues:**

- The Crescent Garden in Alverstoke should be shown on the Proposals Map as a historic garden (44/01).
- The test of 'materiality' is absent (CO/82/11).
- Policy should be changed to read '... its setting will not be adversely harmed' (CO/82/11).

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

- Paragraph 10.28 indicates that Policy R/BH6 is to apply to parks and gardens not included on the English Heritage list. PPG15 makes clear that local planning authorities should protect "registered parks and gardens". If the intention is to protect non-registered parks and gardens, it may be necessary to consider preparing a separate policy (1/46).

### **Conclusions:**

- 10.8 While I acknowledge that the difference between the one Listed Park and other locally listed parks is explained in the text, there should be separate policies that make clear the status and protection given to both types of park. I endorse the Council's comments in respect of the suggestions made by the Friends of Crescent Gardens, but consider that PIC 77 is the only change that should be made as the Gardens are adequately protected by the designation under Policy R/OS3, Policy R/BH6 and PIC 77, as well as the fact that the Council own the land. For the reasons given under Policy R/BH3, I do not agree with the suggestions made by Berkeley Homes Limited. Paragraph 10.29 addresses the approach and circumstances adopted towards development proposals in historic parks, although the separate supporting text for each new policy should clearly explain those circumstances.

### **Recommendation:**

- 10.9 That PIC 77 be adopted.
- 10.10 That the Council establish two separate policies for Listed and locally listed Parks in the Borough and for each policy and supporting text to make clear the different status attributed to each and the protection given.

## **POLICY R/BH7 AND PARAGRAPH 10.31: ARCHAEOLOGY AND ANCIENT MONUMENTS**

### **Objections:**

1/47 - Government Office for the South East  
7/16 - English Heritage  
CO/82/12 - Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited

### **Main Issues:**

- Policy does not fully reflect the advice in PPG16 which advises the inclusion of policies on protection, enhancement and preservation of sites

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

of archaeological interest and of their settings. (1/47).

- Preservation must be assessed looking at the individual merits of the case, including the need for development (1/47).
- PPG16 advises that policies should concentrate on those matters which are likely to provide the basis for considering conditions to be attached to planning permissions (1/47).
- Circular 1/97 states that where a local authority is likely to seek planning obligations in connection with a particular type of development, they should make this clear by setting it out in their plan policies (1/47).
- The test of 'materiality' is absent (CO/82/12).
- Policy should be changed to read '... its setting will not be adversely harmed' (CO/82/12).
- Reference in paragraph 10.31 to scheduled monument consent should attribute consent to the Secretary of State for Culture, Media & Sport (7/16).

### **Conclusions:**

- 10.11 The Council has suggested further changes in PFA 16 relating to the policy wording. I accept that the changes and those in the Second Deposit of the Plan satisfactorily address the objections made by GOSE. For the reasons I have given under Policy R/BH3, I do not agree with the suggestions made by Berkeley Homes Limited. The supporting text addresses the approach taken in assessing applications affecting important archaeological sites. I also consider that the responsibilities and titles of Government Departments may change over the years and for the wording of the Plan to remain relevant, paragraph 10.31 should remain in the form shown in the Second Deposit of the Plan.

### **Recommendation:**

- 10.12 That Policy R/BH7 be amended in accordance with PFA 16; that wording and the supporting text be adopted.

**11. Chapter 11: Open Space and Nature Conservation**

**POLICY OMISSION: FARM LAND**

**Objections:**

25/29 - Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group

**Main Issues:**

- There is no mention of the importance of farmland.

**Conclusions:**

- 11.1 I am informed that there are no working farms within the Borough. As other policies such as those for open spaces, nature conservation, natural areas and amenity spaces provide significant control, I see little point in including yet another policy to protect farmland.

**Recommendation:**

- 11.2 That no further changes be made to the Plan.

**PARAGRAPHS 11.3, 11.5, 11.13:  
INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES**

**Objections:**

23/04 - Friends of Stokes Bay

**Main Issues:**

- A Stokes Bay Policy is required.

**Conclusions:**

- 11.3 This area is already covered by other policies and the Council is assessing the situation to see if it is relevant to create a new Conservation Area. In such circumstances, I do not recommend yet another layer of protection.

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

### Recommendation:

11.4 That no further changes be made to the Plan.

### **POLICY R/OS1 AND PARAGRAPH 11.14: CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE OF THE URBAN AREA**

#### **Objections:**

25/17 - Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group  
40/02 - Davies Associates

#### **Support:**

Sup/4/05 - Fareham Borough Council  
Sup/22/35 - Lee Residents' Association  
Sup/51/01 - Mr Murray Bell

#### **Main Issues:**

- Policy attempts to prohibit all development outside of the designated urban areas with only two exceptions (40/02).
- This is tantamount to treating the land as Green Belt. However there is no policy within the current Structure Plan which enables the designation of Green Belt or Green Belt by another name within the Borough with the consequent presumption against development as set out in PPG2 (40/02).
- Only restricting "most" forms of development does not go far enough (25/17).

#### **Conclusions:**

11.5 Gosport Borough is very urbanised and therefore I can see little harm in a designation which seeks to ensure that development does not take place within strategic areas of undeveloped land. However, the Council should be careful where it does impose this designation. I have suggested that at least one site covered by several designations should no longer be the subject of protection under Policy R/OS2 or Policy R/OS1. That is not in order to allow development, but because it is not necessary to have several layers of control all seeking a similar protection from future development. The Council are correct in allowing some flexibility by inclusion of the word "most".

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **Recommendation:**

- 11.6 That the amended Policy R/OS1 and the supporting text be adopted.

### **POLICY R/OS2 AND PARAGRAPHS 11.20 AND 11.21: URBAN GAPS**

#### **Objections:**

1/48 - Government Office for the South East  
35/08 - Abbey Developments Limited  
CO/35/16 - Abbey Developments Limited  
40/01 - Davies Associates

#### **Support:**

Sup/11/17 - Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust

#### **Main Issues:**

- Policy does not fully reflect the advice in PPG7 which advises that local designations carry less weight than national designations, and that development plans should not apply the same policies to them (1/48).
- Stokesmead Field should be deleted from the Stoke Lake/Gosport Park Urban Gap (35/08).
- The designation of an Urban Gap for Frater Lane is inappropriate (40/01).
- Object to the wording in 11.20 as there is no qualification as to what 'significant' means. Some of the areas within the Urban Gap are clearly of varying quality and the Council appears to have drawn a blanket designation across areas instead of forming a view on a site by site or area basis (35/16).

#### **Conclusions:**

- 11.7 Under Policy R/OS3 I have supported the designation of Stokesmead Field as an open space and where development should not be permitted. While I do not oppose Policy R/OS2 as a principle, I really see no need for that designation to cover Stokesmead Field. National planning advice suggests that it is quite unnecessary to have several layers of different control in order to protect the open appearance of existing undeveloped areas. While there

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

may be some areas that do not have the protection afforded by Policy R/OS3 or any other policy, the Council should review the boundaries of Policy R/OS2 to ensure no duplication of control.

- 11.8 The use of the word “significant” is a well used and proper qualification to ensure some flexibility to the purpose set out in paragraph 11.20. As far as the objections from GOSE are concerned, I agree with the Council that this policy is intended to influence the settlement pattern rather than refer to countryside designations; indeed, most of the gaps are between urban areas. Accordingly, I support the objectives of the policy. Regarding the Frater Lane area, I am satisfied that the locality is properly included within the Urban Gap designation, but as with Stokesmead Field, I suggest the Council review areas where there are several designations seeking the same or similar objectives.

### **Recommendation:**

- 11.9 That Policy R/OS2 and the supporting text be reviewed to ensure there is no unnecessary duplication of control and then adopted.
- 11.10 That Stokesmead Field be omitted from the designation.

### **PARAGRAPHS 11.24 AND 11.25: EXISTING SUPPLY OF OPEN SPACE**

#### **Objections:**

1/49 - Government Office for the South East  
1/50 - Government Office for the South East

#### **Main Issues:**

- Local authorities are advised to take account of the advice in PPG17 including the use of locally derived standards (1/49 1/50).

#### **Conclusions:**

- 11.11 In the Second Deposit of the Plan, paragraphs 11.24 and 11.25 have been amended and do take account of the advice in PPG17.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 11.12 That paragraphs 11.24 and 11.25 be adopted.



## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **POLICY R/OS3, PARAGRAPHS 11.27, 11.27A, 11.28, 11.29 AND 11.31, AND INSET MAP 1, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 60 : PROTECTION OF EXISTING OPEN SPACE**

#### **Objections:**

1/51 - Government Office for the South East  
CO/1/73 - Government Office for the South East  
2/16 - Hampshire County Council: Estates Practice  
CO/13/22 - Defence Estates  
25/20 - Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group  
25/21 - Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group  
35/09 - Abbey Developments Limited  
CO/35/17 - Abbey Developments Limited  
CO/75/01 - Mr Brian Hart Brian Filmer Hart Limited

#### **Support:**

Sup/9/21 - The Countryside Agency

#### **Main Issues:**

- Existing open space should not be built on unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space to be surplus to requirements (1/51; CO/1/73).
- In advance of an assessment of need, local authorities should give careful consideration to any planning applications involving development on playing fields (1/51).
- Criterion i and paragraph 11.28 refer to the loss of open space, in order to provide community facilities. Approach does not fully accord with the advice in PPG17 which states local authorities should weigh any benefits being offered to the community against the loss of space that will occur (1/51).
- Text indicates that some sites afforded protection by Policy R/OS3 are not shown on the Proposals Map. This does not provide clarity or certainty for users of the Plan (1/51 35/09).
- The Proposals Map allocates school playing fields as protected open space and therefore severely restricts schools and the Local Education Authority in their ability to extend and/or rationalise existing institutions (2/16).

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

- It should be made explicit that no housing developments will be permitted on open space (25/20).
- Paragraph 11.29 is unclear when it states "in exceptional circumstances planning permission may be granted for development at a recreational site" (25/21).
- The wording of Policy R/OS3 is too restrictive. It is considered to be contrary to national planning policy guidance to seek to retain all existing areas of open space without an assessment (35/09).
- The Open Space Audit has not been subject to separate public consultation and therefore the value of it is substantially diminished (CO/35/17).
- Stokesmead Field should not be allocated as open space (35/09, CO/35/17).
- Objection to the designation of the helipad area at DARA Fleetlands as Existing Open Space(CO/13/22).
- No improvements are proposed to Carisbrooke Pond (CO/75/01).
- The categorisation of the pond in the Open Space Monitoring Report should be re-assessed as high value; it should be developed as a learning park haven (CO/75/01).

### Conclusions:

- 11.13 Dealing firstly with the objections from Abbey Developments Limited, I do support the designation of Stokesmead Field as an open space. The Open Space Monitoring Report identifies a deficiency in the Anglesey Ward of sports pitches, children's play areas and other outdoor sports facilities. The site is also within a high density housing area and located in an ideal position to provide an area clear of development. It is unlikely that the land could provide full sized sports pitches, but I was informed at the Inquiry that it could provide junior sports pitches; it is also adjacent to a Ramsar designation and able to provide a useful buffer between that area and housing.
- 11.14 The Council did suggest that Stokesmead Field is a high value open space due to its waterside location, is an important feature of the Anglesey Conservation Area and provides a setting for a number of important buildings in the adjoining Alverstoke Conservation Area. I concur with that opinion. But in view of my conclusions on the need to use all of the land for open space, I also consider there is no purpose in its inclusion within the urban area boundary.

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

- 11.15 I note that a planning appeal for housing was dismissed in 1996 and the Inspector recorded the opinion that the open space designation was a material consideration. I agree with that conclusion and consider the designation should continue. However, I see no need for the Council to also include the site within two other designations. Inclusion within the Urban Gap may well provide a degree of separation between built-up areas, but so does an Open Space designation. Whilst it may be within the Urban Gap in the adopted Plan, that is no reason to continue the designation as all policies should be reviewed in the Deposit Plan.
- 11.16 As far as the Coastal Zone designation is concerned, I was informed at the Inquiry that the assessment was part of the Portsmouth Harbour Coastal Zone arrangements which are also part of the Fareham and Portsmouth Local Plan Reviews. I am aware of the representations made to those Plans, but I find it difficult to understand the need to designate an area of land that does not form part of a lake or waterway in such a manner. Furthermore, its allocation as an open space under Policy R/OS3 provides the buffer required by the Council between the Portsmouth Harbour SPA/Ramsar site/SSSI and the urban areas. I recommend that the Council reviews the designations under both the Urban Gap and Coastal Zone designations and remove areas that are covered by other designations that provide duplication in protection terms.
- 11.17 I also suggest that the Council include a reference in paragraph 11.47 of the intention to seek the purchase of Stokesmead Field as open space either through negotiations with the owners or via a Compulsory Purchase Order; the latter should be fully justified as a necessary requirement for the area based on the findings of the Open Space Monitoring Report and the annual review of that document that I have recommended. I am also satisfied that the policy and supporting text complies with the general objectives of PPG17 and when taken with the Monitoring Report provides a reasonable basis upon which to determine planning applications.
- 11.18 I also agree with the Council that the DARA Fleetlands site has significant recreational value and is worthy of protection under Policy R/OS3. I am aware of the concerns of the Friends of the Earth Local Group, but the intention of the policy is to retain the designations clear of any development; reference to housing development is unnecessary. However, there is always a need to be flexible and that is why the words “exceptional circumstances” are necessary.
- 11.19 Dealing with the objection from Mr Hart, I do not consider that Carisbrooke Pond should be specifically mentioned in either Policy R/OS3 or the supporting text. If the Council were to single out one particular open space area for attention, it would be quite unfair not to then mention all other open spaces. In any case, the policy seeks to prevent any development proposals from having a significantly detrimental effect on any of the identified open

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

spaces. The supporting text is intended to justify the Council's opposition to the loss of open spaces rather than detailed proposals to improve or up-grade each area. The Open Space Audit concludes that there are no open spaces surplus to requirements; the text suggests some areas could be improved in qualitative terms.

- 11.20 The Report does mention the Carisbrooke Road site as an “amenity greenspace” of low quality and medium value. That is the conclusion of the Report and although the objector may not agree with that assessment, I have concluded there is nothing in that Report or in the evidence submitted by the objector to justify that area being referred to as “a learning park haven”. Indeed, from the evidence submitted by the objector, it would seem that the present quality of the pond is of low quality.
- 11.21 At the Inquiry, the Council confirmed that the Leisure Department did have the land in a programme for improvement and up-grading. Again, that may not be what this objector wishes for the area, but that is the decision of the Council as a corporate body. Accordingly, it would be wrong to attempt to include within a Land Use Plan, proposals by other Departments of the Council. Neither is a Local Plan Inquiry the venue for seeking to amalgamate the various responsibilities of different Departments or indeed the current bodies responsible for managing the Carisbrooke Pond area in particular.
- 11.22 But I do agree that the Council should decide what status the Open Space Report should have and what is intended in respect of the funding of priority projects. I suggest that there should be an annual review by the Planning Department of the Report and any improvements or changes that are to be made. Paragraph 11.27 of the Plan should include a commitment to an annual review of open spaces.
- 11.23 I now turn to the objections raised by the Hampshire County Council. I am aware of the responsibilities and duties of the County Council and Department of Education. But for that Authority to object to this policy because they may need to allow development of an open or undeveloped area to finance future improvements or additions to the educational facilities in the Borough, is not a proper basis for opposing a planning policy intended to retain open spaces. If there is a need to retain an open space then it should be retained regardless of ownership. Furthermore, the County Council also has a wider duty to pursue planning policies that protect the environment of communities and open spaces in particular.
- 11.24 The Borough Council's audit of open spaces has shown a need for the general retention of such areas; the policy and paragraph 11.31 does allow some flexibility, particularly where there is an improvement in the quality of community provision or a small loss of open space which may not cause significant harm to the overall objectives of the policy. During the course of

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

the Inquiry, the Council was able to give examples of where circumstances could lead to flexibility in the policy. I suggest the Council should expand paragraph 11.31 to give an example. In these circumstances, I am satisfied that the policy and supporting text would be acceptable. It was also pointed out to me that reference should also be made in Policy R/CF5 to there being no significant loss of open space. I concur with that suggestion and have made an appropriate recommendation.

- 11.25 At the Inquiry session into Policy R/OS3, and other sessions, I was informed on behalf of this objector that the Estates Practice of the County Council did not necessarily represent the views of other Departments of the County Council. Indeed, neither the Planning nor Education Departments have raised objections to this policy; following the publication of the First Deposit of the Plan, the Planning Department actually asked for amendments that have been accepted by the Borough Council at Second Deposit stage. It seems to me that for the County Council to make separate and sometimes contradictory representations to another Authority is quite unacceptable. I suggest that the Borough Council make strong representations to the County Council to adopt a consistent and corporate approach when dealing with planning proposals or policies.

### **Recommendation:**

- 11.26 That Policy R/OS3 and the supporting text be adopted subject to the inclusion within paragraph 11.31 of an example of where the Council would be prepared to accept the loss of an open space.
- 11.27 That the Council determine the status of the Open Space Monitoring Report and consider the annual publication of a statement listing any changes or improvements in the open spaces mentioned in the Report.
- 11.28 That representation be made to the County Council regarding the consistency of the representations of that Authority as a corporate body.
- 11.29 That Stokesmead Field be retained under the designation of open space and the Council include under paragraph 11.47 a commitment to seek the acquisition of the land for that purpose.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **POLICY R/OS5: RECREATION ALLOCATION IN THE ALVER VALLEY**

#### **Objections:**

11/18 - Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust

#### **Main Issues:**

- The Borough's aspirations for enhancing the biodiversity of the site should be reflected in the Policy.
- As it is currently written, Policy R/OS5 effectively permits recreation (both formal and informal) in unspecified locations within the Alver Valley. There is currently uncertainty about what type of recreational development will be permitted.

#### **Conclusions:**

11.30 All policies within the Plan should be read as a whole and any proposals within the Alver Valley are also subject to other policies, including nature conservation interest. I see no reason to amend or add to the existing wording of the policy.

#### **Recommendation:**

11.31 That Policy R/OS5 and the supporting text be adopted.

### **POLICY R/OS6 AND PARAGRAPH 11.47: ADDITIONAL OPEN SPACE ALLOCATIONS**

#### **Objections:**

35/10 - Abbey Developments Limited

#### **Support:**

Sup/54/01 - Mr D L Wood  
Sup/20/01 - Gosport Society  
Sup/24/01 - Crescent Owners Association  
Sup/46/01 - St Vincent Local History Club  
Sup/51/02 - Mr Murray Bell

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

Sup/55/02 - Mrs Joan Russell

Sup/56/01 - Mr David Maber

Sup/69/01 - Mr F P Gradidge

### **Main Issues:**

- Stokesmead should be deleted from the additional open space allocations.
- Recent evidence does not justify the need for the site for recreation purposes.
- The site is not described as being of any intrinsic importance in visual or environmental terms.

### **Conclusions:**

- 11.32 For the reasons I have given under Policy R/OS3, I do not agree with this objection.

### **Recommendation:**

- 11.33 That Policy R/OS6 and the supporting text be adopted.

## **POLICY R/OS7, PARAGRAPHS 11.53-11.60 AND APPENDIX P: RECREATIONAL SPACE FOR NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

### **Objections:**

1/53 - Government Office for the South East

1/55 - Government Office for the South East

18/04 - House Builders Federation

30/02 – BT PLC

PIC/30/05 - BT PLC

36/06 - McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd

CO/82/01 - Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited

### **Main Issues:**

- Use of national standards are not appropriate. PPG17 advises that open space standards are best set locally (1/53 30/02 PIC/30/05).

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

- The Plan should be updated to take account of the advice in PPG17 and the companion guide to PPG17, "Assessing Needs and Opportunities" (1/55).
- Applying this policy to each net dwelling gain is inappropriate and impractical. A threshold of 10 is more applicable (18/04).
- It is inappropriate to require maintenance payments for on-site open space provision to cover a period of 10 years (18/04).
- Policy and Appendix could lead to the imposition of excessive or unrelated financial burdens on developers not in accordance with Government advice in PPG17 (30/02 PIC/30/05).
- It is not appropriate for the Council to expect the developers of sheltered housing for the elderly to provide financial contributions to make provision of public open space in the form of bowling greens and tennis courts, and provide on-site informal open space (36/06).
- The open space requirement is greater than the NPFA standard (CO/82/01).
- Recognition needs to be given to other competing needs, such as the objective to achieve higher densities (CO/82/01).

### Conclusions:

11.34 National planning advice suggests that open space standards should be set locally. Although the Council have based their standards on NPFA figures, they have recorded in the Second Deposit of the Plan that work will be carried out to establish a locally determined basis for such standards. The Open Space Monitoring Report has now been published and I would suggest the Council now seeks an urgent review of these standards based on local information. Until such further work is prepared, I accept that the standards presently listed are reasonable and give realistic targets. As with other requirements of policies within the Plan, the Council seeks such provision as part of a negotiation at the time of a planning application. I am satisfied that the targets for open space and the explanation given in the text is a proper basis for this type of provision.

11.35 The suggested 10 year time period for maintenance would provide a reasonable time span for such areas to become properly established. I see no purpose in setting a threshold as even the occupants of one dwelling would generate a demand. Provision is set in hectares per 1000 persons and for smaller sites. Appendix P shows the standard for individual dwellings or commuted sums. I disagree that such provision would be onerous or place an



## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

unnecessary burden on developers and landowners; land value can only be based on what development is permitted on a site and such schemes require a proper standard of facility to accompany development.

- 11.36 I am very surprised that McCarthy and Stone Limited consider that elderly persons do not require on-site informal open space or outdoor activities; such provision would of course be on a pro-rata basis depending on the number of units built. But not all elderly persons are inactive and in the modern world we are all being exhorted to try to keep healthy and active as long as possible. Residents of the type of accommodation built by the objector would also benefit from such areas when younger members of the family visit.

### **Recommendation:**

- 11.37 That Policy R/OS7, the supporting text and Appendix P be adopted.
- 11.38 That the Council further reviews the standards to ensure they reflect needs.

### **POLICY R/OS8 AND PARAGRAPH 11.61: ALLOTMENT GARDENS**

#### **Objections:**

58/04 - Mr Andrew Shaw  
CO/80/01 - Gosport Allotments Association

#### **Main Issues:**

- Loss of allotments should not be allowed, if demand rises again there will be no space left in Gosport for new allotments (58/04).
- Allotment sites should not be used for facilities such as shops or car parks (58/04).
- Allotment sites should be protected from built leisure facilities (CO/80/01).
- The word 'continuing' in paragraph 11.61 should be deleted (CO/80/01).

#### **Conclusions:**

- 11.39 I consider the basic objective of the policy to be correct and provide a flexible approach for a number of years. I note the concerns of the objectors, but suggest the Council is in general agreement with them and is attempting to

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

account for circumstances over some period when there may be no demand. However, I do agree that the policy wording would benefit from an amendment to reflect the changes in paragraph 11.61.

### **Recommendation:**

11.40 That Policy R/OS8 be amended to read as follows:

“Development proposals which result in the loss of allotment gardens will not be permitted unless it can be shown there is a continuing and significant lack of demand locally. Any development proposals that may be permitted must retain the general open nature of the land and provide for the improvement, modernisation or extension of recreation/leisure facilities.”

11.41 That paragraph 11.61 be adopted

### **POLICY R/OS9 AND PARAGRAPHS 11.62 AND 11.64A, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 61: PROTECTION OF AREAS OF INTERNATIONAL NATURE CONSERVATION IMPORTANCE**

#### **Objections:**

1/57 - Government Office for the South East  
CO/1/74 - Government Office for the South East  
10/03 – RSPB

#### **Support:**

Sup/4/04 - Fareham Borough Council

#### **Main Issues:**

- Policy does not fully reflect the advice in PPG9 (1/57).
- The text defining Ramsar Sites needs to be amended (10/03).
- Paragraph 11.64a indicates in what circumstances planning permission would be refused. However, PPG12 states that the reasoned justification should not contain policies and proposals, which will be used in themselves for taking decisions on planning applications (CO/1/74).

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **Conclusions:**

- 11.42 I consider the policy and supporting text in the Second Deposit of the Plan is basically correct and sets the circumstances for protection of those important areas; it generally overcomes the objections to the First Deposit of the Plan. I am satisfied that the content of paragraph 11.64a is a proper basis for advice needed in the supporting text. However, criterion (i) should include the additional advice given in paragraph 11.64a as it does form part of the assessment of any scheme. PIC 61 addresses the objection from the RSPB.

### **Recommendation:**

- 11.43 That Policy R/OS9, the supporting text and PIC 61 be adopted subject to an amendment to criterion (i) showing the inclusion of the last sentence in paragraph 11.64a.

### **POLICY R/OS10 AND PARAGRAPH 11.67: PROTECTION OF AREAS OF NATIONAL NATURE CONSERVATION IMPORTANCE**

#### **Objections:**

25/25 - Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group

#### **Support:**

Sup/4/03 - Fareham Borough Council

Sup/11/20 - Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust

#### **Main Issues:**

- Allowing damage to an SSSI based on value judgements is dangerous and likely to lead to unnecessary developments that adversely affect these sites.
- Compensation for adverse impacts is unsatisfactory.

### **Conclusions:**

- 11.44 It is always to be hoped that development proposals would never harm an SSSI. But the Council is correct in following national planning guidance in that account has to be taken of exceptional circumstances and make provision for mitigation measures. Value judgements are an inevitable part of everyday

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

life, including planning proposals and decisions.

### **Recommendation:**

11.45 That Policy R/OS10 and the supporting text be adopted.

### **POLICY R/OS11 AND PARAGRAPHS 11.68 AND 11.70: LOCALLY DESIGNATED AREAS OF NATURE CONSERVATION IMPORTANCE**

#### **Objections:**

1/59 - Government Office for the South East  
13/21 - Defence Estates  
18/05 - House Builders Federation  
CO/18/09 - House Builders Federation

23/02 - Friends of Stokes Bay  
25/27 - Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group

#### **Support:**

Sup/11/21 - Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust  
Sup/23/01 - Friends of Stokes Bay

#### **Main Issues:**

- This policy seeks to apply the same degree of protection and weight to SINC's and other local designations as the national/international designations (1/59 18/05).
- The use of local countryside designations is not appropriate and consequently the policy should be deleted (CO/18/09).
- The measures listed in paragraph 11.70 to overcome potential impacts are not satisfactory alternatives (25/27).
- Part of the DM Gosport site should not be designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)(13/21).
- Additional land at Stokes Bay should be designated (23/02).

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **Conclusions:**

- 11.46 Although Defence Estates have suggested that they have commissioned a survey showing which areas should not be designated under this policy, to date, they have not submitted the evidence to support their request. As a contrast, the Council have given a full and detailed justification in their evidence of the importance of such designations. I see no reason to support the objection. The changes made in the Second Deposit of the Plan are sufficient to provide the distinction between local, national and international nature conservation measures. The provisions of paragraph 11.70 are quite adequate to provide any mitigation measures. I have insufficient evidence to support the inclusion of land at Stokes Bay and therefore concur with the Council that it would not be appropriate to designate such areas.

### **Recommendation:**

- 11.47 That Policy R/OS11 and the supporting text be adopted.

## **POLICY R/OS12: PROTECTION OF HABITATS SUPPORTING PROTECTED SPECIES**

### **Objections:**

25/28 - Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group

### **Main Issues:**

- The satisfactory transfer of species to an alternative site is not considered possible. Translocation of a species very rarely works and is therefore never a satisfactory option.

### **Conclusions:**

- 11.48 I do support the concerns of the objectors, but on some occasions it may be necessary to move species and therefore the Council are correct in setting out a policy in order to provide mitigation measures.

### **Recommendation:**

- 11.49 That Policy R/OS12 and the supporting text be adopted.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **PARAGRAPH 11.74, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 62: BIODIVERSITY ACTION PLANS (ORIGINAL OBJECTION REFERRED TO PARAGRAPH 11.72)**

#### **Objections:**

8/32 - English Nature

#### **Main Issues:**

- Paragraph 11.74 should read Habitats Regulations.

#### **Conclusions:**

11.50 PIC 62 amends paragraph 11.74 in accordance with the objection.

#### **Recommendation:**

11.51 That PIC 62 be adopted.

**12. Chapter 12: Coast and Harbour**

**PARAGRAPH 12.15, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 63:  
OBJECTIVES FOR THE COAST AND HARBOUR**

**Objections:**

22/39 - Lee Residents' Association

23/03 - Friends of Stokes Bay

25/31 - Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group

**Support:**

Sup/8/34 - English Nature

**Main Issues:**

- Objectives need to control coastal activities to protect people (22/39).
- Need for an additional objective regarding sea going activities and control of "noise pollution" (22/39).
- Reference should be made in the Plan to improve access to the coast on the Haslar Peninsula (23/03).
- Concern that the objective concerning nature conservation may conflict with the objective to maintain and improve coastal recreational opportunities (25/31).

**Conclusions:**

- 12.1 I support the additional objective included in PIC 63 as it would ensure that any proposal along the coast and within the Borough would not cause significant harm to the amenities and safety of local people. However, it is not possible to control all coastal activities as many do not require planning permission and some may not be within the jurisdiction of the Council. The changes in the Second Deposit of the Plan address the objection raised by the Friends of Stokes Bay. There is often a need to balance the needs of various activities against the protection of nature conservation interests. I am satisfied that the Council have sufficient and appropriate policies to ensure there would be no significant harm to ecological interests.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **Recommendation:**

12.2 That paragraph 12.15 and PIC 63 be adopted.

### **POLICY R/CH1: DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE COASTAL ZONE: STOKESMEAD FIELD**

#### **Objections:**

35/11 - Abbey Developments Limited  
1/60 - Government Office for the South East  
39/01 - John Wyeth & Brother Limited

#### **Support:**

Sup/2/32 - Hampshire County Council  
Sup/2/33 - Hampshire County Council  
Sup/4/02 - Fareham Borough Council

12.3 Main Issues:

- Stokesmead Field, Alverstoke should be deleted from the Coastal Zone (35/11).
- The Policy and accompanying text do not reflect the advice in PPG20. This makes clear that in the coastal zone, development plans should normally not provide for development which does not require a coastal location (1/60).
- There is concern that the Policy could restrict the range of employment and economic development opportunities on the Fareham Reach site (39/01).

#### **Conclusions:**

12.4 I have supported the designation of Stokesmead Field under Policy R/OS3 as an open space worthy of retention as an undeveloped area. In my opinion, it is unnecessary to extend the designation of Policy R/CH1 to cover that site as it is contrary to national planning advice to have several layers of different designations each achieving similar objectives. Furthermore, Policy R/CH1



## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

would permit some development under certain circumstances, whereas Policy R/OS3 would resist additional built development.

- 12.5 I urge the Council to review all areas covered by this policy to ensure there are no unnecessary layers of designations. I note the comments from GOSE, but in common with the Inspector for the Portsmouth Local Plan, I agree that PPG20 does not set clear parameters for the definition of Coastal Zones. In fact, the advice does allow for some exceptions by including the word “normally”. I am satisfied that the Plan should include this policy subject to the review of the boundaries that I have already mentioned. I also agree that the Council does have sufficient policies under which it is possible to balance the needs of the various uses along the coast, including the area at Fareham Reach.

### **Recommendation:**

- 12.6 That the Council review all areas covered by Policy R/CH1 and then adopt the policy and supporting text.
- 12.7 That Stokesmead Field be deleted from the designation.

### **POLICY R/CH2 AND PARAGRAPH 12.22, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 64: PEDESTRIAN ACCESS ALONG THE COAST**

#### **Objections:**

CO/82/02 - Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited

#### **Main Issues:**

- The proposed extension to the Millennium Promenade is supported in relation to the Royal Clarence Yard site. The precise alignment of the route may change through discussion with the Council on the recently submitted planning application for the site.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 12.8 PIC 64 addresses this objection.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **Recommendation:**

- 12.9 That Policy R/CH2, the supporting text and PIC 64 be adopted.

### **PARAGRAPH 12.23: RECLAMATION AND DREDGING**

#### **Objections:**

25/34 - Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group

#### **Main Issues:**

- Allowing development based on "compensatory" measures will result in cheap and ineffective solutions from developers. Translocation of a species is not a satisfactory alternative to not developing in the first place.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 12.10 Whilst acknowledging the concerns of this objector, I have concluded that Policy R/CH3 and the supporting text give reasonable protection in the event of the need for reclamation and dredging schemes.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 12.11 That Policy R/CH3 and the supporting text be adopted.

**13. Chapter 13: Environmental Controls**

**POLICY R/ENV1 AND PARAGRAPH 13.6, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Changes 65 AND 66:  
FLOODPLAINS AND TIDAL AREAS**

**Objections:**

1/63 - Government Office for the South East  
35/12 - Abbey Developments Limited  
CO/82/03 - Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited

**Support:**

Sup/2/28 - Hampshire County Council  
Sup/8/39 - English Nature  
Sup/9/23 - The Countryside Agency  
Sup/11/25 - Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust

**Main Issues:**

- The Plan needs to identify the extent of natural floodplains and the tidal region (1/63 35/12).
- The Policy does not appear to fully reflect the risk based approach in determining planning applications (1/63).
- In preparing the development plan, it is not clear that regard has been given to the advice in PPG25 on local plan allocations, for example the risk based approach (1/63).
- The Policy does not refer to the sequential characterisation of flood risk in PPG25 (35/12).
- The Policy does not refer to the possibility of developers agreeing flood defence measures with the Environment Agency to address design and/or mitigation issues (35/12).
- The northern tip of the St George Barracks North and Royal Clarence Yard sites should not be included within the area at risk from fluvial and tidal flooding. Flood defence works have been carried out as part of the redevelopment of these sites (CO/82/03).

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

### Conclusions:

- 13.1 The Second Deposit of the Plan and PICs 65 and 66 address the concerns of GOSE for the Plan to reflect the advice in PPG25. PIC 8 refers to the need for all schemes to take account of the advice in that Government guidance. PICs 78, 79 and 80 address the matters raised by Abbey Developments Limited and that objection has been withdrawn on the basis of the changes in the Second Deposit of the Plan. For the reasons given by the Council in their proof of evidence, I agree that to exclude the northern tip of St George Barracks North and Royal Clarence Yard land would be contrary to Government advice despite flood defence works having been carried out.

### Recommendation:

- 13.2 That Policy R/ENV1, the supporting text and PICs 65, 66, 78, 79 and 80 be adopted.

### **POLICY R/ENV4 AND PARAGRAPHS 13.10 & 13.10A: TREATMENT OF FOUL SEWAGE AND DISPOSAL OF SURFACE WATER**

#### Objections:

14/02 - Southern Water  
CO/14/04 - Southern Water

#### Support:

Sup/2/31 - Hampshire County Council  
Sup/9/26 - The Countryside Agency  
Sup/14/05 - Southern Water  
Sup/14/06 - Southern Water

#### Main Issues:

- Policy R/ENV4 does not make reference to the capacity limits of the sewerage system that conveys wastewater to the treatment works (14/02).
- The necessary capacity needs to be in place before development takes place (14/02, 14/04).
- The amended policy has an emphasis on surface water drainage issues and detracts from wastewater service provision (14/04).

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **Conclusions:**

- 13.3 The Council has taken account of some of the matters raised in the objections in the Second Deposit of the Plan. In paragraphs 13.10 and 13.10a it has also given a commitment to a practice of working closely with agencies and providers in order to deliver the most effective drainage solutions for new development. I consider that is a correct approach for the treatment of foul sewage and surface water disposal.

### **Recommendation:**

- 13.4 That Policy R/ENV4 and the supporting text be adopted.

### **POLICIES R/ENV5B, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 67 and ENV5C: HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES**

#### **Objections:**

1/66 - Government Office for the South East  
CO/1/75 - Government Office for the South East

#### **Main Issues:**

- It is not clear if consideration has been given to the advice in PPG12, which advises the inclusion of a policy relating to the location of establishments where hazardous substances are used or stored, and to the development of land within the vicinity of such establishments (1/66).
- Policy R/ENV5b refers to "unsatisfactory" risk, though it is not clear what is meant by this. PPG12 advises that plans need to be clear and easily understood (CO/1/75).

#### **Conclusions:**

- 13.5 I consider the changes made to the Second Deposit of the Plan to properly address the matters raised by GOSE. But the comment from that objector regarding the use of the word "unsatisfactory" in Policy R/ENV5b should follow the more conventional test; that is given in PIC 67 and which I support.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **Recommendation:**

- 13.6 That Policy R/ENV 5b be adopted subject to PIC 67.

### **POLICY R/ENV5D/ PROPOSALS MAP: SAFEGUARDED AREAS**

#### **Objections:**

CO/13/24 - Defence Estates

#### **Main Issues:**

- The safeguarding area shown on the Proposals Map should be amended to coincide with the latest data from the Ministry of Defence.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 13.7 PIC 81 updates the Proposal Map.

### **Recommendation:**

- 13.8 That PIC 81 be adopted.

### **POLICY R/ENV9, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 68: TELECOMMUNICATIONS**

#### **Objections:**

1/64 - Government Office for the South East  
CO/1/76 - Government Office for the South East  
8/41 - English Nature  
25/41 - Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group  
CO/49/03 - Mobile Operators Association

#### **Support:**

Sup/9/30 - The Countryside Agency  
Sup/49/01,02,04,05,06,07,08,09 - Mobile Operators Association

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

### Main Issues:

- Local plans should include policies on the circumstances in which prior approval is required for the siting and appearance of certain telecommunications development (1/64).
- Criteria (vi) refers to demonstrating the need for development. This does not appear to accord with the advice in PPG8 which states that authorities should not question the need for the telecommunications system (CO/1/76).
- Concern that the policy does not refer to possible health and safety implications of telecommunications masts and other telecommunications equipment. A precautionary approach is necessary (25/41).
- Criterion (v) is considered unnecessary as provisions for the removal of telecommunications equipment no longer required already exists in the relevant legislation (CO/49/03).
- Fourth bullet point should include the word 'interests' rather than 'issues' (8/41).

### Conclusions:

- 13.9 I disagree with the Council's comments regarding criterion (vi). Despite the explanation given by the Council, criterion (vi) questions the need for the telecommunication installation and that would be contrary to PPG8. If it is intended to protect environmental matters such as visual intrusion, then that issue is adequately covered by criterion (i). I recommend that criterion (vi) be omitted. PIC 68 provides clarity for criterion (iv). Although the Friends of the Earth Local Group ask for a reference to be made in the policy to possible health and safety issues, the Council are correct in stating that such matters are addressed in PPG8 and the Government follows closely the advice of the ICNIRP guidelines. I agree that criterion (v) duplicates the requirements of the Telecommunications Act. I support the Council's suggestion to put that criterion into the supporting text.

### Recommendation:

- 13.10 That Policy R/ENV9 and the supporting text be adopted subject to the omission of criterion (vi) and including criterion (v) in the supporting text.
- 13.11 That PIC 68 be adopted.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **PARAGRAPH 13.25, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 69: RENEWABLE ENERGY**

#### **Objections:**

No representations received.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 13.12 PIC 69 provides further clarity on the requirements for renewable energy with which I concur.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 13.13 That PIC 69 be adopted.



**14. Chapter 14 Monitoring and Resources**

**PARAGRAPH 14.1, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 70:  
INTRODUCTION**

**Objections:**

No representations received.

**Conclusions:**

- 14.1 PIC 70 correctly updates the Plan in accordance with the new format for local plans.

**Recommendation:**

- 14.2 That PIC 70 be adopted.

**PARAGRAPH 14.3, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 71:  
RESOURCES**

**Objections:**

No representations received.

**Conclusions:**

- 14.3 PIC 71 up-dates the Plan in terms of the latest legislation.

**Recommendation:**

- 14.4 That PIC 71 be adopted.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **PARAGRAPH 14.4, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 72: INDICATORS**

#### **Objections:**

No representations received.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 14.5 PIC 72 introduces the changes necessary under PPS12. I also consider that the Council should add my suggested monitoring and review of the Open Space Audit annually.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 14.6 That PIC 72 be adopted subject to the addition of the Open Space Audit.

## **15. Appendices**

### **APPENDICES A, B, D, E AND J: DESIGN ISSUES**

#### **Objections:**

7/17 - English Heritage  
2/20 - Hampshire County Council: Estates Practice  
CO/78/01 - Paul Sealey  
CO/79/01 - Youngs Developments Ltd

#### **Main Issues:**

- Design Guidance Appendices (A, B, D, E and J) relate to design guidance, but contain little in the way of illustration.
- The Plan would also benefit from references to more recent published guidance in terms of best practice, e.g. 'By Design'.
- Appendix B is overly prescriptive and is therefore contrary to the requirements of PPG3 and 'By Design: Better Places to Live' which endorses a more flexible approach to development plan standards. (2/20 CO78/01 CO/79/01).

#### **Conclusions:**

15.1 The reference in paragraph 3.16 of the Plan to best practice guides should be sufficient without the need for mention in Appendices A, B, D, E or J; given that the appendices are intended only as guidance, I see no reason for them to be expanded with further examples or illustration. Although the Council maintains that Appendix B is not intended to be used to establish rigid standards, that is how it appears to a reader of the Plan. The use of such phrases as “a clear indication of its expectations”, “have regard to this advice when determining” and “the distance of separation would need to be increased”, all give an indication that without such compliance, any planning application would be refused. The use of specific distance and heights also add to a general feeling that Appendix B is a requirement of the Plan rather than guidelines.

15.2 I do not oppose the principle of such guidance, but suggest the Council significantly reviews the wording of Appendix B and employs an approach of “seeking adequate visual privacy” or “seeking to achieve a satisfactory degree of privacy”. Similarly, the Council should “seek” a minimum rear garden

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

length. Unless there is some flexibility built into the advice, the Council would be unable to encourage innovative design and forms of layout; new developments could easily become far too standardised. I concur with the change to paragraph 3.20 of Chapter 3 in the use of “guidelines” rather than “standards” as that provides the flexibility that I have mentioned. I have made reference to Appendix E under Policy R/DP10.

### **Recommendation:**

- 15.3 That Appendix E be deleted
- 15.4 That Appendix B be significantly amended in accordance with my comments and then adopted.
- 15.5 That the remaining Appendices be adopted subject to the suggestions I have made.

### **APPENDIX F: HAMPSHIRE PARKING STRATEGY AND STANDARDS**

#### **Objections:**

34/01 - W M Morrison Supermarkets PLC

#### **Main Issues:**

- It is considered that the base standard for car parking associated with new food retail developments should reflect recent Government guidance set out in PPG13.
- It is considered that the minimum long and short stay cycle parking standards for food retail development are unnecessarily high, and will result in an over-provision of spaces and the inefficient use of land.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 15.6 Given my own experience of gaining vehicular access via the A32 to Gosport town centre, I do agree with the Council that unless or until highway access and public transportation provision are improved, little of the Borough could truly be said to be called “an accessible location”. In such circumstances, I consider the Council are correct to introduce the level of parking standard for retail activity shown in Appendix F. The high usage of bicycles in the Borough is to be applauded; if only more residents of the United Kingdom were able to follow that example, many traffic problems could be resolved. I

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

support the high standard of bicycle provision set out in Appendix F as that should encourage cycling even further.

### **Recommendation:**

- 15.7 That Appendix F be adopted.

### **APPENDIX G, including proposed pre-inquiry change 74: PROVISION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

#### **Objections:**

2/21 - Hampshire County Council: Estates Practice

#### **Main Issues:**

- Developers will appreciate the certainty provided from this information but it seems more appropriate that it be provided in supplementary planning guidance.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 15.8 I see no objection to the inclusion of the advice in PIC 74 as part of Appendix G, but it should be reviewed and amended in accordance with my advice under Policy R/H5. I have no objections to PFA 22, but again, it should be reviewed in accordance with my advice under Policy R/H5.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 15.9 That Appendix G, PIC 74 and PFA 22 be reviewed and amended in accordance with my advice under Policy R/H5.

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report

### APPENDIX K: CONSERVATION AREAS

#### Objections:

20/03 - Gosport Society

#### Main Issues:

- The Society objects to the omission of Stokes Bay from the list of Conservation Areas from Appendix K.
- The importance of the beach and its historic hinterland is recognised nationally and the Society believes that the area should be accorded Conservation Status.

#### Conclusions:

- 15.10 The consideration and adoption of a locality as a conservation area is a matter for the Council under other legislation; it does not form part of my consideration of the Local Plan. I am aware that the Council is giving consideration to such a designation, but I also note that Stokes Bay area already benefits from a number of designations. As with other areas of the Borough, I suggest that the Council should be sure of the need for several layers of control and that the reasons and objectives are not duplicated. It really does only need one designation to protect an area from additional development and not a succession of designations.
- 15.11 I also question the need for Appendix K. Conservation Areas do not form part of Local Plans because they are established under other legislation. If Appendix K is simply intended to inform, then an explanation of the appropriate legislation and procedures separate from the Local Plan is needed.

#### Recommendation:

- 15.12 That Stokes Bay be not included in the list in Appendix K
- 15.13 That the Council reviews the purpose of Appendix K and if it is retained, a full explanation of the legislation and process for Conservation Areas be included.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **APPENDIX L: LIST OF LISTED BUILDINGS FOR GOSPORT BOROUGH**

#### **Objections:**

55/01 - Mrs Joan Russell

#### **Main Issues:**

- The List of Listed Buildings in Anglesey Road (Appendix L, P244) needs revision and clarification.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 15.14 The Council has suggested amendments which address the objector's concerns.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 15.15 That the amendments referred to in paragraph 3.1 of the Council's proof of evidence be adopted.

### **APPENDIX N, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 75: LIST OF HISTORIC PARKS AND GARDENS**

#### **Objections:**

21/03 - Hampshire Gardens Trust (Research Group)

#### **Main Issues:**

- The wording for the description of Stanley Park should be changed to include the 'historic grounds of Bay House'. By far the largest areas of land, comprising Stanley Park, were the original grounds to Bay House. Listed Building Grade II.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 15.16 PIC 75 amends Appendix N to address the objection.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **Recommendation:**

- 15.17 That PIC 75 be adopted.

### **APPENDIX P: OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENTS FOR NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS**

### **Objections:**

No representations received.

### **Conclusions**

- 15.18 Please refer to my comments regarding Appendix P under Policy R/DP3.

### **Recommendation:**

- 15.19 That Appendix P be amended in accordance with my comments made under Policy R/DP3 and the supporting text.



## 16. Proposals Map

### **PROPOSALS MAP, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 77: HISTORIC PARKS AND GARDENS**

#### **Objections:**

21/02 - Hampshire Gardens Trust (Research Group)

#### **Objection to proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 77**

PIC/82/19 - Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd

#### **Main Issues:**

- The unlisted Parks and Gardens should also be shown on the Proposals Map.
- Objection to the Amended List of Changes to the Proposals Map (PIC77) and specifically the list of Historic Parks and Gardens to Inset Map 2, which does not distinguish between those sites which are listed on the English Heritage's National Register of Historic Parks and Gardens (Haslar Hospital) and other sites which are unlisted and identified as of only local merit (PIC/82/19).

#### **Conclusions:**

- 16.1 Given the distinction between the national register and the local list of such sites mentioned in paragraphs 10.27 and 10.28 of Policy R/BH6 and the source for the unlisted parks and gardens in paragraph 10.30, I see no reason for changes to be made to the Proposals Map. There is a limit to further notations that are able to be included on the Proposals Map and I do not see the necessity for the unlisted sites to be shown.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 16.2 That PIC 77 be adopted.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **PROPOSALS MAP, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Changes 78/79/80: FLOOD RISK**

#### **Objections:**

CO/19/37 - Environment Agency

#### **Support:**

Sup/2/34 - Hampshire County Council

#### **Objection to proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 79**

PIC/82/20 - Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd

#### **Main Issues:**

- Flood Zones 2 and 3 should now be included on the Proposals Map as they give a better understanding of the areas at risk of flooding than was available previously (CO/19/37).
- Object to the deletion of 2003 Indicative Floodplain Maps and replacement with Flood Zone Maps 2 and 3 provided by the Environment Agency June 2004 to Inset Map 4, which does not take account of local circumstances such as the flood defences agreed with the Environment Agency as part of the redevelopment of Royal Clarence Yard (PIC/82/20).

#### **Conclusions:**

- 16.3 The amendments given in PIC 79 show the Flood Zone Maps provided by the Environment Agency in accordance with PPG25.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 16.4 That PICs 78, 79 and 80 be adopted.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **PROPOSALS MAP, including proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 81: SAFEGUARDED AREAS**

#### **Objection to proposed Pre-Inquiry Change 81**

PIC/82/21 - Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd

#### **Main Issues:**

- Objection to the proposed amendment of the Safeguarded Area for the Storage of Munitions, as proposed in Inset Map 6 of the Pre Inquiry Changes.

#### **Conclusions:**

- 16.5 The Council have consulted Defence Estates regarding this objection and they are satisfied the boundary shown on the Proposals Map is correct.

#### **Recommendation:**

- 16.6 That PIC 81 be adopted.

## **Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Inspector's Report**

### **17. Glossary of terms**

#### **AREA OF SPECIAL CHARACTER**

##### **Objections:**

No representations received.

##### **Conclusions:**

- 17.1 As the advice under this section is incorrect, the Council have suggested under PFA 17, the inclusion of the word “not” after “does” in the last sentence. This is a change with which I concur.

##### **Recommendation**

- 17.2 That PFA 17 be adopted.



## **Appendix 1**

### **GOSPORT BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN REVIEW INQUIRY**

#### **Index of Outstanding Objections**

## Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.			Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
	General	167	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East		

### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.			Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
	1.4	75	02	CO	R	Mr	Hart	Brian Filmer Hart Limited	
	2.5a	1	04	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	

### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.			Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
	3.2	22	06	Obj	F	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	
	3.11	22	10	Obj	F	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	
	3.12	8	09	Obj	F	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	✓
	3.12	10	01	Obj	F	Ms	Temple	RSPB	✓



### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.		Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
R/DP01		13	01 Obj	F			Defence Estates	
R/DP01		35	01 Obj	F			Abbey Developments Limited	
R/DP01	Appendix B	82	04 CO	R			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	
R/DP02	iii	13	03 Obj	F			Defence Estates	✓
R/DP03		35	02 Obj	F			Abbey Developments Limited	
	3.30	22	13 Obj	F	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	
	3.33	2	05 Obj	F	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	
R/DP04		2	06 Obj	F	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	
R/DP04	3.38	1	06 Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	3.40	19	05 Obj	F	Mr	Young	Environment Agency	
	3.47	19	07 Obj	F	Mr	Young	Environment Agency	
R/DP07		19	10 Obj	F	Mr	Young	Environment Agency	
R/DP08		1	08 Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/DP08	3.61	20	06 CO	R	Mrs	Bumford	Gosport Society	
R/DP10		1	09 Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/DP10	3.68 3.69 Appendix E	22	18 Obj	F	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	
R/DP10	3.65-3.70	36	07 CO	R			McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd	
R/DP10		57	01 Obj	F	Ms	Blank		
R/DP10	3.69 & Summary	60	01 Obj	F	Mr	Smith		
R/DP10		71	01 Obj	F	Mr & Mrs	Vernon		
R/DP10	3.68a	77	01 CO	R	Mr	Wallace		
R/DP10	and Appendix E	79	02 CO	R			Youngs Developments Ltd	
	3.70	22	19 Obj	F	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	

### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.		Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
	4.7	8	17	Obj	F	Dr McMullon	English Nature	
	4.9	8	18	Obj	F	Dr McMullon	English Nature	
	4.15	13	05	Obj	F		Defence Estates	
R/T05		25	08	Obj	F	Ms Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
R/T05	4.17 Reg 24(9)	1	68	CO	R	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	4.19	58	01	Obj	F	Mr Shaw		
	4.23	25	11	Obj	F	Ms Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
R/T08		25	12	Obj	F	Ms Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
	4.27	58	02	Obj	F	Mr Shaw		
R/T09		50	03	Obj	F	Mr Jones		

### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.		Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
	5.6a	35	14 CO	R			Abbey Developments Limited	
		1	17 Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	5.10	8	19 Obj	F	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	
R/H01		26	01 Obj	F	Ms	Cole	CPRE Hampshire	
R/H01		35	03 Obj	F			Abbey Developments Limited	
R/H01		35	13 CO	R			Abbey Developments Limited	
	5.15	22	24 Obj	F	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	
	5.16	35	18 CO	R			Abbey Developments Limited	
R/H01	Table 1	82	05 CO	R			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	
R/H02		35	04 Obj	F			Abbey Developments Limited	
R/H02	5.18	52	01 Obj	F	Mr	Lane		
R/H02		82	06 CO	R			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	
	5.18	19	14 Obj	F	Mr	Young	Environment Agency	
R/H03		2	07 Obj	F	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	
R/H03		82	07 CO	R			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	
R/H03	5.22	18	02 Obj	F	Mr	Errington	House Builders Federation	
R/H04	5.25 - 5.27	1	11 Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/H05		1	12 Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/H05		1	69 CO	R	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/H05		2	15 Obj	F	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	

### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.		Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
R/H05		502	Obj	F			Department of Health, Director of Health and Social Care, South	
R/H05	5.28	1309	Obj	F			Defence Estates	
R/H05		1323	CO	R			Defence Estates	
R/H05	5.28-5.33 Appendix G	1803	Obj	F	Mr	Errington	House Builders Federation	
R/H05		1807	CO	R	Mr	Errington	House Builders Federation	
R/H05		3001	Obj	F			BT PLC	
R/H05		3506	Obj	F			Abbey Developments Limited	
R/H05		3515	CO	R			Abbey Developments Limited	
R/H05		3602	Obj	F			McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd	
R/H05		8101	CO	R			Fairview New Homes	
R/H05		8102	CO	R			Fairview New Homes	
R/H05		8208	CO	R			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	
	5.30	5803	Obj	F	Mr	Shaw		
	5.31	114	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/H08		501	Obj	F			Department of Health, Director of Health and Social Care, South	
	5.39	2228	Obj	F	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	
R/H08a	5.39b	1808	CO	R	Mr	Errington	House Builders Federation	
R/H10	5.41-5.42	116	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
		119	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	

### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.		Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
	6.11	37	03	Obj	F	Ms Mercer	Littman and Robeson	
R/EMP1		33	01	Obj	F		B & Q	
R/EMP2		2	08	Obj	F	Mr Wilson	Hampshire County Council	
	6.20	1	22	Obj	F	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/EMP3		33	02	Obj	F		B & Q	
R/EMP3		36	01	Obj	F		McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd	
R/EMP3		37	05	Obj	F	Ms Mercer	Littman and Robeson	
R/EMP3		38	01	Obj	F		DS Smith PLC	
R/EMP3	6.24	37	06	Obj	F	Ms Mercer	Littman and Robeson	
R/EMP5	6.30 and 6.31	37	07	Obj	F	Ms Mercer	Littman and Robeson	
R/EMP7	6.35-6.38	37	08	Obj	F	Ms Mercer	Littman and Robeson	
R/EMP7	6.38	37	09	Obj	F	Ms Mercer	Littman and Robeson	

### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.		Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
	7.7	123	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	7.22-7.25	3303	Obj	F			B & Q	
R/S1		124	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	7.29	1915	Obj	F	Mr	Young	Environment Agency	
	7.32	170	CO	R	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/S2		3304	Obj	F			B & Q	
R/S2	7.36	171	CO	R	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/S2	7.36	125	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	7.36	3305	Obj	F			B & Q	
	7.37	126	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
		131	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	

### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.		Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
R/CF02		503	Obj	F			Department of Health, Director of Health and Social Care, South	
R/CF02		3603	Obj	F			McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd	
R/CF02		6501	Obj	F	Mrs	Ravyts		
R/CF03	8.12	5202	Obj	F	Mr	Lane		
R/CF04		4201	Obj	F			Owner of 159 Forton Road	
R/CF07		130	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/CF07	8.21	2516	Obj	F	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
R/CF07	8.22	7601	CO	R	Mr	Whittle	Learning & Skills Council, Hampshire and the Isle of Wight	
R/CF08		132	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	8.23	133	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/CF08	8.23	172	CO	R	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/CF09		134	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/CF09	8.25, 8.26, 8.27	2005	Obj	F	Mrs	Burton	Gosport Society	
R/CF09	8.27	2803	Obj	F	Mrs	Lee	St Vincent College	✓
	8.26	135	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/CF10	Protection of Hotel Site	6301	Obj	F	Mr & Mrs	Smith		
R/CF10	Protection of Hotel Site	6401	Obj	F	Mrs	Scaife		
R/CF10	Protection of Hotel Site	6701	Obj	F	Mr & Mrs	Wakeman		

### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.		Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
R/CF10	Protection of Hotel Site	68	01	Obj	F	Mrs George		
R/CF10	Protection of Hotel Site	70	01	Obj	F	Mr Wilkinson		
R/CF10	Protection of Hotel Site	71	02	Obj	F	Mr & Mrs Vernon		
R/CF10	Protection of Hotel Site	73	01	Obj	F	Mr Stubbs		
R/CF10	Protection of Hotel Site	74	01	Obj	F	Mr Wilkinson		
R/CF10	Protection of Hotel Sites	66	01	Obj	F	Mrs Edwards		
R/CF10	Protection of Hotel	61	01	Obj	F	Mrs Palmer		
R/CF10		1	36	Obj	F	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/CF10		41	01	Obj	F	Vine Esq	Lloyd Vine Properties	
R/CF10	8.29	45	01	Obj	F	Mr Penn-Barrow	West Point Management Company	
R/CF11	8.30	1	37	Obj	F	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/CF12		11	14	Obj	F	Ms Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	✓



### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.			Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
R/MOD1	ii	13	18	Obj	F			Defence Estates	✓
R/MOD1	v	13	19	Obj	F			Defence Estates	✓
R/MOD2		8	22	Obj	F	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	
R/MOD2		11	15	Obj	F	Ms	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	
R/MOD2	9.10	1	39	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/MOD2	9.12	10	02	Obj	F	Ms	Temple	RSPB	
	9.12	8	23	Obj	F	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	✓

### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.		Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
R/BH1		35	07	Obj	F		Abbey Developments Limited	
R/BH3		82	09	CO	R		Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	
	10.17	1	42	Obj	F	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	10.24	1	43	Obj	F	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/BH5		82	10	CO	R		Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	
R/BH5	10.26	1	44	Obj	F	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/BH6		44	01	Obj	F	Dr Rintoul (Chairman)	Friends of Crescent Garden	
R/BH6		82	11	CO	R		Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	
	10.28	1	46	Obj	F	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/BH7		1	47	Obj	F	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/BH7		82	12	CO	R		Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	
	10.31	7	16	Obj	F	Mr Williams	English Heritage	

### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.		Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
Omission	Farm land	25	29	Obj	F	Ms Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
	11.3, 11.5, 11.13	23	04	Obj	F	Rear Admiral Hervey	Friends of Stokes Bay	
R/OS01	3.14	40	02	Obj	F	Mr Davies	Davies Associates	
	11.14	25	17	Obj	F	Ms Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
R/OS02		1	48	Obj	F	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/OS02		35	08	Obj	F		Abbey Developments Limited	
R/OS02	11.20	40	01	Obj	F	Mr Davies	Davies Associates	
	11.20	35	16	CO	R		Abbey Developments Limited	
	11.24	1	49	Obj	F	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	11.25	1	50	Obj	F	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/OS03		35	09	Obj	F		Abbey Developments Limited	
R/OS03	11.27	75	01	CO	R	Mr Hart	Brian Filmer Hart Limited	
R/OS03	11.28	1	51	Obj	F	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/OS03	11.31	2	16	Obj	F	Mr Wilson	Hampshire County Council	
R/OS03	Inset Map 1	13	22	CO	R		Defence Estates	
	11.27	35	17	CO	R		Abbey Developments Limited	
	11.27a	1	73	CO	R	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	11.28	25	20	Obj	F	Ms Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
	11.29	25	21	Obj	F	Ms Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	

### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.		Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
R/OS05		11	18	Obj	F	Ms Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	
R/OS06		35	10	Obj	F		Abbey Developments Limited	
R/OS07		82	01	CO	R		Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	
R/OS07	Appendix P	18	04	Obj	F	Mr Errington	House Builders Federation	
R/OS07	Appendix P	30	02	Obj	F		BT PLC	
	11.53	1	53	Obj	F	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	11.55-11.60	1	55	Obj	F	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	11.59	36	06	Obj	F		McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd	
R/OS08	11.61	27	01	Obj	F	Mr Baker	Diocese of Portsmouth	
R/OS08	11.61	80	01	CO	R	Mr More	Gosport Allotments Association	
	11.61	58	04	Obj	F	Mr Shaw		
R/OS09		1	57	Obj	F	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/OS09	Para 11.62, 11.64	10	03	Obj	F	Ms Temple	RSPB	✓
	11.64a	1	74	CO	R	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	11.67	25	25	Obj	F	Ms Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
R/OS11		13	21	Obj	F		Defence Estates	
R/OS11		18	05	Obj	F	Mr Errington	House Builders Federation	
R/OS11		18	09	CO	R	Mr Errington	House Builders Federation	
R/OS11	11.70	1	59	Obj	F	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	11.68	23	02	Obj	F	Rear Admiral Hervey	Friends of Stokes Bay	

### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.			Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
	11.70	25	27	Obj	F	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
R/OS12		25	28	Obj	F	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
	11.72	8	32	Obj	F	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	✓

### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.		Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
	12.15	22	39	Obj	F	Mrs Roast	Lee Residents' Association	
	12.15	23	03	Obj	F	Rear Admiral Hervey	Friends of Stokes Bay	
	12.15	25	31	Obj	F	Ms Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
R/CH1		35	11	Obj	F		Abbey Developments Limited	
R/CH1		39	01	Obj	F		John Wyeth & Brother Limited	
R/CH1	12.16-12.19	1	60	Obj	F	Ms O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/CH2		82	02	CO	R		Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	
	12.23	25	34	Obj	F	Ms Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	

### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.		Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
R/ENV01		163	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/ENV01		3512	Obj	F			Abbey Developments Limited	
R/ENV01		8203	CO	R			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	
R/ENV04		1402	Obj	F	Mr	Kneale	Southern Water	✓
R/ENV04		1404	CO	R	Mr	Kneale	Southern Water	
		166	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/ENV05b		175	CO	R	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/ENV05d	Proposals Map	1324	CO	R			Defence Estates	✓
R/ENV09		176	CO	R	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/ENV09		164	Obj	F	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/ENV09		841	Obj	F	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	✓
R/ENV09		2541	Obj	F	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
R/ENV09	Criterion v	4903	CO	R			Mobile Operators Association	

### Outstanding Objections Index

Policy	Paragraph	Reference No.		Deposit Stage	Title	Surname	Organisation	Conditional Withdrawal
	Appendices	7	17	Obj	F	Mr Williams	English Heritage	
	Appendix B	2	20	Obj	F	Mr Wilson	Hampshire County Council	
	Appendix B	79	01	CO	R		Youngs Developments Ltd	
	Appendix B	78	01	CO	R		Paul Sealey	
	Appendix F	34	01	Obj	F		W M Morrison Supermarkets PLC	
	Appendix G	2	21	Obj	F	Mr Wilson	Hampshire County Council	
	Appendix K	20	03	Obj	F	Mrs Burton	Gosport Society	
	Appendix L	55	01	Obj	F	Mrs Russell		
	Appendix N	21	03	Obj	F	Mrs Bumford	Hampshire Gardens Trust (Research Group)	✓
	Proposals Map	21	02	Obj	F	Mrs Bumford	Hampshire Gardens Trust (Research Group)	
	Proposals Map	19	37	CO	R	Mr Young	Environment Agency	





## **Appendix 2**

### **GOSPORT BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN REVIEW INQUIRY**

#### **Index of Supporters Representations**

Policy No.	Paragraph	Reference No.		Deposit	Title	FName	Surname	Organisation
	1.2	2201	Sup	F	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
	Chapter 2	901	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
	2.1	1806	Sup	R	Mr	Pete	Errington	House Builders Federation
	2.6a, I	2202	Sup	F	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
	2.13 The Strategy	2204	Sup	F	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
	2.13 The Strategy P7	401	Sup	F	Mr	Dominic	Lyster	Fareham Borough Council
	SS1	407	Sup	F	Mr	Dominic	Lyster	Fareham Borough Council
	SS1	801	Sup	F	Dr	Chris	McMullon	English Nature
	SS1	1101	Sup	F	Ms	Louise	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
	2.16-2.17	1204	Sup	F	Mr	Howard	Moore	Highways Agency
	SS2	408	Sup	F	Mr	Dominic	Lyster	Fareham Borough Council
	SS2	1102	Sup	F	Ms	Louise	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust

	2.19	905	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
	SS3	409	Sup	F	Mr	Dominic	Lyster	Fareham Borough Council
	2.21	906	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
	SS4	410	Sup	F	Mr	Dominic	Lyster	Fareham Borough Council
	2.22	907	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
	2.22	2241	Sup	R	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
	SS5	411	Sup	F	Mr	Dominic	Lyster	Fareham Borough Council
	SS6	412	Sup	F	Mr	Dominic	Lyster	Fareham Borough Council
	2.25-2.26	908	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
	SS7	413	Sup	F	Mr	Dominic	Lyster	Fareham Borough Council
	3.6	2207	Sup	F	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
	3.9	2208	Sup	F	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association

	3.10	703	Sup	F	Mr	Steve	Williams	English Heritage
	3.10	2209	Sup	F	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
R/DP01		226	Sup	R	Mr	Mike	Long	Hampshire County Council
R/DP02		1106	Sup	F	Ms	Louise	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
	3.27	227	Sup	R	Mr	Mike	Long	Hampshire County Council
	3.28	1107	Sup	F	Ms	Louise	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
R/DP03		814	Sup	F	Dr	Chris	McMullon	English Nature
R/DP03		1108	Sup	F	Ms	Louise	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
R/DP03		2212	Sup	F	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
	3.33	2214	Sup	F	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
	3.33ii	1403	Sup	R	Mr	Chris	Kneale	Southern Water
	3.42	2215	Sup	F	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
R/DP06		1110	Sup	F	Ms	Louise	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust

R/DP09		1202	Sup	F	Mr	Howard	Moore	Highways Agency
R/DP10	sub para (I) and (ii)	2242	Sup	R	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
R/DP10		4801	Sup	R	Mr	Andrew	Reid	Tourism South East
R/DP10		5301	Sup	F	Ms	Kathleen	Roast	
	3.66	6803	Sup	F	Mrs	S	George	
	4.1, 4.3-4.7	2502	Sup	F	Ms	Ruth	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group
	4.7	909	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/T01	4.8	2243	Sup	R	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
R/T02		1203	Sup	F	Mr	Howard	Moore	Highways Agency
R/T02		2221	Sup	F	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
R/T03	v	2244	Sup	R	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
R/T05		1306	Sup	F				Defence Estates
R/T05		1701	Sup	F	Mr	Chris	Price	Network Rail
R/T07		2510	Sup	F	Ms	Ruth	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group

R/T08		406	Sup	F	Mr	Dominic	Lyster	Fareham Borough Council
R/T09		2513	Sup	F	Ms	Ruth	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group
R/T10	(ii)	2245	Sup	R	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
R/T11	4.31	2515	Sup	F	Ms	Ruth	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group
R/H01	5.15	2246	Sup	R	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
R/H04		3505	Sup	F				Abbey Developments Limited
R/H04	Para 5.7 & Para 5.27	2004	Sup	F	Mrs	Lesley	Burton	Gosport Society
R/H05		910	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
	6.1	3701	Sup	F	Ms	Karen	Mercer	Littman and Robeson
	6.8	3702	Sup	F	Ms	Karen	Mercer	Littman and Robeson
	6.11	4802	Sup	R	Mr	Andrew	Reid	Tourism South East
R/EMP1		301	Sup	F	Mr	Mike	Allgrove	Portsmouth City Council

R/EMP1	6.12	37	04	Sup	F	Ms	Karen	Mercer	Littman and Robeson
R/EMP2		3	02	Sup	F	Mr	Mike	Allgrove	Portsmouth City Council
R/EMP3		3	03	Sup	F	Mr	Mike	Allgrove	Portsmouth City Council
R/EMP3		4	14	Sup	F	Mr	Dominic	Lyster	Fareham Borough Council
R/EMP3		22	29	Sup	F	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
R/EMP4		3	04	Sup	F	Mr	Mike	Allgrove	Portsmouth City Council
R/EMP5		3	05	Sup	F	Mr	Mike	Allgrove	Portsmouth City Council
	6.28	7	19	Sup	R	Mr	Steve	Williams	English Heritage
R/EMP6		3	06	Sup	F	Mr	Mike	Allgrove	Portsmouth City Council
R/EMP7		3	07	Sup	F	Mr	Mike	Allgrove	Portsmouth City Council
R/S6		22	33	Sup	F	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
R/CF01		9	11	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/CF02		9	12	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/CF02		68	04	Sup	F	Mrs	S	George	
R/CF02	8.10	20	02	Sup	F	Mrs	Lesley	Burton	Gosport Society

R/CF03		913	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/CF04		914	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/CF05		915	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/CF06		916	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/CF07		917	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/CF07		5001	Sup	F	Mr	John	Jones	
R/CF08		918	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/CF09		919	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/CF10		920	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/CF10		4803	Sup	R	Mr	Andrew	Reid	Tourism South East
R/CF11		4804	Sup	R	Mr	Andrew	Reid	Tourism South East
R/CF11	8.30	2804	Sup	F	Mrs	Lynn	Lee	St Vincent College
	8.30	6802	Sup	F	Mrs	S	George	
	8.32	708	Sup	F	Mr	Steve	Williams	English Heritage
	9.1	709	Sup	F	Mr	Steve	Williams	English Heritage



R/MOD1		710	Sup	F	Mr	Steve	Williams	English Heritage
	10.8	720	Sup	R	Mr	Steve	Williams	English Heritage
R/BH6		4805	Sup	R	Mr	Andrew	Reid	Tourism South East
R/BH6	10.27-10.30	4701	Sup	R	Mr	John	Clark	Garden History Society
R/BH6	Appendix N 10.27-10.30	2101	Sup	F	Mrs	May	Bumford	Hampshire Gardens Trust (Research Group)
R/OS01		405	Sup	F	Mr	Dominic	Lyster	Fareham Borough Council
R/OS01		2235	Sup	F	Mrs	Alison	Roast	Lee Residents' Association
R/OS01	11.16-11.17	5101	Sup	F	Mr	Murray	Bell	
	11.21	1117	Sup	F	Ms	Louise	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
	11.23	2519	Sup	F	Ms	Ruth	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group
R/OS03		921	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/OS06		5401	Sup	F	Mr	D L	Wood	
R/OS06		6901	Sup	F	Mr	F P	Gradidge	

R/OS06	(i)11.46-11.47	2001	Sup	F	Mrs	Lesley	Burton	Gosport Society
R/OS06	11.47	2401	Sup	F	Mrs	Angela	Valentine	Crescent Owners Association
R/OS06	11.47	5102	Sup	F	Mr	Murray	Bell	
R/OS06	Stokesmead Field Only	5601	Sup	F	Mr	David	Maber	
	11.47	4601	Sup	F	Ms	Joan	Symonds (Secretary)	St Vincent Local History Club
	11.47	5502	Sup	F	Mrs	Joan	Russell	
R/OS09		404	Sup	F	Mr	Dominic	Lyster	Fareham Borough Council
R/OS10		403	Sup	F	Mr	Dominic	Lyster	Fareham Borough Council
R/OS10		1120	Sup	F	Ms	Louise	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
R/OS11		1121	Sup	F	Ms	Louise	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
	11.68	2301	Sup	F	Rear Admiral		Hervey	Friends of Stokes Bay
	12.15	834	Sup	F	Dr	Chris	McMullon	English Nature
R/CH1		402	Sup	F	Mr	Dominic	Lyster	Fareham Borough Council
R/CH1	12.19b	233	Sup	R	Mr	Mike	Long	Hampshire County Council

R/CH1v	12.6	232	Sup	R	Ms	Caroline	Bird	Hampshire County Council Environment Department
R/CH4		837	Sup	F	Dr	Chris	McMullon	English Nature
R/CH4		1124	Sup	F	Ms	Louise	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
R/CH4		2535	Sup	F	Ms	Ruth	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group
R/CH5		838	Sup	F	Dr	Chris	McMullon	English Nature
R/ENV01		228	Sup	R	Mr	Mike	Long	Hampshire County Council
R/ENV01		839	Sup	F	Dr	Chris	McMullon	English Nature
R/ENV01		923	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/ENV01		1125	Sup	F	Ms	Louise	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
R/ENV02		229	Sup	R	Mr	Andrew	Pitt	Hampshire County Council
R/ENV02		840	Sup	F	Dr	Chris	McMullon	English Nature
R/ENV02		924	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency

R/ENV02		1126	Sup	F	Ms	Louise	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
R/ENV03		230	Sup	R	Mr	Andrew	Pitt	Hampshire County Council Environment Department
R/ENV03		925	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/ENV04		926	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/ENV04	13.10a	231	Sup	R	Mr	Mike	Long	Hampshire County Council Environment Strategy Group
	13.10	1405	Sup	R	Mr	Chris	Kneale	Southern Water
	13.10a	1406	Sup	R	Mr	Chris	Kneale	Southern Water
R/ENV05		927	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/ENV06		928	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/ENV07		929	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency

	13.17	2540	Sup	F	Ms	Ruth	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group
R/ENV09		930	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
R/ENV09		4901	Sup	R				Mobile Operators Association
R/ENV09	Criterion ii	4902	Sup	R				Mobile Operators Association
R/ENV09	Criterion vi	4904	Sup	R				Mobile Operators Association
R/ENV09	Criterion vii	4905	Sup	R				Mobile Operators Association
	13.19	4906	Sup	R				Mobile Operators Association
	13.20	4907	Sup	R				Mobile Operators Association
	13.22a	4908	Sup	R				Mobile Operators Association
R/ENV10		931	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency
	Chapter 14	902	Sup	F	Mr	Colin	Pritchard	The Countryside Agency

	Chapter 14 IND13	1605	Sup	F	Mr	John	Feetam	Sport England
	Appendix Q	1128	Sup	F	Ms	Louise	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
	Proposals Map	234	Sup	R	Mr	Mike	Long	Hampshire County Council

**GOSPORT BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN REVIEW INQUIRY**

**Appearances at the Local Plan Inquiry**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Wednesday 30 <sup>th</sup> March	Alison Roast	Lee on the Solent Residents Association
	Richard Wilson	Hampshire County Council
	David Ottley	Gosport Borough Council
	Chris Payne	Gosport Borough Council
	Rob Harper	Gosport Borough Council
	Jayson Grygiel	Gosport Borough Council
Tuesday 12 <sup>th</sup> April	Simon Smith	Smith Stuart Reynolds on behalf of Abbey Developments
	David Ottley	Gosport Borough Council
Wednesday 13 <sup>th</sup> April	Richard Wilson	Hampshire County Council
	John Vivien	Friends of the Earth-Fareham and Gosport
	Brian Hart	Brian Filmer Hart Ltd
	David Ottley	Gosport Borough Council
Thursday 14 <sup>th</sup> April	Lesley Burton Nina Champion	Gosport Society Rowner Residents Association
	David Ottley	Gosport Borough Council
Wednesday 20 <sup>th</sup> April	Simon Mitchell	Level Consulting Ltd
	Chris Payne	Gosport Borough Council
	Oona Hickson	Gosport Borough Council
	David Couttie	David Couttie Associates





## GOSPORT BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN REVIEW INQUIRY

### ATTENDANCE LISTS

**Pre-inquiry Meeting  
Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> January 2005  
Council Chamber, Gosport Town Hall**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
David Hollis	Local Plan Inspector PINS
Christine Carter	Local Plan Programme Officer
Linda Edwards	Gosport Borough Solicitor
David Ottley	Head of Forward Planning GBC
Chris Payne	Principal Planning Officer GBC
Jayson Grygiel	Senior Planning Officer GBC
Kim Catt	Senior Planning Officer GBC
Rob Harper	Principal Conservation Officer GBC
Lucy Watson	Planning Officer GBC
Oona Hickson	Head of Housing Strategy GBC
Richard Wilson	Hampshire County Council
Richard Boother	Defence Estates
Lesley Burton	Gosport Society
May Bumford	Gosport Society
Mrs Alsion Roast	Lee Residents Association
Maurice Bell	Lee Residents Association
David Wright	Friends of Stokes Bay
Brian Hart	Filmer Hart Ltd
David Maber	Local Resident
Daniel Hatcher	Barton Wilmore (Berkeley Homes)

**Public Local Inquiry Hearing**  
**Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> March 2005 – Day One (1<sup>st</sup> Session – 10.00am)**  
**Council Chamber, Gosport Town Hall**

Name	Organisation
David Hollis	Planning Inspector PINS
Christine Carter	Local Plan Programme Officer
Lucy Watson	Planning Officer GBC
Chris Payne	Principal Planning Officer GBC
Jayson Grygiel	Senior Planning Officer GBC
Rob Harper	Principal Conservation Officer GBC
Kim Catt	Senior Planning Officer GBC
David Ottley	Head of Forward Planning GBC
Warren Jackson-Hookins	Planning Assistant GBC
Helen Wilson	Lee Residents Association
Alison Roast	Lee Residents Association
Jean Robertson	Lee Residents Association
Alan Robertson	Lee Residents Association
Brian Hart	Filmer Hart Ltd
May Bumford	Gosport Society
David Maber	Resident
Jill Downing	Resident
J Woods	Resident

**Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> March 2005 – Day One (2<sup>nd</sup> Session – 2.00pm)**  
**Council Chamber, Gosport Town Hall**

Name	Organisation
David Hollis	Planning Inspector PINS
Christine Carter	Local Plan Programme Officer
Chris Payne	Principal Planning Officer GBC
Mike Jeffery	Regulatory Services Manager GBC
Kim Catt	Senior Planning Officer GBC
David Ottley	Head of Forward Planning GBC
Lucy Watson	Planning Officer GBC
Warren Jackson-Hookins	Planning Assistant GBC
Richard Wilson	Hampshire County Council
Helen Wilson	Lee Residents Association
Alison Roast	Lee Residents Association
J Woods	Resident
P D Windsor	Resident

**Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> March 2005 – Day One (3<sup>rd</sup> Session – 3.15pm)  
Council Chamber, Gosport Town Hall**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
David Hollis	Planning Inspector PINS
Christine Carter	Local Plan Programme Officer
Chris Payne	Principal Planning Officer GBC
Helen Green	Conservation & Urban Design Officer GBC
Rob Harper	Principal Conservation Officer GBC
Kim Catt	Senior Planning Officer GBC
Warren Jackson-Hookins	Planning Assistant GBC
May Bumford	Gosport Society
Alan Robertson	Lee Residents Association
Jean Robertson	Lee Residents Association
Helen Wilson	Lee Residents Association
Alison Roast	Lee Residents Association
M Woods	Resident
P D Windsor	Resident

**Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> April 2005 – Day Two 10.00am  
Council Chamber, Gosport Town Hall**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
David Hollis	Planning Inspector PINS
Christine Carter	Local Plan Programme Officer
Helen Green	Conservation & Urban Design Officer GBC
David Ottley	Head of Forward Planning GBC
Jayson Grygiel	Senior Planning Officer GBC
Lucy Watson	Planning Officer GBC
Warren Jackson-Hookins	Planning Assistant GBC
Alison Roast	Lee Residents Association
J Woods	Resident
Simon Smith	SSR

**Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> April 2005 – Day Three 10.00am  
Council Chamber, Gosport Town Hall**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
David Hollis	Planning Inspector PINS
Christine Carter	Local Plan Programme Officer
Councillor Peter Langdon	Gosport Borough Council
David Ottley	Head of Forward Planning GBC
Chris Payne	Principal Planning Officer GBC
Kim Catt	Senior Planning Officer GBC
Lucy Watson	Planning Officer GBC
Richard Wilson	Hampshire County Council (Estates Practice)
Claire Burnett	Hampshire County Council (Estates Practice)
May Bumford	Gosport Society
R Hart	Filmer Hart Ltd
D Payne	Resident
M Michael Bell	Resident

**Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> April 2005 – Day Three 2.00pm  
Council Chamber, Gosport Town Hall**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
David Hollis	Planning Inspector PINS
Christine Carter	Local Plan Programme Officer
D Payne	Resident
Lucy Watson	Planning Officer GBC
Alison Roast	Lee Residents Association
Maurice Bell	Lee Residents Association
John Vivian	Gosport and Fareham F.o.E
David Ottley	Head of Forward Planning GBC
J Downing	Resident
G Downing	Resident
M W Bell	Resident
Brian F Hart	Filmer Hart Ltd

**Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> April 2005 – Day Three 3.15pm  
Council Chamber, Gosport Town Hall**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
David Hollis	Planning Inspector PINS
Christine Carter	Local Plan Programme Officer
Brian F Hart	Resident
Anne Heaton	Resident
Alison Roast	Lee Residents Association
Maurice Bell	Lee Residents Association
Denis Payne	Resident
M W Bell	Residents
Jayson Grygiel	Senior Planning Officer GBC
David Ottley	Head of Forward Planning GBC
J Harighi	Resident
Mike Jeffery	Regulatory Services Manager GBC
Helen Green	Conservation & Urban Design Officer GBC
Kim Catt	Senior Planning Officer GBC
T Eaves	Resident

**Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> April 2005 – Day Four 11.00am  
Council Chamber, Gosport Town Hall**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
David Hollis	Planning Inspector PINS
Christine Carter	Local Plan Programme Officer
David Ottley	Head of Forward Planning GBC
Oona Hickson	Head of Housing Strategy GBC
Jayson Grygiel	Senior Planning Officer GBC
Lucy Watson	Planning Officer GBC
Councillor N Champion	Gosport Borough Council
L A Burton	Gosport Society
May Bumford	Gosport Society
Denis Payne	Resident

**Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> April 2005 10.00am  
Council Chamber, Gosport Town Hall**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
David Hollis	Planning Inspector PINS
Christine Carter	Local Plan Programme Officer
David Couttie	David Couttie Associates for GBC
Simon Mitchell	Levvel Consulting Ltd
Richard Bailey	Levvel Consulting Ltd
Chris Payne	Principal Planning Officer GBC
Lucy Watson	Planning Officer GBC
Kim Catt	Senior Planning Officer GBC
Warren Jackson-Hookins	Planning Assistant GBC
A Pennell	Berkeley Homes
Stacie McNair	Administration Officer GBC
Oona Hickson	Head of Housing Strategy GBC
Alison Roast	Lee Residents Association
Sarah Taylor	Bevan Britten
Jill Downing	Resident
Helen Green	Conservation & Design Officer GBC

**Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> April 2005 2.00pm  
Council Chamber, Gosport Town Hall**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
David Hollis	Planning Inspector PINS
Christine Carter	Local Plan Programme Officer
David Ottley	Head of Forward Planning GBC
Chris Payne	Principal Planning Officer GBC
Helen Green	Conservation & Urban Design Officer GBC
David Couttie	David Couttie Associates
Oona Hickson	Gosport Borough Council GBC
Warren Jackson-Hookins	Planning Assistant GBC
Richard Wilson	Hampshire County Council

**Formal Closure of Local Plan Inquiry  
Monday 4<sup>th</sup> July 2005 – 2.00pm  
Council Chamber, Gosport Town Hall**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Ian Lycett	Chief Executive GBC
Councillor Mark Hook	Leader of GBC
David Hollis	Planning Inspector PINS
Christine Carter	Local Plan Programme Officer GBC
David Ottley	Head of Forward Planning GBC
Chris Payne	Principal Planning Officer GBC
Jayson Grygiel	Senior Planning Officer GBC
Leslie Burton	Gosport Society
May Bumford	Gosport Society
Alison Roast	Lee Residents Association
Maurice Bell	Lee Residents Association
Michael Bell	Resident



**GOSPORT BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN REVIEW INQUIRY**

**Accompanied Site Visits made by Mr David Hollis, the Local Plan  
Inspector for the Gosport Borough Local Plan**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>Accompanied by</b>
Monday 4 <sup>th</sup> July 2005	Defence Munitions Fareham Road, Gosport	Mrs Christine Carter, Programme Officer for the GBLP







## **Appendix 6**

### **GOSPORT BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN REVIEW INQUIRY**

#### **List of Inquiry Proofs of Evidence, Written Representations And Core Documents**

## List of Objectors Proofs of Evidence

PolicyNo	Policy Sub-division	Objection No	Objectors No	Title	LName	Organisation	Obj Proof No
		1	67	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	1.4	75	02	Mr	Hart	Brian Filmer Hart Limited	
	2.5a	1	04	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	3.2	22	06	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	Para 3.2/22/06/Obj/A
	3.11	22	10	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	Para 3.11/22/10/Obj/A
	3.12	8	09	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	
	3.12	10	01	Ms	Temple	RSPB	
R/DP01		13	01			Defence Estates	
R/DP01		35	01			Abbey Developments Limited	
R/DP01	Appendix B	82	04			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	R/DP1/Appendix B/8S/04/C O/A
R/DP02	iii	13	03			Defence Estates	
	3.30	22	13	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	Para 3.30/22/13/Obj/A

	3.33	2	05	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	3.33/2/05/A
R/DP04	3.38	1	06	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	3.40	19	05	Mr	Young	Environment Agency	
	3.47	19	07	Mr	Young	Environment Agency	
R/DP4	3.40	83	02	Mr	Perry		
R/DP07		19	10	Mr	Young	Environment Agency	
R/DP08		1	08	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/DP08	3.61	20	06	Mrs	Bumford	Gosport Society	
R/DP10		1	09	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/DP10	3.68 3.69 Appendix E	22	18	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	R/DP10/22 /18/Obj/A
R/DP10	3.65-3.70	36	07			McCarthy and Stone (Development s) Ltd	R/DP10 36/07CO/A -G
R/DP10		57	01	Ms	Blank		
R/DP10	3.69 & Summary	60	01	Mr	Smith		
R/DP10		71	01	Mr & Mrs	Vernon		
R/DP10	3.68a	77	01	Mr	Wallace		

R/DP10	and Appendix E	79	02			Youngs Developments Ltd	
	3.70	22	19	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	Para 3.70/22/19/ Obj/A
	4.7	8	17	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	
	4.9	8	18	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	
	4.15	13	05			Defence Estates	
R/T05		25	08	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
R/T05	4.17 Reg 24(9)	1	68	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	4.19	58	01	Mr	Shaw		
	4.23	25	11	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
R/T08		25	12	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
	4.27	58	02	Mr	Shaw		
R/T09		50	03	Mr	Jones		
		1	17	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	

	5.10	8	19	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	
R/H01		26	01	Ms	Cole	CPRE Hampshire	
	5.15	22	24	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	
R/H01	Table 1	82	05			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	Policy R/H1/Table 1/82/05/CO/A
	5.16 Table 1	82	13			Berkeley Homes Southern	PIC/Para 5.16/82/13/Obj/A
R/H02		35	04			Abbey Developments Limited	R/OS2/35/08/Obj/A
R/H02	5.18	52	01	Mr	Lane		
R/H02		82	06			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	R/H2/82/06/CO/A
	5.18	19	14	Mr	Young	Environment Agency	
R/H2		82	14			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	PIC/RH2/82/14/Obj/A
R/H03		82	07			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	R/H3/82/07/CO/A
R/H3		82	15			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	PIC/RH3/82/15/Obj/A

R/H03	5.22	18	02	Mr	Errington	Home Builders Federation	
R/H3		83	01	Mr	Perry		
R/H3		84	01			Breamore Properties	
	5.24b	84	02			Breamore Properties	
R/H04	5.25 - 5.27	1	11	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/H05		1	12	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/H05		1	69	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/H05		2	15	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	R/H5 & Appx. G/2/15 & 21/A
R/H05		5	02			Department of Health, Director of Health and Social Care, South	
R/H05	5.28	13	09			Defence Estates	
R/H05		13	23			Defence Estates	
R/H05	5.28-5.33 Appendix G	18	03	Mr	Errington	Home Builders Federation	Para 5.28-5.33/18/03/Obj/A R/H05/18/07/CO/A

R/H05		18	07	Mr	Errington	House Builders Federation	Para 5.28-5.33/18/03/Obj/A R/H05/18/07/CO/A
R/H5		30	01			BT PLC	
R/H5		30	04			BT PLC	
R/H05		36	02			McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd	R/H5/36/02/Obj/82/08/CO/16/17/18/PICS
R/H05		81	01			Fairview New Homes	
R/H05		81	02			Fairview New Homes	
R/H5		81	03			Fairview New Homes Ltd	
R/H05		82	08			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	R/H5/36/02/Obj/82/08/CO/16/17/18/PICS
R/H5		82	16			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	R/H5/36/02/Obj/82/08/CO/16/17/18/PICS
	5.30	58	03	Mr	Shaw		
	5.30c	82	17			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	R/H5/36/02/Obj/82/08/CO/16/17/18/PICS
	5.31	1	14	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	

R/H5		22	47	Mrs	Roast	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	
	5.32a	82	18			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	R/H5/36/02 /Obj/82/08/ CO/16/17/18/PICS
R/H08		5	01			Department of Health, Director of Health and Social Care, South	
	5.39	22	28	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	Para 5.39/22/28/ ObjA
R/H08a	5.39b	18	08	Mr	Errington	House Builders Federation	
R/H10	5.41-5.42	1	16	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
		1	19	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	6.11	37	03	Mr	Robeson	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	
R/EMP1		33	01			B & Q	



	6.20	1	22	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/EMP3		33	02			B & Q	
R/EMP3		36	01			McCarthy and Stone (Development s) Ltd	
R/EMP3		37	05	Mr	Robeson	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	
R/EMP3		38	01			DS Smith PLC	
R/EMP3	6.24	37	06	Mr	Robeson	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	
R/EMP5	6.30 and 6.31	37	07	Mr	Robeson	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	
R/EMP7	6.35-6.38	37	08	Mr	Robeson	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	
R/EMP7	6.38	37	09	Mr	Robeson	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	
	7.7	1	23	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	7.22-7.25	33	03			B & Q	
R/S1		1	24	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	7.29	19	15	Mr	Young	Environment Agency	

	7.32	1	70	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/S2		33	04			B & Q	
R/S2	7.36	1	71	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/S2	7.36	1	25	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	7.36	33	05			B & Q	
	7.37	1	26	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
		1	31	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/CF02		5	03			Department of Health, Director of Health and Social Care, South	
R/CF02		36	03			McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd	
R/CF02		65	01	Mrs	Ravyts		
R/CF03	8.12	52	02	Mr	Lane		

R/CF07		1	30	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/CF07	8.21	25	16	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
R/CF07	8.22	76	01	Mr	Whittle	Learning & Skills Council, Hampshire and the Isle of Wight	
R/CF08		1	32	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	8.23	1	33	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/CF08	8.23	1	72	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/CF09		1	34	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/CF09	8.25, 8.26, 8.27	20	05	Mrs	Burton	Gosport Society	R/CF09/Para 8.25, 8.26, 8.27/20/05/Obj/A
R/CF09	8.27	28	03	Mrs	Lee	St Vincent College	

	8.26		1 35	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/CF10	Protectio n of Hotel Site		63 01	Mr & Mrs	Smith		
R/CF10	Protectio n of Hotel Site		64 01	Mrs	Scaife		
R/CF10	Protectio n of Hotel Site		67 01	Mr & Mrs	Wakeman		
R/CF10	Protectio n of Hotel Site		68 01	Mrs	George		
R/CF10	Protectio n of Hotel Site		70 01	Mr	Wilkinson		
R/CF10	Protectio n of Hotel Site		71 02	Mr & Mrs	Vernon		
R/CF10	Protectio n of Hotel Site		74 01	Mr	Wilkinson		
R/CF10	Protectio n of Hotel Sites		66 01	Mrs	Edwards		
R/CF10	Protectio n of Hotels		61 01	Mrs	Palmer		
R/CF10			1 36	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/CF10			41 01		Vine Esq	Lloyd Vine Properties	
R/CF11	8.30		1 37	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	

R/CF12		11	14	Ms	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	
R/MOD1	ii	13	18			Defence Estates	
R/MOD1	v	13	19			Defence Estates	
R/MOD2		8	22	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	R/MOD2/8/22/Obj/A/B/C/D
R/MOD2		11	15	Ms	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	R/MOD2/11/15/Obj/A
R/MOD2	9.10	1	39	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/MOD2	9.12	10	02	Ms	Temple	RSPB	
	9.12	8	23	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	
R/BH3		82	09			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	R/BH3/82/09/CO/A
	10.17	1	42	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	10.24	1	43	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/BH5		82	10			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	R/BH5/82/10/CO/A

R/BH5	10.26	1	44	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/BH6		44	01	Dr	Rintoul (Chairman)	Friends of Crescent Garden	
R/BH6		82	11			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	R/BH6/82/11/CO/A
	10.28	1	46	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/BH7		1	47	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/BH7		82	12			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	R/BH7/82/12/CO/A
	10.31	7	16	Mr	Williams	English Heritage	
Omission	Farm Land	25	29	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
	11.3, 11.5, 11.13	23	04	Dr	Wright	Friends of Stokes Bay	Para 11.3, 11.5, 11.13 23/04Obj/A
R/OS01	3.14	40	02	Mr	Davies	Davies Associates	

	11.14	25	17	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
R/OS02		1	48	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/OS02		35	08			Abbey Developments Limited	R/OS2/35/08/Obj/A
R/OS02	11.20	40	01	Mr	Davies	Davies Associates	
	11.20	35	16			Abbey Developments Limited	R/OS2/35/08/Obj/A
	11.24	1	49	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	11.25	1	50	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/OS03		35	09			Abbey Developments Limited	R/OS2/35/08/Obj/A
R/OS03	11.27	75	01	Mr	Hart	Brian Filmer Hart Limited	Para 11,27/75/01/CO/A
R/OS03	11.28	1	51	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	

R/OS03	11.31	2	16	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	R/OS3 & 11.31/2/16/A
R/OS03	Inset Map 1	13	22			Defence Estates	
	11.27	35	17			Abbey Developments Limited	R/OS2/35/08/Obj/A
	11.27a	1	73	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	11.28	25	20	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
	11.29	25	21	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
R/OS05		11	18	Ms	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	R/OS/5/11/18/Obj/A
R/OS06		35	10			Abbey Developments Limited	R/OS2/35/08/Obj/A
R/OS07		82	01			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	
R/OS07	Appendix P	18	04	Mr	Errington	Home Builders Federation	



R/OS07	Appendix P	30	02			BT PLC	
R/OS7	Appendix P	30	05			BT PLC	
	11.53	1	53	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	11.55-11.60	1	55	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	11.59	36	06			McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd	
R/OS08	11.61	80	01	Mr	More	Gosport Allotments Association	R/OS08 Para 11.61/80/01/CO
	11.61	58	04	Mr	Shaw		
R/OS09		1	57	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/OS09	Para 11.62, 11.64	10	03	Ms	Temple	RSPB	
	11.64a	1	74	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	11.67	25	25	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
R/OS11		13	21			Defence Estates	

R/OS11		18	05	Mr	Errington	Home Builders Federation	
R/OS11		18	09	Mr	Errington	House Builders Federation	
R/OS11	11.70	1	59	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
	11.68	23	02	Dr	Wright	Friends of Stokes Bay	Para 11.68 23/02/Obj/ A
	11.70	25	27	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
R/OS12		25	28	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
	11.72	8	32	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	
	12.15	22	39	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	
	12.15	23	03	Dr	Wright	Friends of Stokes Bay	
	12.15	25	31	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	

R/CH1		35	11			Abbey Developments Limited	R/OS2/35/08/Obj/A
R/CH1		39	01			John Wyeth & Brother Limited	
R/CH1	12.16-12.19	1	60	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/CH2		82	02			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	R/CH2/82/02/CO/A
	12.23	25	34	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
R/ENV01		1	63	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/ENV01		35	12			Abbey Developments Limited	
R/ENV01		82	03			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	R/ENV1/Inset Map 4/82/03/CO/A
R/ENV04		14	02	Mr	Kneale	Southern Water	
R/ENV04		14	04	Mr	Kneale	Southern Water	

		1	66	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/ENV05b		1	75	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/ENV05d	Proposals Map	13	24			Defence Estates	
R/ENV09		1	76	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/ENV09		1	64	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	
R/ENV09		8	41	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	
R/ENV09		25	41	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	
R/ENV09	Criterion v	49	03			Mobile Operators Association	
	Appendices	7	17	Mr	Williams	English Heritage	
	Appendix B	2	20	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	Appendix B/2/20/A
	Appendix B	79	01			Youngs Developments Ltd	
	Appendix B	78	01			Paul Sealey	

	Appendix F	34	01			W M Morrison Supermarkets PLC	
	Appendix G	2	21	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	R/H5 & Appx. G/2/15 & 21/A
	Appendix K	20	03	Mrs	Burton	Gosport Society	
	Appendix L	55	01	Mrs	Russell		
	Appendix N	21	03	Mrs	Bumford	Hampshire Gardens Trust (Research Group)	
	Proposals Map	21	02	Mrs	Bumford	Hampshire Gardens Trust (Research Group)	
	Proposals Map	19	37	Mr	Young	Environment Agency	
	Proposals Map	82	21			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	PIC/Inset Map 6/82/21/Obj/A
	Proposals Map Changes to Inset Map 2	82	19			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	PIC/Inset Map 2/82/19/Obj/A
	Proposals Map Inset Map 4	82	20			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	PIC/Inset map 5/82/20/CO/A

List of Gosport Borough Council's Proofs of Evidence

Chapter	Policy No	Paragraph No.	Objection No	Title	Surname	Organisation	GBC Proof No
03		3.30	22 13	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	GBC/Para 3.30/A
03		3.33	2 05	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	GBC/Para 3.33/A
03	R/DP10	3.68 3.69 Appendix E	22 18	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	GBC/R/DP10/Appendix E/C
03	R/DP10	3.65-3.70	36 07			McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd	GBC/R/DP10/AA GBC/R/DP10/AB
03		3.70	22 19	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	GBC/R/DP10/D
04	R/T05		25 08	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	GBC/R/T5/A
04	R/T08		25 12	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	GBC/R/T8/A
05	R/H02		35 04			Abbey Developments Limited	GBC/R/H2/A
05	R/H05		1 69	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/H5/A GBC/RH5/Z
05	R/H05		2 15	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	GBC/R/H5/J GBC/R/H5/JJ GBC/RH5/Z
05	R/H05		5 02			Department of Health, Director of Health and Social Care, South	GBC/R/H5/L GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H05	5.28	13 09			Defence Estates	GBC/R/H5/K GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H05		13 23			Defence Estates	GBC/R/H5/G GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H05	5.28-5.33 Appendix G	18 03	Mr	Errington	House Builders Federation	GBC/R/H5/I GBC/R/H5/Z GBC/R/H5/Y
05	R/H05		18 07	Mr	Errington	House Builders Federation	GBC/R/H5/I GBC/R/H5/Z GBC/R/H5/Y
05	R/H5		30 01			BT PLC	GBC/R/H5/D GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H5		30 04			BT PLC	GBC/R/H5/D GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H05		36 02			McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd	GBC/R/H5/C GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z

List of Gosport Borough Council's Proofs of Evidence

Chapter	Policy No	Paragraph No.	Objection No	Title	Surname	Organisation	GBC Proof No
05	R/H05		81 01			Fairview New Homes	GBC/R/H5/E GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H05		81 02			Fairview New Homes	GBC/R/H5/E GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H5		81 03			Fairview New Homes Ltd	GBC/R/H5/E GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H05		82 08			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	GBC/R/H5/B GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H5		82 16			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	GBC/R/H5/B GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05		5.30c	82 17			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	GBC/R/H5/B GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05		5.31	1 14	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/H5/A GBC/R/H5/Z
05		5.32a	82 18			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	GBC/R/H5/B GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
08	R/CF09	8.25, 8.26, 8.27	20 05	Mrs	Burton	Gosport Society	GBC/R/CF9/Para 8.25-27/C
11	R/OS02		35 08			Abbey Developments Limited	GBC/R/OS2/Para 11.20/B
11		11.20	35 16			Abbey Developments Limited	GBC/R/OS2/Para 11.20/B
11	R/OS03		35 09			Abbey Developments Limited	GBC/R/OS3/Para 11.27/A
11	R/OS03	11.27	75 01	Mr	Hart	Brian Filmer Hart Limited	GBC/R/OS3/Para 11.27/B
11	R/OS03	11.31	2 16	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	GBC/R/OS3/Para 11.31/C
11		11.27	35 17			Abbey Developments Limited	GBC/R/OS3/Para 11.27/A
11	R/OS06		35 10			Berkeley homes (Hampshire) Limited	GBC/R/OS6/A
12	R/CH1		35 11			Abbey Developments Limited	GBC/R/CH1/C
AG		Appendix G	2 21	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	GBC/R/H5/JJ

List of Outstanding Objections to GBLP Review and corresponding GBC Proofs of Evidence

Chapter	Policy No	Paragraph No.	Objection No	Title	Surname	Organisation	GBC Proof No
0			1 67	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/General Format of the Plan/Policy Criteria/A
01		1.4	75 02	Mr	Hart	Brian Filmer Hart Limited	GBC/Para 1.4/A
02		2.5a	1 04	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/Para 2.5/A
03		3.2	22 06	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	GBC/Para 3.2/A
03		3.11	22 10	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	GBC/Para 3.11/A
03		3.12	8 09	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	GBC/Para 3.12/A
03		3.12	10 01	Ms	Temple	RSPB	GBC/Para 3.12A
03	R/DP01		13 01			Defence Estates	GBC/R/DP1/B
03	R/DP01		35 01			Abbey Developments Limited	GBC/R/DP1/A
03	R/DP01	Appendix B	82 04			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	GBC/R/DP1/Appendix B/C
03	R/DP02	iii	13 03			Defence Estates	GBC/R/DP2iii/A
03		3.30	22 13	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	GBC/Para 3.30/A
03		3.33	2 05	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	GBC/Para 3.33/A
03	R/DP04	3.38	1 06	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/DP4/Para 3.38 & /R/S1/A
03		3.40	19 05	Mr	Young	Environment Agency	GBC/Paras 3.40, 3.47, 5.18, 7.29/A
03		3.47	19 07	Mr	Young	Environment Agency	GBC/Paras 3.40, 3.47, 5.18, 7.29/A
03	R/DP4	3.40	83 02	Mr	Perry		GBC/R/DP4/R/H3/A
03	R/DP07		19 10	Mr	Young	Environment Agency	GBC/R/DP7/A
03	R/DP08		1 08	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/DP8/A
03	R/DP08	3.61	20 06	Mrs	Bumford	Gosport Society	GBC/R/DP8/A
03	R/DP10		1 09	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/DP10/B
03	R/DP10	3.68 3.69 Appendix E	22 18	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	GBC/R/DP10/Appendix E/C
03	R/DP10	3.65-3.70	36 07			McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd	GBC/R/DP10/AA GBC/R/DP10/AB



List of Outstanding Objections to GBLP Review and corresponding GBC Proofs of Evidence

Chapter	Policy No	Paragraph No.	Objection No	Title	Surname	Organisation	GBC Proof No
03	R/DP10		57 01	Ms	Blank		GBC/R/DP10/F
03	R/DP10	3.69 & Summary	60 01	Mr	Smith		GBC/R/DP10/Para 3.69/I
03	R/DP10		71 01	Mr & Mrs	Vernon		GBC/R/DP10/G
03	R/DP10	3.68a	77 01	Mr	Wallace		GBC/R/DP10/H
03	R/DP10	and Appendix E	79 02			Youngs Developments Ltd	GBC/R/DP10/Appendix E/E
03		3.70	22 19	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	GBC/R/DP10/D
04		4.7	8 17	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	GBC/Para 4.7/A
04		4.9	8 18	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	GBC/Para 4.9/A
04		4.15	13 05			Defence Estates	GBC/Para 4.15/A
04	R/T05		25 08	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	GBC/R/T5/A
04	R/T05	4.17 Reg 24(9)	1 68	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/T5/Para 4.17/B
04		4.19	58 01	Mr	Shaw		GBC/Para 4.19/A
04		4.23	25 11	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	GBC/Para 4.23/A
04	R/T08		25 12	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	GBC/R/T8/A
04		4.27	58 02	Mr	Shaw		GBC/Para 4.27/A
04	R/T09		50 03	Mr	Jones		GBC/R/T9/A
05			1 17	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/Para 5.7/A
05		5.10	8 19	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	GBC/Para 5.10/A
05	R/H01		26 01	Ms	Cole	CPRE Hampshire	GBC/R/H1/A
05		5.15	22 24	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	GBC/Para 5.15/A
05	R/H01	Table 1	82 05			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	GBC/R/H1/Para 5.16/C
05		5.16 Table 1	82 13			Berkeley Homes Southern	GBC/R/H1/Para 5.16 C

List of Outstanding Objections to GBLP Review and corresponding GBC Proofs of Evidence

Chapter	Policy No	Paragraph No.	Objection No	Title	Surname	Organisation	GBC Proof No
05	R/H02		35 04			Abbey Developments Limited	GBC/R/H2/A
05	R/H02	5.18	52 01	Mr	Lane		GBC/R/H2/B
05	R/H02		82 06			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	GBC/RH2/C
05		5.18	19 14	Mr	Young	Environment Agency	GBC/Paras 3.40, 3.47, 5.18, 7.29/A
05	R/H2		82 14			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	GBC/RH2/C
05	R/H03		82 07			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	GBC/R/H3/A
05	R/H3		82 15			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	GBC/R/H3/A
05	R/H03	5.22	18 02	Mr	Errington	House Builders Federation	GBC/R/H3/D
05	R/H3		83 01	Mr	Perry		GBC/R/DP4/R/H3/A
05	R/H3		84 01			Breamore Properties	GBC/R/H3/Para 5.24b/B
05		5.24b	84 02			Breamore Properties	GBC/R/H3/Para 5.24b/B
05	R/H04	5.25 - 5.27	1 11	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/H4/A
05	R/H05		1 12	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/H5/A
05	R/H05		1 69	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/H5/A GBC/RH5/Z
05	R/H05		2 15	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	GBC/R/H5/J GBC/R/H5/JJ GBC/RH5/Z
05	R/H05		5 02			Department of Health, Director of Health and Social Care, South	GBC/R/H5/L GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H05	5.28	13 09			Defence Estates	GBC/R/H5/K GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H05		13 23			Defence Estates	GBC/R/H5/G GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H05	5.28-5.33 Appendix G	18 03	Mr	Errington	House Builders Federation	GBC/R/H5/I GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H05		18 07	Mr	Errington	House Builders Federation	GBC/R/H5/I GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H5		30 01			BT PLC	GBC/R/H5/D GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z

List of Outstanding Objections to GBLP Review and corresponding GBC Proofs of Evidence

Chapter	Policy No	Paragraph No.	Objection No	Title	Surname	Organisation	GBC Proof No
05	R/H5		30 04			BT PLC	GBC/R/H5/D GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H05		36 02			McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd	GBC/R/H5/C GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H05		81 01			Fairview New Homes	GBC/R/H5/E GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H05		81 02			Fairview New Homes	GBC/R/H5/E GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H5		81 03			Fairview New Homes Ltd	GBC/R/H5/E GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H05		82 08			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	GBC/R/H5/B GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H5		82 16			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	GBC/R/H5/B GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05		5.30	58 03	Mr	Shaw		GBC/R/H5/M
05		5.30c	82 17			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	GBC/R/H5/B GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05		5.31	1 14	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/H5/A GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H5		22 47	Mrs	Roast	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents' Association	GBC/R/H5/H
05		5.32a	82 18			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	GBC/R/H5/B GBC/R/H5/Y GBC/R/H5/Z
05	R/H08		5 01			Department of Health, Director of Health and Social Care, South	GBC/RH8/A
05		5.39	22 28	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	GBC/Para 5.39/A
05	R/H08a	5.39b	18 08	Mr	Errington	House Builders Federation	GBC/R/H8a/A
05	R/H10	5.41-5.42	1 16	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/H10/Paras 5.41 & 5.42/A
06			1 19	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/Omission Demand for Offices/A
06		6.11	37 03	Ms	Mercer	Littman and Robeson	GBC/Para 6.11/A
06	R/EMP1		33 01			B & Q	GBC/R/EMP1/A

List of Outstanding Objections to GBLP Review and corresponding GBC Proofs of Evidence

Chapter	Policy No	Paragraph No.	Objection No	Title	Surname	Organisation	GBC Proof No
06		6.20	1 22	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/Para 6.20/A
06	R/EMP3		33 02			B & Q	GBC/R/EMP3/A
06	R/EMP3		36 01			McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd	GBC/R/EMP3/A
06	R/EMP3		37 05	Ms	Mercer	Littman and Robeson	GBC/R/EMP3/A
06	R/EMP3		38 01			DS Smith PLC	GBC/R/EMP3/A
06	R/EMP3	6.24	37 06	Ms	Mercer	Littman and Robeson	GBC/R/EMP3 Para 6.24/B
06	R/EMP5	6.30 and 6.31	37 07	Ms	Mercer	Littman and Robeson	GBC/R/EMP5/A
06	R/EMP7	6.35-6.38	37 08	Ms	Mercer	Littman and Robeson	GBC/R/EMP7/A
06	R/EMP7	6.38	37 09	Ms	Mercer	Littman and Robeson	GBC/R/EMP7/A
07		7.7	1 23	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/Para 7.7/A
07		7.22-7.25	33 03			B & Q	GBC/Paras 7.22-7.25/A
07	R/S1		1 24	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/DP4/Para 3.38 & GBC/R/S1/A
07		7.29	19 15	Mr	Young	Environment Agency	GBC/Paras 3.40, 3.47, 5.18, 7.29/A
07		7.32	1 70	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/Paragraph 7.32/A
07	R/S2		33 04			B & Q	GBC.R/S2/A
07	R/S2	7.36	1 71	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/RS2/Para 7.36/B
07	R/S2	7.36	1 25	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/RS2/Para 7.36/B
07		7.36	33 05			B & Q	GBC/Paragraph 7.36/A
07		7.37	1 26	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/Para 7.37/A
08			1 31	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/CF8 & R/CF9/A
08	R/CF02		5 03			Department of Health, Director of Health and Social Care, South	GBC/R/CF2/A
08	R/CF02		36 03			McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd	GBC/R/CF2/B
08	R/CF02		65 01	Mrs	Ravyts		GBC/R/CF2/C
08	R/CF03	8.12	52 02	Mr	Lane		GBC/R/CF3/A
08	R/CF07		1 30	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/CF7/A

List of Outstanding Objections to GBLP Review and corresponding GBC Proofs of Evidence

Chapter	Policy No	Paragraph No.	Objection No	Title	Surname	Organisation	GBC Proof No
08	R/CF07	8.21	25 16	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	GBC/R/CF7/C
08	R/CF07	8.22	76 01	Mr	Whittle	Learning & Skills Council, Hampshire and the Isle of Wight	GBC/R/CF7/Para 8.22/B
08	R/CF08		1 32	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/CF8 & R/CF9/A
08		8.23	1 33	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/CF8 & R/CF9/A
08	R/CF08	8.23	1 72	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/CF8 & R/CF9/A
08	R/CF09		1 34	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/CF8 & R/CF9/A
08	R/CF09	8.25, 8.26, 8.27	20 05	Mrs	Burton	Gosport Society	GBC/R/CF9/Para 8.25-27/C
08	R/CF09	8.27	28 03	Mrs	Lee	St Vincent College	GBC/R/CF9/B
08		8.26	1 35	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/Para.8.26/A
08	R/CF10	Protection of Hotel Site	63 01	Mr & Mrs	Smith		GBC/R/CF10/A
08	R/CF10	Protection of Hotel Site	64 01	Mrs	Scaife		GBC/R/CF10/A
08	R/CF10	Protection of Hotel Site	67 01	Mr & Mrs	Wakeman		GBC/R/CF10/A
08	R/CF10	Protection of Hotel Site	68 01	Mrs	George		GBC/R/CF10/A
08	R/CF10	Protection of Hotel Site	70 01	Mr	Wilkinson		GBC/R/CF10/A
08	R/CF10	Protection of Hotel Site	71 02	Mr & Mrs	Vernon		GBC/R/CF10/A
08	R/CF10	Protection of Hotel Site	74 01	Mr	Wilkinson		GBC/R/CF10/A
08	R/CF10	Protection of Hotel Sites	66 01	Mrs	Edwards		GBC/R/CF10/A
08	R/CF10	Protection of Hotels	61 01	Mrs	Palmer		GBC/R/CF10/A
08	R/CF10		1 36	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/CF10/B

List of Outstanding Objections to GBLP Review and corresponding GBC Proofs of Evidence

Chapter	Policy No	Paragraph No.	Objection No	Title	Surname	Organisation	GBC Proof No
08	R/CF10		41 01	Mr	Vine	Lloyd Vine Properties	GBC/R/CF10/C
08	R/CF10	8.29	45 01	Mr	Penn-Barrow	West Point Management Company	GBC/R/CF10/A
08	R/CF11	8.30	1 37	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/CF11/A
08	R/CF12		11 14	Ms	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	GBC/R/CF12/A
09	R/MOD1	ii	13 18			Defence Estates	GBC/R/MOD1ii/A
09	R/MOD1	v	13 19			Defence Estates	GBC/R/MOD1v/B
09	R/MOD2		8 22	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	GBC/R/MOD2/B
09	R/MOD2		11 15	Ms	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	GBC/R/MOD2/B
09	R/MOD2	9.10	1 39	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/MOD2/Para 9.10/A
09	R/MOD2	9.12	10 02	Ms	Temple	RSPB	GBC/R/MOD2/B & GBC/Para 9.12/A
09		9.12	8 23	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	GBC/Para 9.12/A
10	R/BH3		82 09			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	GBC/R/BH3, R/BH5, R/BH6, R/BH7/B
10		10.17	1 42	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/BH3/Para 10.17/A
10		10.24	1 43	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/Para 10.24/A
10	R/BH5		82 10			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	GBC/R/BH3, R/BH5, R/BH6, R/BH7/B
10	R/BH5	10.26	1 44	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/BH5/Para 10.26/A
10	R/BH6		44 01	Dr	Rintoul (Chairman)	Friends of Crescent Garden	GBC/R/BH6/A
10	R/BH6		82 11			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	GBC/R/BH3, R/BH5, R/BH6, R/BH7/B
10		10.28	1 46	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/BH6/B
10	R/BH7		1 47	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/BH7/A
10	R/BH7		82 12			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	GBC/R/BH3, R/BH5, R/BH6, R/BH7/B
10		10.31	7 16	Mr	Williams	English Heritage	GBC/Para 10.31/A
11	Omission	Farm Land	25 29	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	GBC/Chapter 11 Omission Farmland/A
11		11.3, 11.5, 11.13	23 04	Dr	Wright	Friends of Stokes Bay	GBC/Paras 11.3, 11.5, 11.13/A

List of Outstanding Objections to GBLP Review and corresponding GBC Proofs of Evidence

Chapter	Policy No	Paragraph No.	Objection No	Title	Surname	Organisation	GBC Proof No
11	R/OS01	3.14	40 02	Mr	Davies	Davies Associates	GBC/R/OS1/Para 3.14/A
11		11.14	25 17	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	GBC/ Para11.14/A
11	R/OS02		1 48	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/OS2/A
11	R/OS02		35 08			Abbey Developments Limited	GBC/R/OS2/Para 11.20/B
11	R/OS02	11.20	40 01	Mr	Davies	Davies Associates	GBC/R/OS2/Para 11.20/A
11		11.20	35 16			Abbey Developments Limited	GBC/R/OS2/Para 11.20/B
11		11.24	1 49	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/Para11.24/A
11		11.25	1 50	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/Para11.25/A
11	R/OS03		35 09			Abbey Developments Limited	GBC/R/OS3/Para 11.27/A
11	R/OS03	11.27	75 01	Mr	Hart	Brian Filmer Hart Limited	GBC/R/OS3/Para 11.27/B
11	R/OS03	11.28	1 51	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/OS3/C
11	R/OS03	11.31	2 16	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	GBC/R/OS3/Para 11.31/C
11	R/OS03	Inset Map 1	13 22			Defence Estates	GBC/R/OS3/E
11		11.27	35 17			Abbey Developments Limited	GBC/R/OS3/Para 11.27/A
11		11.27a	1 73	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/Para11.27a/A
11		11.28	25 20	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	GBC/Para. 11.28/A
11		11.29	25 21	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	GBC/Para 11.29/A
11	R/OS05		11 18	Ms	Wilkinson	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	GBC/R/OS5/A
11	R/OS06		35 10			Abbey Developments Limited	GBC/R/OS6/A
11	R/OS07		82 01			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	GBC/R/OS7/A
11	R/OS07	Appendix P	18 04	Mr	Errington	House Builders Federation	GBC/R/OS7/B
11	R/OS07	Appendix P	30 02			BT PLC	GBC/R/OS7/C
11	R/OS7	Appendix P	30 05			BT PLC	GBC/R/OS7/C

List of Outstanding Objections to GBLP Review and corresponding GBC Proofs of Evidence

Chapter	Policy No	Paragraph No.	Objection No	Title	Surname	Organisation	GBC Proof No
11		11.53	1 53	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/Paras.11.53 11.55-60/A
11		11.55-11.60	1 55	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/Paras.11.53.11.55-60/A
11		11.59	36 06			McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd	GBC/Para11.59/A
11	R/OS08	11.61	80 01	Mr	More	Gosport Allotments Association	GBC/R/OS8/A
11		11.61	58 04	Mr	Shaw		GBC/R/OS8/B
11	R/OS09		1 57	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/OS9/A
11	R/OS09	Para 11.62, 11.64	10 03	Ms	Temple	RSPB	GBC/Para 11.62/A
11		11.64a	1 74	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/Para 11.64a/A
11		11.67	25 25	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	GBC/ Para11.67/A
11	R/OS11		13 21			Defence Estates	GBC/R/OS11/A
11	R/OS11		18 05	Mr	Errington	House Builders Federation	GBC/R/OS11/B
11	R/OS11		18 09	Mr	Errington	House Builders Federation	GBC/R/OS11/B
11	R/OS11	11.70	1 59	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/OS11/C
11		11.68	23 02	Dr	Wright	Friends of Stokes Bay	GBC/R/OS11/D
11		11.70	25 27	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	GBC/Para 11.70/A
11	R/OS12		25 28	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	GBC/R/OS12/A
11		11.72	8 32	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	GBC/Para 11.72/A
12		12.15	22 39	Mrs	Roast	Lee Residents' Association	GBC/Para 12.15/A
12		12.15	23 03	Dr	Wright	Friends of Stokes Bay	GBC/Para 12.15/B
12		12.15	25 31	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	GBC/Para 12.15/C
12	R/CH1		35 11			Abbey Developments Limited	GBC/R/CH1/C
12	R/CH1		39 01			John Wyeth & Brother Limited	GBC/R/CH1/A



List of Outstanding Objections to GBLP Review and corresponding GBC Proofs of Evidence

Chapter	Policy No	Paragraph No.	Objection No	Title	Surname	Organisation	GBC Proof No
12	R/CH1	12.16-12.19	1 60	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/CH1/Para 12.16-12.19/A
12	R/CH2		82 02			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	GBC/R/CH2/A
12		12.23	25 34	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	GBC/Para 12.23/A
13	R/ENV01		1 63	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/ENV1/Proposals Map/A & GBC/R/ENV1/C
13	R/ENV01		35 12			Abbey Developments Limited	GBC/R/ENV1/B
13	R/ENV01		82 03			Berkeley Homes (Hampshire) Limited	GBC/R/ENV1/A
13	R/ENV04		14 02	Mr	Kneale	Southern Water	GBC/R/ENV4/A
13	R/ENV04		14 04	Mr	Kneale	Southern Water	GBC/R/ENV4/A
13			1 66	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/Omission Hazardous Substances/A
13	R/ENV05b		1 75	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/ENV5b/A
13	R/ENV05d	Proposals Map	13 24			Defence Estates	GBC/R/ENV5d/A
13	R/ENV09		1 76	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/ENV9/A
13	R/ENV09		1 64	Ms	O'Sullivan	Government Office for the South East	GBC/R/ENV9/E
13	R/ENV09		8 41	Dr	McMullon	English Nature	GBC/R/ENV9/B
13	R/ENV09		25 41	Ms	Borthwick	Gosport & Fareham Friends of the Earth Local Group	GBC/R/ENV9/C
13	R/ENV09	Criterion v	49 03			Mobile Operators Association	GBC/R/ENV9/D
A		Appendices	7 17	Mr	Williams	English Heritage	GBC/Appendices A, B, D, E & J/A
AB		Appendix B	2 20	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	GBC/Appendix B/A
AB		Appendix B	79 01			Youngs Developments Ltd	GBC/Appendix B/B
AB		Appendix B	78 01			Paul Sealey	GBC/Appendix B/B
AF		Appendix F	34 01			W M Morrison Supermarkets PLC	GBC/Appendix F/A
AG		Appendix G	2 21	Mr	Wilson	Hampshire County Council	GBC/R/H5/JJ

List of Outstanding Objections to GBLP Review and corresponding GBC Proofs of Evidence

Chapter	Policy No	Paragraph No.	Objection No	Title	Surname	Organisation	GBC Proof No
AK		Appendix K	20 03	Mrs	Burton	Gosport Society	GBC/Appendix K/A
AL		Appendix L	55 01	Mrs	Russell		GBC/Appendix L/A
AN		Appendix N	21 03	Mrs	Bumford	Hampshire Gardens Trust (Research Group)	GBC/Appendix N/Proposals Map/A
P		Proposals Map	21 02	Mrs	Bumford	Hampshire Gardens Trust (Research Group)	GBC/Appendix N/Proposals Map/A
P		Proposals Map	19 37	Mr	Young	Environment Agency	GBC/R/ENV1/Proposals Map/A
		Proposals Map	82 21			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	GBC/PIC/81/A
		Proposals Map Changes to Inset Map 2	82 19			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	GBC/PIC 77/A
		Proposals Map Inset Map 4	82 20			Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	GBC/PIC/79/A
		Outstanding Pre Inquiry Changes		Mrs	Catt	Gosport Borough Council	GBC/PICs/A

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

Ref.	Title of Document	Organisation	Date
<b>CD 1 LOCAL PLAN DOCUMENTS</b>			
CD1/1	Gosport Borough Local Plan: <b>Adopted Version</b>	Gosport Borough Council	April 1995
CD1/2	Gosport Borough Local Plan Inspectors Report	P. A. Vincent	March 1994
CD1/3	Gosport Borough Local Plan Review ( <b>First Deposit</b> )	Gosport Borough Council	Dec. 2002
CD1/4	Gosport Borough Local Plan Review First Deposit Letter of Conformity with the Hampshire Structure Plan 1996-2011 Review	Hampshire County Council	17 October 2002
CD1/6	Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Summary of Representations made to the First Deposit	Gosport Borough Council	2003
CD1/7	Gosport Borough Local Plan Review ( <b>Revised Deposit</b> )	Gosport Borough Council	June 2004
CD1/8	Gosport Borough Local Plan Review Revised Deposit Letter of Conformity with Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996-2011 Review	Hampshire County Council	15 June 2004
CD1/9	Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Sustainability Appraisal (First Deposit)	Gosport Borough Council	November 2002

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD1/10	Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Sustainability Appraisal (Revised Deposit)	Gosport Borough Council	June 2004
CD1/11	Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Statement on Pre deposit Consultation	Gosport Borough Council	Dec. 2002
CD1/12	Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Statement on Consultation	Gosport Borough Council	June 2004
CD1/12a	Gosport Borough Local Plan Review Statement on Consultation	Gosport Borough Council	January 2005
CD1/13	Gosport Borough Local Plan Review (Revised Deposit): Schedule of Changes	Gosport Borough Council	June 2004
CD1/14	Summary of Representations to GBLP Review Revised Deposit and GBC Response	Gosport Borough Council	2004
CD1/15	Pre-Inquiry Changes Schedule of Proposed Changes	Gosport Borough Council	November 2004
CD1/16	General Statement Planning for an Urban Peninsula	Gosport Borough Council	January 2005
CD1/17/a	Housing	Gosport Borough Council	January 2005
CD1/18	Employment	Gosport Borough Council	January 2005
CD1/19 ONWARDS	Committee Reports	Gosport Borough Council	1999-2004
CD1/91	Gosport Borough Local Plan Review Site Specific Outstanding Objections 5 January 2005	Gosport Borough Council	January 2005
CD1/92	Supplementary Topic Paper 4: Delivering Housing through the 'Plan, Monitor and Manage' Process	Gosport Borough Council	March 2005
CD1/93	Local Development Scheme	Gosport Borough Council	February 2005

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

<b>CD 2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN PRACTICE AND PROCEDURES</b>			
CD2/2	Local Plan & Unitary Development Plans: A Guide to Procedures	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	1999
CD2/5	Planning and development briefs: a guide to better practice		-
CD2/6	Better Local Plans – A Guide to Writing Effective Policies	Planning Officers Society	1997
CD2/7	Notes of Pre-Inquiry Meeting	Programme Officer	2004
CD2/8	Inquiry Programme	Programme Officer	On going
CD2/9	Attendance List	Programme Officer	2004
CD2/10	Public Notices (various)	Gosport Borough Council	2002-2005
CD2/11	Letter from Programme Officer re Pre Inquiry Meeting scheduled for 6 <sup>th</sup> January 2005	Programme Officer	2004
<b>CD 3 DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES</b>			
CD3/1	Marine Parade Area of Special Character: Supplementary Planning Guidance	Gosport Borough Council	June 2004
CD3/1A	<b>Draft</b> Marine Parade Area of Special Character: Interim Policy Statement and Supplementary Planning Guidance	Gosport Borough Council	July 2003

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD3/1B	Marine Parade Area of Special Character: Interim Policy Statement and Supplementary Planning Guidance	Gosport Borough Council	September 2003
CD3/2	"Save our Seafront Campaign"	The News	2003
CD3/3	"Hands of Lee Seafront" petition	Organised by the Lee Ward Councillors	2003
CD3/4	By Design	DETR	2000
CD3/5	By Design: Better Places To Live	DETR	2001
CD3/6	Planning for Sustainable Development: Towards Better Practice	DETR	-
CD3/7	Building a Better Quality of Life – A Strategy for more Sustainable Construction	DETR	April 2000
CD3/8	Urban White Paper: Our Towns and Cities: The Future	ODPM	-
CD3/10	Living Places: Urban Renaissance in the South East	ODPM	-
CD3/11	Planning and access for disabled people: a good practice guide	ODPM	-
CD3/12	Marine Parade Building Heights	JC Radford	
CD3/13	Appeal Decision on 38-42 marine Parade East, Lee-on-the-Solent Appeal Ref: APP/J1725/A/04/1148972	Appeal decision by Inspector J O Head BSc (Econ) DipTP MRTPI	23 March 2005
<b>CD 4 TRANSPORT</b>			
CD4/1	A Cycle Strategy for Gosport * Proposed cycle network map was updated in July 2004	Gosport Borough Council & Hampshire County Council	February 1997
CD4/2	Transpol	Atkins	2004
CD4/3	Hampshire Local Transport Plan 2001-2006	Hampshire County Council	July 2000
CD4/4	Movement, Access, Streets and Spaces (MASS)	Hampshire County Council	August 2001
<b>CD 5 HOUSING</b>			
CD5/1	Gosport Borough Urban Capacity Study	Gosport Borough Council	Nov. 2002

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD5/2	Gosport Borough Urban Capacity Study	Gosport Borough Council	June 2004
CD5/3	A Housing Strategy for Gosport 2003-6 Background Strategies Update	Gosport Borough Council	2004
CD5/4	Gosport Borough Council Housing Strategy 2004	Gosport Borough Council	2004
CD5/5	SE Hampshire Sub-Regional Housing Market Study	Produced by LSE Enterprise & Cambridge University on behalf of Gosport, Fareham and Havant Borough Councils and Portsmouth City Council.	Dec 2002
CD5/6	Gosport Borough Housing Needs Survey	Produced by David Couttie Associates on behalf of GBC	2003
CD5/7	Gosport Borough Housing Needs Survey	Produced by David Couttie Associates on behalf of GBC	1998
CD5/8	Housing Land Supply in Hampshire	Hampshire County Council	2003
CD5/9	Draft Policy H4 Monitoring Paper 2005	Hampshire County Council	2004
CD5/9a	Draft Policy H4 Monitoring Paper 2005: Representations on behalf of Berkeley Community Villages	Berkeley Homes Limited	January 2004
CD5/11	Policy H4 Monitoring Paper 2004	Hampshire County Council	2004
CD5/12	Implementing Policy H4	Hampshire County Council	June 2001
CD5/13	Strategic Planning Joint Advisory Panel Policy H4	Hampshire County Council	March 2004
CD5/14	Strategic Planning Joint Advisory Panel Policy H4 Monitoring Paper 2004 – Consultation response from Government Office for the South East	Hampshire County Council	March 2004
CD5/15	Guidelines for Urban Capacity Studies	Hampshire County Council	July 2001

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD5/16	Implementing Policy H4 – Addendum	Hampshire County Council	June 2004
CD5/17	Assessing Urban Housing Potential	GOSE and Baker Associates	January 2004
CD5/18	Extracts from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation website on Lifetime Homes	Joseph Rowntree Foundation	January 2005
CD5/18A	Life time Homes: The Life time Homes standards incorporate 16 design standards that make homes more flexible, convenient , safe and accessible.	Joseph Rowntree Foundation	-
CD5/19	Improving the Delivery of Affordable Housing in London and the South East	ODPM	-
CD5/20	Tapping the Potential: Accessing Urban Capacity Study: Towards Better Practice	ODPM	-
CD5/22	Monitoring provision of housing through the planning system	ODPM	Oct 2000
CD5/23	Planning to deliver: the managed release of housing sites	ODPM	June 2001
CD5/24	Review of Housing Supply Delivering Stability: Securing our Future Housing Needs (Final Report)	Kate Barker	March 2004
CD5/25	Local Housing needs Assessment: A Guide to Good Practice	ODPM	-
CD5/26	Delivering affordable housing through planning policies	DETR	Feb 2002
CD5/27	A Housing Strategy for Gosport A Position Statement	Gosport Borough Council	July 2004
CD5/28	Planning, Development and Affordable Housing Strategy	Gosport Borough Council	2004
CD5/29	Minutes of the Gosport Borough Council Housing Committee 2 June 1999 and Planning and Transportation Committee 14 June 1999	Gosport Borough Council	June 1999



## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD5/30	Housing Land Supply in Hampshire	Hampshire County Council	2004
CD5/31	South East Hampshire Housing Market Study: Gosport Report Executive Summary	Produced by LSE Enterprise & Cambridge University on behalf of Gosport, Fareham and Havant Borough Councils and Portsmouth City Council.	Sep 2002
CD5/32	South East Hampshire Housing Market Study: Gosport Report: Gosport Report	Produced by LSE Enterprise & Cambridge University on behalf of Gosport, Fareham and Havant Borough Councils and Portsmouth City Council.	Sep 2002
CD5/33	Review of Housing Supply: Securing our Future Housing Needs (Interim Report – Analysis)	Kate Barker	Dec 2003
CD5/35	Hampshire Housing Supply Action Plan	Hampshire County Council	2004
CD5/36	Extract from Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan Inspector's Report	The Inspector for the Havant Borough Public Local Inquiry	June 2004
CD5/37	Have planning agreements increased the supply of affordable housing?	Joseph Rowntree Foundation	March 2005
CD5/38	Assessing Housing needs in the South East: A Good Practice Guide	SEERA	January 2004
<b>CD 6 EMPLOYMENT</b>			
CD6/1	Gosport Borough Economic Regeneration Strategy 2004 - 2007	Gosport Borough Council	2004
CD6/2	Borough of Gosport Industrial Estates Register	Gosport Borough Council	September 2002
CD6/3	South East Hampshire Area Investment Framework	DTZ Pieda Consulting	January 2004
CD6/4	HEDF Project Brief on Accommodation needs analysis for move-on businesses in Portsmouth and South East Hampshire	Harbour Economic Development Forum	2004

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

<b>CD 7 RETAIL</b>			
CD7/1	Retail Study for Gosport – Main Report	Produced by Hillier Parker on behalf of Gosport Borough Council	1998
CD7/2	Retail Study for Gosport - Appendices	Produced by Hillier Parker on behalf of Gosport Borough Council	1998
CD7/3	Town Centres and Out of Centre Development	Prepared by Hampshire County Council and the Hampshire LPAs	-
CD7/4	Hampshire Town Centre Qualitative Assessment Survey 2000	Hampshire County Council	2001
CD7/5	Shopping Catchment Areas Study 1998	Prepared by Hampshire County Council and the Hampshire LPAs	1998
CD7/6	Vital and Viable Town Centres: Meeting the Challenge	URBED	1994
<b>CD 8 COMMUNITY AND BUILT LEISURE</b>			
CD8/2	Hotel Sector Shortage Assessment and Site Marketing Study for Gosport – Final Report	Tourism Solutions	August 2001
CD8/3	Hotel Sector Shortage Study for Hampshire	Tourism Solutions	August 2001
CD8/4	Hampshire Tourism Strategy – 2000 – 2005	Hampshire County Council	2000
CD8/5	Major Commercial Leisure Uses (Leisure Parks and Cinemas)	Hampshire County Council	-
CD8/6	Cultural Strategy for Gosport 2004-2007	Gosport Borough Council	2004

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD8/7	Developer Contributions towards Education Facilities	Gosport Borough Council	August 2004
CD8/8	School Organisation Plan 2003/04-2007/08	Hampshire County Council	December 2003
CD8/9	Best Value Holbrook Recreation Centre Review (extracts- excludes Appendices regarding detailed staff and management issues)	Gosport Borough Council	2002
<b>CD 9 BUILT HERITAGE</b>			
CD9/1	Forton Road Conservation Area Action Plan	Gosport Borough Council	1995
CD9/2	Hardway Conservation Area Action Plan	Gosport Borough Council	1995
CD9/3	St George Barracks South Conservation Area Action Plan	Gosport Borough Council	1994
CD9/4	Rowner Village Conservation Area Action Plan	Gosport Borough Council	1993
CD9/5	Anglesey Conservation Area Action Plan	Gosport Borough Council	1995
CD9/6	Bury Road Conservation Area Action Plan	Gosport Borough Council	1993
CD9/7	Pier Street Conservation Area Action Plan	Gosport Borough Council	1993
CD9/8	Conservation Areas	Gosport Borough Council	-
CD9/9	The Conservation of Listed Buildings and Other Older Buildings: Information for Owners	Gosport Borough Council	-
CD9/10	Historic Building Grants	Gosport Borough Council	-
CD9/11	Listed Building Consent	Gosport Borough Council	-
CD9/12	Listed Buildings: Background to the Legislation	Gosport Borough Council	-
CD9/13	Shop fronts and Advertising in Conservation Areas	Gosport Borough Council	-

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD9/14	An Extensive Urban Survey of Hampshire's and Isle of Wight's Historic Towns; Gosport		1999
CD9/14a	Historic Rural Settlement in the Districts of Fareham, Gosport and Havant and the north of Portsmouth City – An Archaeological and Historical Survey produced for Hampshire County Council	Ian Hewitt, Bournemouth University	July 2001
CD9/15	Register of Historic Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest (Haslar Hospital)	English Heritage	2001
CD9/16	Building in Context: New Development in Historic Areas		-
CD9/17	The Historic Environment: A Force for our Future		December 2001
CD9/18	Secured By Design Principles	Association of Police Officers	June 2004
CD9/19	Enabling Development and the Conservation of Heritage Assets	English Heritage	December 2001
<b>CD 10 OPEN SPACE</b>			
CD10/1	Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Open Space Monitoring Report	Gosport Borough Council	July 2004
CD10/1a	Open Space Audit: Methodology 2003/04	Gosport Borough Council	-
CD10/3	Alver Valley Park Master Plan Study	Gosport Borough Council in partnership with Groundwork Solent and H/E/D	May 2003
CD10/4	The Six Acre Standard: Minimum standards for outdoor playing space	National Playing Fields	2001
CD10/5	A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England: Policy on planning applications for development on playing fields	Sport England	
CD10/6	Sport and Leisure: results from the sport and leisure module of the 2002 General Household Survey	National Statistics	2004

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD10/7	Defence Estates Letter dated 28 January 2005; Jack in the Woods Bungalow Monk's Walk	Defence Estates	January 2005
CD10/8	Driving Up Participation: The Challenge for Sport	Sport England	April 2004
CD10/9	Extract from Portsmouth City Council Local Plan Review Inspector's Report	Inspector for the Portsmouth City Council Local Plan Review Public Local Inquiry	January 2004
CD10/10	Green Spaces, Better Places: Final Report of the Urban Green Spaces Taskforce	Department of Transport Local Government and the Regions	2002
CD10/11	Providing for Sport and Recreation through New Housing Development	Sport England	June 2001
CD10/12	Gosport Borough Council Best Value Parks and Open Space Review	Gosport Borough Council	2002
CD10/13	Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation in Hampshire	Hampshire County Council, Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust and English Nature	
<b>CD 11 NATURE CONSERVATION</b>			
CD11/1	Solent European Marine Sites Draft Management Scheme	Gosport Borough Council as part of the SEMS Management Group	April 2004
CD11/2	Brent Goose Strategy: South East Hampshire Coast	Gosport Borough Council as part of the Hampshire Brent Goose Strategy Group	2002
CD11/3	Hampshire Biodiversity Action Plan- Volumes 1 & 2	Produced by the Hampshire Biodiversity Partnership	2000-2004
CD11/4	A Biodiversity Strategy for England: Working with the Grain of Nature	DEFRA	2003
CD11/6	Strategic Guidance for the Solent	Produced by the Solent Forum	1997
CD11/7	Solent European Maritime Site: English Nature's advice given under Regulation 33(2) of the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994'	English Nature	October 2001

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD11/8	A Habitat Survey of RNAD Gosport	GBC	March 2000
<b>CD 12 COAST AND HARBOUR</b>			
CD12/1	Portsmouth Harbour Plan Review 2000	Produced in partnership by Gosport Borough Council, Fareham Borough Council, Portsmouth City Council, Queens Harbour Master, The Crown Estate and English Nature.	2000
CD12/2 CD 12/5	East Solent Shoreline Management Plan (Volumes I to IV)	Produced by HR Wallingford on behalf of the East Solent Coastal Group which includes Gosport Borough Council)	1997
CD12/6	Solent Coastal Habitat Management Plan (CHaMPs)	Produced by a number of organisations including DEFRA, the Environment Agency and English Nature	January 2003
<b>CD 13 ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROLS</b>			
CD13/1	Gosport Borough Contaminated Land Strategy		June 2002
CD13/2	Hampshire Water Strategy	Hampshire County Council et al.	March 2003
CD13/3	Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems	National SUDS Working Group	July 2004
CD13/4	Making Space for Water – Developing a new Government strategy for flood and coastal erosion risk management in England – A consultation exercise	DEFRA	July 2004
CD13/6	Mobile phone network and development: code of best practice	ODPM	-
CD13/7	AP Mobile: mobile phone masts: Report of an Inquiry by the All Party Mobile Group	All Party Parliamentary Mobile Group	July 2004
CD13/8	Mobile Phones and Health 2004	NRPB	2004
CD13/9	Foresight Future Flooding: Executive Summary	Office of Science and Technology 2003	2003

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD13/10	Extracts from Local Plans on Telecommunications Criteria	Various	-
CD13/11	Extract from the Inspector's Report into the Guildford Borough Local Plan Inquiry and the adopted Guildford Borough Local Plan (adopted January 2003)	The Planning Inspectorate and Guildford Borough Council	-
CD13/12	Planning for Telecommunication Developments: Statement by The Minister for Housing and Planning Keith Hill	December 2004	December 2004
CD13/13	Appeal Decision Letter on Byron Avenue, Winchester	August 2003	August 2003
CD13/14	Court of Appeal decision in the case of T-Mobile UK Ltd, Hutchinson 3G UK Ltd and Orange Personal Communications Services Ltd V The First Secretary of State and Harrogate Borough Council	November 2004	November 2004
CD13/15	Coastal Defence Strategy: Reports to the Gosport Borough Council Community and Environment Board by the Leisure Services Manager	Gosport Borough Council	1 November 2004 and 10 January 2005
CD13/16	National Standing Advice to Local Planning Authorities for Planning Applications Development and Flood Risk, England User Guidance Note and supporting documentation.	Environment Agency	2004
<b>CD 14 DEVELOPMENT BRIEFS</b>			
CD14/1	Coldharbour Development Framework	Gosport Borough Council	June 1998
CD14/2	Daedalus Development Strategy	Gosport Borough Council, Fareham Borough Council, Hampshire County Council and Defence Estates	Autumn 1997
CD14/2 A	Notes of the Defence Estate and Local Authorities Liaison Meeting	Chaired by Defence Estate	September 2001

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD14/2 B	Deadalus Development Strategy: Proposed Residential Development (K.15857)	Turley Associates Planning, Environment and Design	July 2002
CD14/3	Land to the East of Cherque Farm	Gosport Borough Council	August 1999
CD14/4	Frater Gate	Gosport Borough Council	November 1999
CD14/5	Priddy's Hard Heritage Area	Gosport Borough Council	August 1999
CD14/6	Royal Clarence Yard/ St George Barracks North	Gosport Borough Council	March 1998
CD14/7	St George Barracks South	Gosport Borough Council	-
CD14/8	Gosport Bus Station	Gosport Borough Council	-
CD14/9	National Children's Home Stokesmead	Gosport Borough Council	1984
<b>CD 15 OTHER BOROUGH COUNCIL DOCUMENTS</b>			
CD15/1	The Community Strategy for Gosport: Partnership Document 2003-2006	Produced by GBC on behalf of the Gosport Partnership	2003
CD15/2	The Community Strategy for Gosport: Delivering Community Priorities – Community Strategy Action Plan 2003-2004	Gosport Borough Council	2003
CD15/3	Listening to your views: General Best Value Summary of the Community	Gosport Borough Council	November 2003
CD15/4	A Sustainable Urban Regeneration Strategy for Gosport	Gosport Borough Council	June 1997
CD15/5	Corporate Plan	Gosport Borough Council	2003
CD15/7	Gosport Crime and Disorder Audit 2002: Summary	Gosport Borough Council, Hampshire County Council and Hampshire Constabulary	2002
CD15/8	Gosport Crime and Disorder Strategy 2002-2005	Gosport Borough Council, Hampshire County Council and Hampshire Constabulary	2002
CD15/9	Gosport Youth Strategy	Gosport Youth Concern, Gosport Borough Council, Hampshire County Youth Service, Portsmouth Housing Association & Connexions	2002
CD15/10	Gosport Community Vision	Gosport Borough Council	June 1999



## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

<b>CD 16 STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK</b>			
CD16/1	Revised Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG9)	Government Office for the South East	March 2001
CD16/4	Sustainable Communities: Building for the Future	ODPM	2003
CD16/5	Sustainable Communities in the South East – Building for the Future	ODPM	2003
CD16/6	Planning for the communities of the future	ODPM	
CD16/7	Regional Transport Strategy (Chapter 9 of RPG for the South East RPG9)	GOSE	July 2004
CD16/8	Executive Summary – Part of the integrated regional framework 2004: A better quality of life in the South East	SEERA	June 2004
CD16/9	Core Report – Part of the integrated regional framework 2004: A better quality of life in the South East (in filing system)	SEERA	June 2004
CD16/10	Compendium of regional strategies – Part of an integrated regional framework 2004 – A better quality of life in the South East	SEERA	June 2004
CD16/11	Data and trends – Part of the integrated regional framework 2004 – A Better quality of life in the South East	SEERA	June 2004
CD16/12	Planning Hampshire's Future – South Hampshire Study	Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council and Southampton City Council	December 2003
CD16/13	Eastern Dorset, South Hampshire and Isle of Wight Sub-Regional Study	Local Authorities of eastern Dorset, southern Hampshire and the Isle of Wight	May 2004
CD16/14	The South East Plan: South Hampshire Sub-Regional Strategy Final Report	Partnership for Urban South Hampshire	November 2004

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD16/14 A	Economic Drivers and Growth Draft Report	Partnership for Urban South Hampshire	February 2005
CD16/15	The South East Plan: Consultation Draft	SEERA	January 2005
CD16/16	South Hampshire Structure Plan First Alteration 1981-1996	Hampshire County Council	March 1988
CD16/17	Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996-2011 (Review)	Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council & Southampton City Council.	March 2000
CD16/18	Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996-2011 (Review) Examination in Public Report of the Panel	Report of the EIP Panel	March 1997
CD16/19	Hampshire County Structure Plan First Review: Statements in support of representations submitted on behalf of Gosport Borough Council	Gosport Borough Council	September 1996
CD16/20	Hampshire County Structure Plan	Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council & Southampton City Council.	March 1994
CD16/21	Hampshire, Portsmouth & Southampton Minerals and Waste Local Plan	Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council & Southampton City Council	1998
CD16/22	Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton Minerals and Waste Review: Minerals Issues for Public Consultation	Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council & Southampton City Council	May 2002
CD16/23	Strategic Planning and Joint Advisory Panel Briefing Notes 1: House building and Note 2: Housing Affordability	The Strategic Planning Joint Advisory Panel	November 2004
CD16/24	South East Regional Housing Statement 2002-2005 – A Framework for Action	Government Office for the South East and Housing Corporation South East	February 2002

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD16/25	Towards the South East – Regional Housing Strategy 2006-2009 Consultation Paper	South East Regional Housing Board	2005
<b>CD 17 ACTS OF PARLIAMENT, REGULATIONS AND ORDERS</b>			
CD17/1	Town and Country Planning Act 1990		1990
CD17/2	Planning and Compensation Act 1991		1991
CD17/3	Planning: Delivering a Fundamental Change		2002
CD17/4	The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (Commencement No1) Order 2004 – Statutory Instrument 2004 No. 2097 (C.89). This Order brings into force certain provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.		September 2004
CD17/5	The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (Commencement No.2) Order 2004 – Transitional Provisions and Savings		2004
CD17/6	Wildlife and Countryside Act		1981
CD17/7	Environment Protection Act 1990 (as amended)		1990
CD17/8	Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act		1990
CD17/9	Protection of Badgers Act		1992
CD17/10	Wildlife and Countryside Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994- commonly referred to as the 'Habitats Regulations'		1994
CD17/11	Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995		1995
CD17/12	Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999		1999
CD17/13	The Building Regulations 2000, Approved Document M: Access Facilities for Disabled People	ODPM	2000

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD17/14	Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council	ODPM	2001
CD17/16	Summary of Requirements for the SEA Directive	ODPM	-
CD17/17	Criteria for Application to Plans and Programs	ODPM	October 2003
CD17/18	Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programs Regulations 2004	ODPM	20 <sup>th</sup> July 2004
CD17/19	Full Regulatory Impact Assessment on Regulations	ODPM	2004
CD17/20	A Draft Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive	ODPM	July 2003
CD17/21	The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development (Amendment) (England) Order 2001	ODPM	2001
CD17/22	Statutory Instrument 2001 NO. 2718	ODPM	2001
CD17/23	Statutory Instrument 1995 No. 418 Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995	DETR	1995
CD17/24	European Marine Sites in England and Wales: A guide to the Conservation (Natural Habitats & C.) Regulations 1994 and to the preparation and application of Management Schemes	DETR	June 1998
CD17/25	Extracts from the Telecommunications Act 1984 and the Communications Act 2003	HMSO	1984 and 2003
CD17/26	National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949- Extract of Sections 21 and 22	HMSO	1949
CD17/27	The Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive: Guidance for Planning Authorities	ODPM	Oct 2003
CD17/28	The Homelessness Act 2002	HMSO	2002
<b>CD 18 PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE (PPGS)</b>			

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD18/1	PPG1: General Policy and Principles		February 1997
CD18/2	PPG3: Housing		March 2000
CD18/3	Better places to live by design: a companion guide to PPG3	ODPM	
CD18/4	Planning Statement by Keith Hill	Ministerial Statement	July 2003
CD18/5	Supporting the delivery of new housing – consultation draft amendment to PPG3	ODPM	-
CD18/5a	Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing Update: Supporting the delivery of New Housing	ODPM	January 2005
CD18/6	Influencing the size, type and affordability of new housing – consultation draft amendment to PPG3	ODPM	July 2003
CD18/6a	A consultation paper on a Proposed Change to PPG3: Planning for Mixed Communities	ODPM	January 2005
CD18/7	Planning Policy Guidance 3: Statement by the Deputy Prime Minister	ODPM	March 2000
CD18/8	PPG4: Industrial, Commercial Development and Small Firms		November 1992
CD18/9	PPG6: Town Centres and Retail Development		June 1996
CD18/9a	The Caborn Statement	Ministerial Statement by Mr Caborn	11 February 1999
CD18/9b	Mr Caborn's Contribution to a Debate in the House of Commons on 11 <sup>th</sup> March 1999		11 March 1999
CD18/9c	Parliamentary Statement on Town Centre Planning Policies	ODPM	11 April 2003
CD18/9d	Environmental Impact of Supermarket Condition		May 2000
CD18/9e	Shopping Centres		July 1997

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD18/10	PPG7 (Revised): The Countryside Environmental Quality and Economic and Social Development* <i>* PPG7 was replaced in 2004 by PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas. Reference to PPG7 is used in response to Objection No. 1/48 only.</i>	DoE	February 1997
CD18/11	PPG8: Telecommunications	ODPM	August 2001
CD18/12	PPG9: Nature Conservation		October 1994
CD18/13	PPG10: Planning and Waste Management		September 1999
CD18/14	PPG12: Development Plans		December 1999
CD18/15	PPG13: Transport	ODPM	March 2001
CD18/16	PPG14: Development on Unstable Land		1990
CD18/17	PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment		September 1994
CD18/18	PPG16: Archaeology and Planning		November 1990
CD18/19	PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport & Recreation	ODPM	July 2002
CD18/19a	Assessing Needs and Opportunities: Planning Policy Guidance 17 Companion Guide	ODPM	September 2002
CD18/20	PPG18: Enforcing Planning Control		December 1991
CD18/21	PPG19: Outdoor Advertisement Control		March 1992
CD18/22	PPG20: Coastal Planning		September 1992
CD18/23	PPG21: Tourism		November 1992
CD18/23a	Consultation Paper on Review of Planning Policy Guidance Note 21 (PPG21) on Tourism		February 2003
CD18/24	PPG23: Planning and Pollution Control		July 1994
CD18/25	PPG24: Planning and Noise		September 1994
CD18/26	PPG25: Development and Flood Risk		July 2001
<b>CD 19 PLANNING POLICY STATEMENTS (PPSS)</b>			
CD19/1	PPS1: Creating Sustainable Communities: Consultation Paper	ODPM	2004

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD19/1a	Delivering Sustainable Development	ODPM	January 2005
CD19/1B	Creating better places to live: A guide to the planning system in England	ODPM	2004
CD19/2	PPS6: Planning for Town Centres: Consultation Draft	ODPM	2004
CD19/3	PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas	ODPM	2004
CD19/3a	Annex E: Permitted Development Rights for Agriculture and Forestry	ODPM	August 2004
CD19/4	PPS11: Regional Spatial Strategies	ODPM	2004
CD19/5	PPS12: Local Development Frameworks	ODPM	October 2003
CD19/5a	Local Planning Guidance Consultation – Summary Report		June 2004
CD19/6	PPS22: Renewable Energy	ODPM	August 2004
CD19/7	Planning for Renewable Energy: A Companion Guide to PPS22	ODPM	December 2004
CD19/8	PPS23: Planning and Pollution Control	ODPM	November 2004
CD19/9	PPS23: Annex 1 – Pollution Control, Air and Water Quality	ODPM	November 2004
CD19/10	PPS23: Annex 2 – Development on Land Affected by Contamination	ODPM	November 2004
CD19/11	Consultation on PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management	ODPM	December 2004
CD19/12	Consultation on PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation	ODPM	September 2004
<b>CD20 GOVERNMENT CIRCULARS</b>			
CD20/1	Circular 18/84: Crown Land and Crown Development		1984
CD20/2	Circular 1/94: Gypsy Sites & Planning		1994
CD20/3	Circular 5/94: Planning Out Crime		1994

## Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

CD20/4	Circular 1/97: Planning Obligations		1997
CD20/5	Draft Revised Circular on Planning Obligations – Consultation Document	ODPM	November 2004
CD20/6	Circular 6/98: Affordable Housing		1998
CD20/7	Circular 9/98 – Town and country planning (playing fields) (England) direction 1998		1998
CD20/8	Circular 2/99: Environmental Impact Assessments		1999
CD20/9	Circular 7/99 – The Town and Country Planning Directions		1999
CD20/10	Circular 04/00 – Planning controls for hazardous substances		2000
CD20/11	Circular 08/00 – The Town and Country Planning (Residential Development on Greenfield Land) (England) Direction		2000
CD20/12	Circular 01/02 – Town and country planning (residential density) (London and South East England)		2002
CD20/13	Circular 1/03: Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas		2003
CD20/14	Circular 06/03 – Disposal of Land for Less than Best Consideration		2003
CD20/15	Circular 08/03 – Amendments to the GDPO and Listed Buildings Regulations		2003
<b>CD 21 STATISTICAL DATA</b>			
CD21/1	A Profile of Hampshire 2004	Hampshire County Council	May 2004
CD21/2	Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review) 1996-2011	Hampshire County Council	November 2002
<b>CD 22 OBJECTORS DOCUMENTS</b>			
	None Received		



Gosport Borough Local Plan Review: Public Local Inquiry Core Documents List

--	--	--	--