



11th Sept., 2014

Ms. K. Catt,
Senior Planning Officer,
Gosport Borough Council,
Town Hall,
High Street,
Gosport PO12 1EB

Dear Madam,
Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029:
Publication Version July 2014 - Consultation
(Regulation 1960)

I refer to your letter of 31st July 2014.
I have looked at the Publication Version.
From your reply of 14th February 2013,
points 1) & 2) of my letter of 30th January
2013 have been answered. Your response
to my Question 3 is noted, but the nine
tests of soundness greatly limit the range
of objections which objectors may raise
compared to objections under the old system.
The new system increasingly restricts the
ability of the public to object.

My objections 4), 5) & 6) in my letter of
30th January 2013 remain unaltered, as the
relevant sections in the Consultation Draft
have not been changed in the Publication

Version, except that my objections 4), 5) & 6) now relate to 'Creating Quality Neighbourhoods Plan 13 pages 140/149, & Box 11.1 & Policy LP24 Housing.' Given recent immigration levels, my comments are all the more pertinent 18 months after my previous letter. The above average reliance of Dorsetians on Council housing as evidenced in Council documents published in the last 2 years directly contradicts the unacknowledged aim of the new planning system to provide immigrant housing.

I wish to speak to the Inspector at the examination. However, I note from The Planning Inspectorate notes that written representations are treated with equal importance to examination appearances. So, if you consider my letters of comment read as a collective whole are adequate as written representations, I am happy to proceed by that method.

Yours sincerely,



Appendix

Letter of Representation from
Mr Perry on the Consultation
Draft Local Plan 2011-29

Dated 30th January 2013

PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT RECEIVED	
- 1 FEB 2013	
OFFICER	FILE

30th January 2013

Planning Policy,
Gosport Borough Council,
Town Hall,
Gosport,
PO12 1EB

Dear Sir/Madam,
Gosport Local Plan 2011-2029
Consultation Draft

I would like to make the following observations on this draft document :-

1) You should ensure that the document complies with the guidance contained in the amended National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as reviewed following complaints from the National Trust, CPRE etc., and as recently referred to in an Evening News article.

2) Following on from 1), the Borough Council is commended for the following course of action set out on the preamble page of the draft document :-

'The Borough Council has decided as a result of the latest Government guidance set out in the NPPF that it would prefer to produce one overarching local plan rather than a number of documents proposed under the previous system which included a Core Strategy and a Site/Allocations

and Delivery Plan.'

3) Final Examination in Public (Eip)

10/4 The preamble page indicates that this will be undertaken by an independent Planning Inspector who will invite appropriate stakeholders to take part in proceedings. As I understand it, this is a change from normal inquiries withents held, where anyone who wishes to make representations can do so, including those who submitted original objections to the application. The ability of the Inspector to choose who appears and who does not is anti-democratic, and conveys the unfortunate impression that although he/she is independent, he/she is really expected not to be independent but to prefer Government policy.

4) Creating Quality Neighbourhoods Plan 14 pages 133-140 & Box 11.1 page 134

10/3 Para 11.6 reads: 'It is necessary to ensure that provision is made for an appropriate number of dwellings to provide a range of homes to meet the needs of current and future residents both in terms of market housing and affordable housing.' Box 11.1 contains no reference to immigration, and this raises the questions of who all this new housing is for and what facilities will be provided.

5) Non-provision of public facilities

From the large local Council housing developments of the 1930's/1950's, to more recent Whiteley & Saneham, a shortage

10/2 of facilities has remained endemic, leading to endless social problems. The miserable state of public finances until c 2035 will ensure that few facilities will be provided.

10/3 a) Immigration - Use of the expression 'current & future residents' in Para 11.6 conceals the issue of who all this new housing is for. The same thing was concealed in July's New Community North of Taneham Options Consultation. Accordingly, I have to ask :- Within the Gopont Local Plan 2011-2029 Consultation Draft, is all development proposed solely for growth of the indigenous local population? If not, what % of new developments proposed up to 2029 within a) private housing & b) affordable housing, will be occupied by :-
1) indigenous locals;
2) immigrant locals;
3) asylum seekers;
4) illegal immigrants,
5) immigrants who have been granted British citizenships.

As you know, 72% of all live births in the last 2 years at the London Borough of Tower Hamlets have been to Moslem Bengladeshi women, ignoring other immigrant groups altogether. In Gopont, Council documents have admitted that eight times the national average of initial housing requests are made to the Council, which is surely incompatible with additional housing demands from immigrants. Indeed, the incompatibility is politically explosive, especially at Gopont.

Ginstly, I do not want Gopont to

A/1013
become like Bradford, Southall or Tower Hamlets, with an out of control immigrant problem. Now do I want the local Plan consultation or process to become a vehicle for firstly concealing immigration, then promoting it. The Plan must address these concerns directly, which will compel any Supervisor to face the issue, even if he/she is under Government pressure not to.

I would appreciate your response to the questions I have raised. Please confirm also that you will take all my observations into consideration during the Plan process.

Yours sincerely,

