

Gosport Borough Council

# **GOSPORT BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN 2011-2029**

## **ISSUES AND QUESTIONS**

Including timetable

Version 2, 23 February 2015

## INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE GOSPORT BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN 2011-2029

**Venue:** Council Chamber, Gosport Town Hall, High Street, Gosport, Hampshire, PO12 1EB

**Council:** Gosport Borough Council will be participating in all hearing sessions.

### Statement deadlines:

All Statements for the Hearing Sessions must be sent to the Programme Officer by **midday on Monday 9 February**. This deadline relates to the receipt of both the **paper and electronic copies**.

### Statements:

The Inspector requests written responses from the Council to all the matters raised.

Written Statements from Representors are not compulsory but if Representors feel a Statement is warranted they should seek only to answer the Inspector's Questions as far as they relate to their original representations.

**The examination starts from the assumption that the Council has submitted what it considers to be a sound Plan and that the Council has fulfilled its legal duty with regard to the Duty to Co-operate. The hearings will therefore be concerned only with considerations relating to the soundness of the document and the legality of the process followed, and all submissions should address those issues as appropriate.**

The Guidance Notes provided set out the requirements for the presentation of all Statements. Its provisions should be thoroughly read and implemented as otherwise Statements could be returned. Please note the 3,000 word limit.

In the Statements from respondents it would be very helpful for the Inspector to have a brief concluding section stating:

what part of the Plan is unsound;  
which soundness criterion it fails;  
why it fails (point to the key parts of your original representations);  
how the Plan can be made sound; and  
the precise change and/or wording that you are seeking.

The Inspector will give equal weight to views put orally or in writing.

**If you have any queries – please contact the Programme Officer  
Tel: 02392545754 or by e-mail at [programmeofficer@gosport.gov.uk](mailto:programmeofficer@gosport.gov.uk)**

## **ISSUES AND QUESTIONS**

### Preamble

If the Inspector is satisfied that an Issue or question has been satisfactorily addressed in the submitted Statements it is possible that it may not be included in the final Agenda. Consequently the timetable and lists of participants may be subject to change, so please contact the Programme Officer or view the programme on the Examination page of the Council's web-site.

### **Tuesday 3 March - 10.00**

#### **Introduction by the Inspector**

#### **Opening Statement by the Council**

#### **Issues: – Spatial Strategy-housing numbers, open space strategy, strategic gaps, Haslar Peninsula and the Duty to Co-operate**

#### ***Participants***

##### ***Gosport Borough Council***

***Mr James Stevens, The Home Builders Federation***

***Mr Alan Dawes, Kenzington Ltd***

***Mr Michael Knott, Barton Willmore (for Abbey Developments Ltd)***

***Mr Mark Harris, Barton Willmore (for Milln Gate Gosport LLP)***

***Mr Ian Knight (for Mr David Brace)***

#### **Questions**

- 1.1 The Council have accepted that the quantum of housing given in policy LP3 is less than that derived from the South Hampshire SHMA. Does the evidence demonstrate that the Council's approach is justified?
- 1.2 Taking into account the previous question, have the Council complied with the Duty to Cooperate?
- 1.3 In light of the acknowledged constraint on housing sites, should the Council have carried out a Strategic Gap Review?
- 1.4 Why have the following sites been classified as open space?
  - (1) Brockhurst Gate.
  - (2) Stokesmead.

(3) Munitions stores.

- 1.5 Should the proposed 'SINC' status be removed from the northwestern site of Priddy's Hard nature conservation area?
- 1.6 Should policy LP35 be subject to an additional sentence to reflect the provisions of the School Standards and Framework Act 1988?
- 1.7 Is the Open Space Monitoring Report based on sound evidence?
- 1.8 Should the Gunboat Sheds be designated separately from the rest of the Haslar Marine Technology Park, as a mixed use area in line with the designation of the Blockhouse?
- 1.9 In light of the above matters and taking into consideration that the last call for housing sites was in 2012, can the SHLAA be considered to be formulated on a sound evidential basis?

## **Tuesday 3 March - 14.00**

### **Issues: CIL, Energy Resources, Gosport Waterfront and Town Centre**

#### ***Participants***

***Gosport Borough Council  
Mr James Stevens, The Home Builders Federation***

#### **Questions**

- 2.1 Is the proposal to seek 40% of affordable housing on housing sites of 10 or more dwellings consistent with the findings of the CIL viability assessment?
- 2.2 Should policy LP38 require developers to incorporate on-site renewable energy measures or connect to existing combined heat and power systems?
- 2.3 Does the proposed Local Plan correlate adequately with the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project in terms of the contributions to be charged to developers and the size of schemes that will be affected?
- 2.4 Is there evidence to demonstrate that the existing infrastructure can accommodate the proposed level of housing and business development?
- 2.5 Should the future of the following areas have been specifically addressed?

- (1) Gas Depot to the west of St George Barracks North
  - (2) The parade of shops opposite the waterfront.
  - (3) The buildings either side of the entrance to the High Street.
- 2.6 Is the assessment of the Trinity Green/Barclay House site sufficient in clarity and have the Council been over optimistic in the number of properties that it could support?
- 2.7 Should the following car parks be subject to redevelopment for employment purposes?
- (1) Mumby Road bus station car park.
  - (2) South Street car parks.
  - (3) Haslar Marina car park.
- 2.8 Should the future of Bastion No 1- Trinity Green and St George Barracks North be specifically assessed with policy LP34?

### Wednesday 4 March - 10.00

#### **Issues: Spatial Strategy-retail provision, transport, specific sites**

##### ***Participants***

##### ***Gosport Borough Council***

***Mr Robert Tutton (for Driftstone Developments Ltd)***

##### **Questions**

- 3.1 Is the figure of 10,500sqm of net retail floorspace given in policy LP3 in line with the findings of the Gosport Retail Capacity Study and is that study based on sound evidence?
- 3.2 Should there be more clarity within the policy of the type of retail space being referred to?
- 3.3 Should the term 'small scale' under section 2(c) of policy LP6 be defined in terms of an actual area?
- 3.4 Is the threshold of 1000sqm given in paragraph 11.68 in the explanation to policy LP29 too high?

- 3.5 Should the reference in policy LP9a to 'approx' 1400sqm be changed to read 'up to approx' 1400sqm?
- 3.6 Should the reference to 'HGV' in section 3e of policy LP5 be replaced with the term delivery?
- 3.7 Should there be an addition to policy LP2 to clarify how transport infrastructure will be funded until the adoption of CIL?
- 3.8 Should the mention of the proposed Stubbington Bypass be accompanied by further details relating to its delivery, with particular reference to the role of private investment and housing development in that delivery?
- 3.9 Does the number of dwellings identified for the Royal Clarence Marina correspond to the areas identified on the proposals map taking into account the un-built extant planning permissions?
- 3.10 Should Ewer Common be shown on the proposals map as both a Park and Garden of Local Historic Interest and as a site of Importance for Nature Conservation?
- 3.11 Should the Sailors Rest site, shown on the proposals map as existing community and health facilities, be deleted?
- 3.12 Should there be specific mention of the biodiversity value of birds in the Wildgrounds SSSI and other sites in the Alver Valley?
- 3.13 Is it the Council's intention to prevent development on rear passageways and if so do relevant policies make this abundantly clear?