

**Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029:
Publication Version (July 2014)**

**SUMMARY OF
CONSULTATION RESPONSES**



GOSPORT
Borough Council

Introduction

Gosport Borough Council conducted consultation on the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 (Publication Version) between 12th August 2014 and 22nd September 2014. The Council received 32 representations including one late comment. This document sets out a summary of comments received.

The full comments are available to view at Gosport Town Hall and on the Council's website www.gosport.gov.uk/localplan2029

List of organisations/individuals making representations

Rep No	Name of organisation/individual	Agent/Consultant (where applicable)
Rep1	Mr Paul Richardson	
Rep2	Ewer Common Conservation Group	
Rep3	Isle of Wight Council	
Rep4	The Theatres Trust	
Rep5	Mobile Operators Association	Mono Consultants Limited
Rep6	Marine Management Organisation	
Rep7	Mr RV Perry	
Rep8	Home Builders Federation	
Rep9	Southern Water	
Rep10	English Heritage	
Rep11	Berkeley Homes (Southern Ltd)	
Rep12	Natural England	
Rep13	Mr Simon Anderton	
Rep14	Mr Danny Daniels	
Rep15	Mrs D Daniels	
Rep16	Mr David Brace	Knight Architectural Design
Rep17	The Gosport Project	
Rep18	Environment Agency	
Rep19	Hampshire County Council (HCC)	
Rep20	Ms Ruth Benn	
Rep21	Kenzington Ltd	
Rep22	Mr C Narrainen	
Rep23	Waitrose	Firstplan
Rep24	Driftstone	Mr Robert Tutton
Rep25	Lee-on-the-Solent Residents'	

	Association	
Rep26	McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	The Planning Bureau Ltd
Rep27	Abbey Developments Ltd	Barton Wilmore LPP
Rep28	Hallam Land Management	Barton Wilmore LLP
Rep29	Milln Gate Gosport LLP	Barton Wilmore LLP
Rep30	Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH)	
Rep31	Highways Agency	
Rep 32 (late)	Portsmouth Water	

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Summary of Key Points	Representation number
Overall Comment	
Support apart from LP10.	REP25/2
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
No comments received.	
CHAPTER 2: NATIONAL AND SUB-REGIONAL CONTEXT	
No comments received.	
CHAPTER 3: GOSPORT PROFILE AND KEY ISSUES	
Paragraph 3.45	
Support.	REP10/1
Summary of Issues	
Support.	REP10/2
CHAPTER 4: VISION FOR GOSPORT BOROUGH AND LOCAL PLAN OBJECTIVES	
Vision: Gosport to 2029	
No comments received.	
Paragraph 4.2.	
Support.	REP10/3
Objectives	
No comments received.	
CHAPTER 5: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	
Policy LP1: Sustainable Development	
No comments received.	
Policy LP2: Infrastructure	
The following statement should be added 'Until CIL is adopted transport infrastructure will continue to be funded by developers in accordance with the Highway Authority's Transport Contribution Policy.'	REP19/1
Support	REP18/1
CHAPTER 6: SPATIAL STRATEGY	
Policy LP3: Spatial Strategy	
The Local Plan has not met its objectively assessed housing needs.	REP8
Support for housing allocation as in line with South Hampshire Strategy 2012.	REP30

Summary of Key Points	Representation number
Delete notation of existing community and built leisure facilities for the Royal Sailors Rest site on policies map.	REP24
Policy LP3 should either adopt the figures for additional retail floorspace requirements identified in the Gosport Retail Capacity Study (i.e. 0sqm for convenience floorspace and 5,365sqm for comparison floorspace over the plan period) or, make explicit reference to the fact that the 10,500sqm figure solely relates to a requirement for additional comparison floorspace and that there is no requirement for additional convenience floorspace.	REP23/1
Support need to conserve heritage assets.	REP10/4
Support alignment of the urban area boundary in relation the former QinetiQ on Fort Road.	REP13, REP14, REP15
Support amendment to the urban area boundary in the vicinity of Heritage Way and consequently this confirms the appropriateness of the whole Brockhurst Gate site to be developed.	REP29
Paragraph 6.17	
Welcomes the recognition that there will be a need to review the housing requirement for Gosport in the context of the SHMA in the short term, and the apparent commitment by the Council to undertake this work in 2016.	REP 28
Paragraph 6.19	
Support the principle of additional housing in the Borough; acknowledges the constraints on the availability of sites; and supports that the Borough Council will continue to contribute towards the overall requirements by taking a positive approach towards new residential development.	REP 28
Paragraph 6.25	
Support.	REP10/5
Paragraph 6.36	
Support.	REP10/6
Paragraph 6.37	
Support.	REP20
Paragraph 6.40	
The Gosport/Fareham and Lee-on-the Solent/Stubbington Gap requires a comprehensive assessment and its capacity to accommodate development in the Borough is required. The gap should only be of a scale that is necessary to fulfil its purposes and therefore kept to a	REP28

Summary of Key Points	Representation number
minimum in terms of overall area.	
CHAPTER 7: REGENERATING GOSPORT THROUGH THE DELIVERY OF HIGH QUALITY SITES	
Policy LP4: The Gosport Waterfront and Town Centre	
The scale of the proposal does not take into account the impact of new housing/business development on existing infrastructure and residents.	REP1
<p>Policy does not specifically address the following areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Gas Depot to west of St George Barracks North b) Parade of shops opposite Waterfront c) Buildings either side of the entrance to the High St. <p>The Local Plan needs to address specific areas within the Waterfront allocation which currently detract from the appearance of Gosport.</p>	REP17/1
The Strategy's assessment for the Trinity Green/Barclay House site is insufficient in clarity, and over optimistic in the number of properties it could support.	REP17/4
Support.	REP10/7, REP18/2, REP22, REP30
Paragraph 7.30	
Support.	REP10/8
Paragraph 7.34	
Support.	REP10/9
Paragraph 7.35	
Support.	REP10/10
Paragraph 7.41	
Seek clarification on role of HCC as Lead Local Flood Authority as the risk of flooding on this site is likely to be from coastal flooding.	REP19/2
Paragraph 7.49	
Support.	REP10/11
Paragraph 7.53	
Support.	REP10/12
Policy LP5: Daedalus	
Criteria 3e – reference to HGV s would exclude smaller goods vehicles. Suggest delete HGV and replace with Delivery.	REP19/3

Summary of Key Points	Representation number
Support.	REP10/14, REP18/3
Paragraphs 7.58-7.60	
Support.	REP10/13
Paragraphs 7.83-7.84	
Support.	REP10/15
Policy LP6: Haslar Peninsula	
The land and buildings known as 'The Gunboat Sheds' are currently designated for employment as part of the Haslar Marine Technology Park. As the Gunboat Sheds include buildings on English Heritage's at risk register the site should be accorded the same designation as the adjoining Blockhouse area which would allow employment, leisure and residential uses.	REP16
In order to prevent any retail development at the former Haslar Hospital site which could potentially harm existing defined centres, the Policy should specifically confirm that 'small scale' means a maximum of 300sqm gross.	REP23/2
Support.	REP10/16
Support. Recommend the inclusion of the requirement for a robust flood warning and evacuation plan to be submitted with any development.	REP18/4
Policy LP7: Rowner	
Support.	REP18/5
Policy LP8: Alver Valley	
Support.	REP10/17 REP18/6
Paragraph 7.183 (para 7.179 in draft local plan)	
The supporting text should include a reference recognising the biodiversity value of birds in the Wildgrounds SSSI and other sites in the Alver Valley.	REP12
Paragraph 7.185	
Support.	REP10/18
Paragraph 7.193	
Support.	REP10/19
Policy LP9a: Allocations Outside The Regeneration Areas: Mixed Use Site	
Policy should be changed to read ' <u>up to</u> approx. 1,400 sq. m of other uses' in order to make it deliverable.	REP12

Summary of Key Points	Representation number
Support.	REP10/20
Support-recommend use of term 'flood risk management measures' rather than 'flood defences'.	REP18/7
Policy LP9b: Allocations Outside The Regeneration Areas: Economic Development Sites	
Support.	REP10/21
The economic development allocation at the Brockhurst Gate (Former Frater House site) should be extended to incorporate the existing open space.	REP29
There is no requirement for any development to require the reprovision of the sport pavilion (criterion d) and introduce a car parking strategy for users of the sports pitches (criterion e). The site does not need to be retained for open space and therefore the criteria are unnecessary and unjustified.	REP29
Additional justification text should be included to reference the appropriateness of the Brockhurst Gate site for residential development in order that it can contribute towards the Borough's objectively assessed needs.	REP29
Policy LP9c: Allocations Outside The Regeneration Areas: Employment Sites	
No comments received.	
Policy LP9d: Allocations Outside The Regeneration Areas: Residential sites	
The Policies Map does not represent the extant planning permissions that remain un-built across the site.	REP11
Policy LP9e: Allocations Outside The Regeneration Areas: Leisure Community and Open Spaces	
The Stokesmead site should not be allocated as an open space.	REP27
Support.	REP10/22
Paragraph 7.224	
Support.	REP10/23
CHAPTER 8: ENHANCING A SENSE OF PLACE: DESIGN AND HERITAGE	
Support.	REP10/24
Box 1	
Support.	REP10/25
Box 2	
Support.	REP10/26

Summary of Key Points	Representation number
Policy LP10: Design Principles	
Residential development should not be permitted on rear accessways.	REP25
Support.	REP10/27
Box 3	
Support.	REP10/28
Policy LP11: Designated Assets: Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Registered Historic Parks & Gardens	
Support.	REP10/29
Policy LP12: Designated Assets: Conservation Areas	
Support.	REP10/30
Policy LP13: Locally Important Heritage Assets	
Ewer Common should be designated as a 'Park and Garden of Local Historic Interest'.	REP2
Support.	REP10/31
Policy LP14: Marine Parade Area of Special Character	
Support.	REP10/32
Policy LP15: Safeguarded Areas	
No comments received.	
CHAPTER 9: DELIVERING A PROSPEROUS ECONOMY	
Policy LP16: Employment Land	
Four Town Centre car parks should be redeveloped for employment purposes - Mumby Road Bus Station Car Park, South Street car parks, Haslar Marina car park, and the main South Street Car Park adjacent Walpole Park.	REP17/3
Policy LP17: Skills	
No comments received.	
Policy LP18: Tourism	
Paragraph 9.44	
Support.	REP10/33
Paragraph 9.46	
Support.	REP10/34
Policy LP19: Marinas and Moorings	
Support.	REP10/35

Summary of Key Points	Representation number
Policy LP20: Information and Communications Technology	
Welcome the inclusion of Policy LP20 to facilitate telecommunications development and support its provisions which is generally in accordance with the NPPF.	REP5
CHAPTER 10: IMPROVING TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY	
Policy LP21: Improving Transport Infrastructure	
Paragraph 10.15/Box 10.2	
Welcome the identification of the Stubbington Bypass and improvements to the western access to the Gosport Peninsula. Further details should be given regarding the delivery of the bypass and that consideration should be given to the role that private investment and housing development can play in ensuring the bypass comes to fruition.	REP28
Paragraph 10.25	
The following statement should be added 'Until CIL is adopted transport infrastructure will continue to be funded by developers in accordance with the Highway Authority's Transport Contribution Policy.'	REP19/4
Policy LP22: Accessibility To New Development	
No comments received.	
Policy LP23: Layout of Sites and Parking	
No comments received.	
CHAPTER 11: CREATING QUALITY NEIGHBOURHOODS	
Immigration has not been fully addressed and that any new immigrants will create additional pressure, additional housing and community facilities.	REP7
Policy LP24: Housing	
The Local Plan and its viability evidence does not justify the proposed rate of 40% affordable housing is viable.	REP8
Support.	REP26/1, REP19/5
Policy LP25: Park Homes and Residential Caravans	
No comments received.	
Policy LP26: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	
A single pitch is likely to be too small for three caravans. Change 1 pitch to 1 site.	REP19/6
Support.	REP10/37

Summary of Key Points	Representation number
PRINCIPAL, DISTRICT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES	
Policy LP27: Principal, District and Neighbourhood Centres	
No comments received.	
Policy LP28: Uses within Centres	
No comments received.	
Policy LP29: Proposals for Retail and Other Town Centre Uses Outside of Centres	
Paragraph 11.68	
The proposed threshold of 1,000sq.m is considered to be too high in respect of new retail development, in particular, in the case of convenience retail floorspace. A lower threshold of 300sqm would be more appropriate.	REP23/3
Policy LP30: Local Shops Outside of Defined Centres	
No comments received.	
Policy LP31: Commercial Frontages Outside of Defined Centres	
No comments received.	
COMMUNITY, CULTURAL AND BUILT LEISURE FACILITIES	
Policy LP32: Community, Cultural and Built Leisure Facilities	
Support Policy LP32 which protects existing cultural facilities and enables the provision of new facilities in accordance with the guidance in the NPPF.	REP4
Delete notation of existing community and built leisure facilities for the Royal Sailors Rest site on polices map.	REP24
Criteria 5c could be more flexible. Add, 'unless it is part of a service providers plans to provide improved local services in equally accessible locations'.	REP19/7
Policy LP33: Cemetery Provision	
Support.	REP18/8
Policy LP34: Provision of New Open Space and improvements to Existing Open Space	
Two areas of historical significance not addressed a) Bastion No 1–Trinity Green – potential to be used as open space b) St George Barracks North – site should be opened up for the public.	REP17/2
Policy LP 34 should be amended to reflect that different forms of residential development, and in particular housing aimed at the elderly, can generate a lesser impact on existing green infrastructure and that open space contributions will be sought at a scale that is related to the development.	REP26/2

Summary of Key Points	Representation number
Policy LP35: Protection of Existing Open Space	
Does not conform with section 77 of the School Standards and Framework Act1998.	REP19/8
The two large former munitions store within the northern site of the Priddy's Hard Nature Conservation Area should not be designated as an open space.	REP21/1
The open space at Brockhurst Gate should not be protected as an 'Existing Open Space' as it is no longer required for sports use.	REP29
Policy LP36: Allotments	
No comments received.	
Policy LP37: Access to the Coast and Countryside	
No comments received.	
CHAPTER 12: CREATING A SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT	
Policy LP38: Energy Resources	
Local Plan should not require developers to incorporate on site renewable energy measures.	REP8
Support.	REP10/37
Policy LP39: Water Resources	
Support- although need to amend text in relation to the SuDs Approval Bodies (SABs) to provide more flexibility to allow the Plan to be consistent with the outcome of the implementation of Schedule 3 of the relevant Act.	REP18/9
Support changes made to the policy in relation to water efficiency standards in new homes.	REP 32
Paragraph 12.31	
The SuDs approval body does not exist yet so text should be amended particularly in light of Government consultation document on future of SuDs.	REP19/9
Policy LP40: Waste and Material Resources	
Support.	REP10/38
Green Infrastructure	
Paragraph 12.46	
Support.	REP10/39
Policy LP41: Green Infrastructure	
Support.	REP 3, REP18/10
Policy LP42: Internationally and Nationally Important Habitats	
Support. The Council could better explain the interim measures proposed by the Solent Recreational Mitigation Partnership.	REP 3

Summary of Key Points	Representation number
Support. Mitigation contributions are already being collected, and this section may benefit from being updated to reflect the current position.	REP12
The Local Plan should provide further details on the arrangements regarding the developer contributions being collected for recreation disturbance.	REP8
Local Plan has not demonstrated that these measures are financially viable.	REP8
Policy LP43: Locally Designated Nature Conservation Sites	
Ewer Common should be designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation	REP 2
The proposed "SINC" status should be removed from the Northern Site of Priddy's Hard nature conservation area.	REP21/2
Policy LP44: Protecting Species and Other Features of Nature Conservation Importance	
No comments received.	
Policy LP45: Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	
Support. In addition would recommend the inclusion of the requirement for a robust flood warning and evacuation plan to be submitted with any applicable development.	REP18/11
Paragraph 12.100	
HCC is not producing Surface Water Management Plans across Hampshire and text needs to clarify situation.	REP19/10
Paragraph 12.102	
The SuDs approval body does not exist yet so text should be amended particularly in light of Government consultation document on future of SuDs.	REP19/11
Policy LP46: Pollution Control	
No comments received.	
Policy LP47: Contaminated Land and Unstable Land	
Support.	REP18/12
Paragraph 12.126	
Support.	REP18/12
Policy LP48: Hazardous Substances	
No comments received.	
CHAPTER 13: IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING	
No comments received.	
APPENDIX 2	
Support.	REP10/40

Summary of Key Points	Representation number
Policies Map	
Support amendment of 'urban area boundary' to exclude QinetiQ site from the urban area.	REP13, REP14, REP15
Delete notation of existing community and built leisure facilities for the Royal Sailors Rest site on policies map.	REP24
Whole Plan issues	
The plan is sound in relation to the Highway Agency's interests.	REP31
Duty to Co-operate	
There appears to be a good appreciation of the Council's obligation to fulfil the Duty to Co-operate.	REP 3
Consultation	
The local community was not consulted in the planning process.	REP 2
No comment	REP6, REP9
Habitat Regulation Assessment	
Concur with the conclusion of the Habitats Regulation Assessment, subject to the change outlined above in relation to LP9a: Priddy's Hard.	REP12