
From: Brian Mansbridge [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 November 2021 14:25
To: Gore, Debbie [REDACTED]; Grygiel, Jayson [REDACTED]
Cc: Planning Gosport Society [REDACTED]; LRA Alison Roast
[REDACTED]; LRA Alison Collett [REDACTED] LRA Alex Scott
[REDACTED] John White - Chair LRA [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Draft response Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation Errors

Dear GBC Development Officers,

Please ignore an earlier message (Sent: 02 November 2021 12:32) that 'escaped' incomplete. The complete message is as follows:

The following minor errors have been noticed in the reading of the Draft 2038 Local Plan and are advised for your consideration.

1. Box 1, P16 Sustainable Economic Growth, 3rd Bullet point 'Form' > 'From'
2. Infrastructure and Facilities P22, Para 1.6.15, fails to mention the Diving Museum and the Hovercraft Museum
3. Explanation of Policy SS11. P205, Para 3.13.18. Norbury House was demolished in the first wave of demolitions for Daedalus Business Park
4. Local Environment, P315, Para 5.26.3 There are no signposted Cycling Routes in the Alver Valley, nor much to indicate walking routes.

Kind Regards, Brian Mansbridge
For LRA

Planning Policy
Planning and Regeneration Services
Gosport Borough Council
Town Hall
High Street
Gosport
Hampshire PO12 1EB

From:

Dated: 19 November 2021

Dear Jason

**Gosport Borough Local Plan 2038 (Regulation 18): Public Consultation draft –
Lee Residents Association’s comments and recommendations**

Overview and Comment

The LRA appreciates the opportunity to comment and recommend the changes detailed in paragraph 7 below.

1. The proposed 2038 Local Plan is a significant step forward from the 2029 Plan, particularly in the robustness of polices that aim to reduce climate change and support environmental protection. Not only in the Policies of Section 2 but embedded elsewhere in the subsequent sections.
2. One suggested forward provision that would be progressive within the Development Areas would be a provision to ‘future proof’ for the environmental benefit of communal heating networks. This could be by setting aside a ‘source site’ for later development and the requirement for area ducting to receive a communal a heating network. This measure is already adopted in other countries and some UK cities where it is recognised that it is far more efficient than each property or business installing its own heating source.
3. It is commendable that the plan is more suited to the “Planning for the Future” Government white paper, should the white paper proposals ever become planning law.
4. The LRA fully supports GBC’s development strategy over the housing requirement limiting the required increase to 3500 net additional dwellings. The unavoidable Gosport peninsula constraints of infamous road congestion, further expansion restrictions due to flood risk and already recognised Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) risks. These factors all add a powerful case in support of the proposed reduction.
5. The congestion and AQMA’s will only be exacerbated by any development, even the lesser target proposed. It is also documented that the recent and underway road improvements were only designed to relieve the current traffic congestion, not to support further development.
6. The LRA supports both the Supporting Evidence and Background Papers. The Sustainability Appraisal contained in the draft 2038 Plan identifies the unique challenges for the Borough that is already about 80% developed and cannot sustain increasing the housing targets beyond the identified proposal of 3,500 dwellings. Gosport contains very few “greenfield” sites and 14% of the land is within a Flood Zone. To add to these restrictions some of the development sites earmarked for disposal by the Defence Infrastructure Organisation do not yet have firm release dates. Policy D2 also gives insight into the competition arising between the creation of employment and training facilities within the peninsula, with the hope of decreasing out commuting, but that demand for development estate is might well be in direct conflict with the allocation the same land for addition housing.

7. Proposals for amendments:

a. Policy SS 11 – DAEDALUS: A commendable policy, paragraphs 2 and 3 should be robustly upheld. It is suggested that explanatory paragraph 3.13.20 may be overly restrictive. The listed buildings to the north and south should set the context for the area development between them. In contrast the east and west accommodation blocks are not unique and can be found on many airbases that expanded in the early years of the RAF. If they are not retained it would allow greater flexibility for a potential developer. Such a change might help in the reuse of the area and in turn encourage the retention and adaption of the more important listed buildings.

b. Policy DE 4 - AREAS OF SPECIAL CHARACTER. Add a new Policy Paragraph 4:

Lee Back Lanes/Service Ways are narrow passage ways that give rise to an uneasy mix between walkers and/or/cyclists since there is rarely room for either to pass a motor vehicle. Development proposals will not be permitted that have a frontage or sole access from these service roads.

Note: Planning Inspectorate Appeal Decision APP/J1725/W/17/3183776 refers.

c. Policy DE 4. AREAS OF SPECIAL CHARACTER - Explanatory Paragraph 5.18.3:

Following the mention of 4 and 5 storeys” insert ***“built prior to the adoption of the Marine Parade Area of Special Character Supplementary Planning Document.”*** These were set in regular plots...

d. Suggested New Expansion Paragraph 5.18.15:

Lee Back Lanes/Service roads were laid out for the tradesman and rubbish collection of the Victorian new town, just adequate for a horse and cart. Today these same back lanes are awkwardly narrow for modern bin collection vehicles, commercial deliveries or cars passing to and from parking garages. They have no pavements or pedestrian refuges. Yet are frequently used by pedestrian and cyclists as they are not subject to fast traffic, traffic fumes and offer a desirable degree of shelter on a windy day. Sight lines are extremely limited for emerging cars and walkers entering from gates or side paths. This creates a regular and potentially dangerous mix of users. Neither is it acceptable for vehicle to stop or wait on the lane, even for a property that has no other access. This causes an obstruction and in the case of wide vehicle a complete blockage, even to a pedestrian. These same lanes also afford a potential advantage in environmental terms providing access for specialist vehicles required to install the more efficient ground source heat pumps, benefits the Victorian New Town planner would not have envisaged.

Yours sincerely

LRA Planning Team