
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 December 2021 15:14
To: PlanningPolicyConsultation
Cc:
Subject: Local Plan 2038 Consultation Response Form

Form Submission

Gosport Borough Local Plan 2038 Consultation Response Form

Gosport Borough Local Plan 2038 Consultation Response Form

Please provide your details

Name Simon Pullin

Organisation (if any)

Address [REDACTED]

Postcode [REDACTED]

Telephone [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

Is an Agent/Consultant appointed? No

Please provide the Agent's/Consultant's details:

Name

Job title (where relevant):

Organisation (if any):

Address

Postcode

Telephone

Email

Your representation (1)

The draft Gosport Borough Local Plan 2038 contains a vision, objectives and policies with explanation text. Please use the boxes below to let us know what you are commenting on and whether you support or object along with your comments.

Paragraph/Policy Number: 4.2 / A1

Support or Object? Object

Please summarise why: Qinetiq Fort Road site – The plan has clearly been written to suit the existing planning application (Ref. No: 20/00284/FULL) that is outstanding, undecided, on the site which has many, many objections. I suspect very few of the objectors to the site plans are aware that the site is now being pushed through the back door by changing the goal posts by updating the policy to suit the developer, and as it would seem the council in some way. The site should remain as employment land in accordance with Gosport policies to reduce out commuting by supporting employment sites. Allowing housing under the auspices of enabling development is a absurd. The former and current land owners have purposely allowed the site to be left derelict and to deteriorate in order to help with their case to get housing on the site. This should in no way factor into the planning justification. If it was maintained as a quality industrial site, as it was not very long ago, there would be absolutely no need for enabling development as the site operated perfectly well whilst retaining the scheduled ancient monument. This is removing an employment site in favour of housing clearly to benefit the site owner / developer. There is a whiff of corruption going on here, as there

was with the original application which has significant shortfalls in the information provided and should never have been validated, but the council appear to have validated it to help the developer fulfill a commercial commitment. Ever since it was submitted the application has sat dormant with objections from many local residents and statutory bodies and yet the application hasn't been refused, the council has just sat on it and now intends to change the policy to suit. What is the justification for change of use of this land? The stubbington bypass can not be used as an excuse that traffic issues in and around Gosport will be improved. This bypass will worsen traffic and create a huge bottle neck at the Peel Common Roundabout as this will now see all traffic whether going east or west pass across it and getting tangled up with each other. Currently the majority of east bound traffic from Gosport will head out via lee and stubbington and hence avoiding tangling up with traffic using new gate lane. There is massive objection to the development of this site, as shown by the comments on the planning application, and when the public find out that the council has got this development through the back door via this policy there will be significant upset in the local community.

If you have no more representations to add, please select this box

Your representation (2)

The draft Gosport Borough Local Plan 2038 contains a vision, objectives and policies with explanation text. Please use the boxes below to let us know what you are commenting on and whether you support or object along with your comments.

Paragraph/Policy Number: SS7

Support or Object? Object

Please summarise why: The old prison on Fort Road should not be converted to housing and should be used for employment land. Furthermore, the existing undeveloped open field part of the site should not be developed but should be left as an open field. The proposed policy says it can be developed if a contribution is made to the adjoining council owned park. Where is this park? If you are classing the golf club as a park then this isn't a park open to all to enjoy, as you're likely to be hit by a golf ball, and how will a developer contribution be used to improve this? The existing field should be opened up to the public as part of the planning requirements for this site. The Haslar peninsular is not suitable for yet more intensive development, the road network is not fit for purpose, fort road will be the main route used and this is narrow with no footpaths and traffic travels along it very quickly. They will not use clayhall road from this site as it is a single track road in many places due to being heavily used by existing residents for parking, making it a very unattractive through route. And no-body will access the site from further afield via the haslar marina bridge direction. The policy map even shows this field as important to the migration of brent geese, how does a packet of money to the council remove this importance to a protected species?

If you have no more representations to add, please select this box

Your representation (3)

The draft Gosport Borough Local Plan 2038 contains a vision, objectives and policies with explanation text. Please use the boxes below to let us know what you are commenting on and whether you support or object along with your comments.

Paragraph/Policy Number: SS8

Support or Object? Object

Please summarise why: What adds to the sense of corruption by the council helping the developer of the fort road site, is that it is the same developer promoting the lad to the south west of the Haslar Technology Park, and the council is proposing to allow housing development on yet more green open space there. This site is inappropriate for housing, right on the very boundary of a flood zone, which is not to be protected by the upcoming flood defenses. The site is immediately adjacent to the technology park, and so having more residents very close to this is likely to lead to friction between the occupiers of the two types of land use. Furthermore, there is no means to connect the site to the road

network. The Haslar Technology Park is a MOD approved Security Site so an access road via its entrance road is highly unlikely to be approved as it will breach the existing line of security fencing. And the land doesn't have sufficient frontage to have a direct connection to Haslar Road whilst being a suitable distance away from the junction with Clayhall Road. This land is highly unsuitable for housing development. Yet again the council seems to be supporting this particular developer very favorably.

If you have no more representations to add, please select this box

Your representation (4)

The draft Gosport Borough Local Plan 2038 contains a vision, objectives and policies with explanation text. Please use the boxes below to let us know what you are commenting on and whether you support or object along with your comments.

Paragraph/Policy Number: A4

Support or Object? Object

Please summarise why: The Stokesmead site earmarked for public open space which is surrounded by Clayhall Road, Anglesey Road and Little Anglesey Road, is not a space open to the public and the information online shows communication from the owner to the council stating that they will not sell it for such use. This site is far more sustainable for housing than either the Qinetiq Fort Road SS8 site or the old prison on Fort Road SS7 as it is close to the Alverstoke village centre and has far better road connections. But clearly the land is owned by the wrong person for the council to acknowledge this! The site will soon be protected by the new flood defense wall, and with some careful policy wording for properties to be built on short stilts say, the site could be very well developed for housing and add the character of the area, whereas it is currently a bit of an eyesore in a very visible location. Developing the site sympathetically is a far better way forward for this site, rather than remaining at stale mate with the land owner and leaving it as an overgrown mess indefinitely.

If you have no more representations to add, please select this box

Your representation (5)

The draft Gosport Borough Local Plan 2038 contains a vision, objectives and policies with explanation text. Please use the boxes below to let us know what you are commenting on and whether you support or object along with your comments.

Paragraph/Policy Number: H1

Support or Object? Object

Please summarise why: The New local plan should impose a restriction on the ownership of all new build houses / flats so they are compelled to be marketed for a minimum period of 12 months to people that have employment, or a confirmed offer of employment within the borough. This is a certain way to help the major problem that Gosport has with out commuting making it currently a highly unsustainable settlement. There are far too many people already living in the borough who do not work in the borough and by allowing more housing to be sold to those with no intension of working in the borough is making the situation worse. The new, Newgate Lane is already stationary every morning and evening within 2 years of being built and even now with traffic volumes lower than before the pandemic. The Stubbington bypass will make this congestion even worse. The council can not say this is an impossible thing to include in a local plan, exactly this is included in other council areas to restrict the sale of new housing to local people and there is a very strong case that can be argued in court that this is necessary for this borough to remain functioning without complete gridlock every morning and evening.

If you have no more representations to add, please select this box

Your representation (6)

The draft Gosport Borough Local Plan 2038 contains a vision, objectives and policies with explanation text. Please use the boxes below to let us know what you are commenting on and whether you support or object along with your comments.

Paragraph/Policy Number: DE2

Support or Object? Object

Please summarise why: The policy needs to be much stronger on preserving the existing character of local areas. It should prevent over development of sites, if an area has properties on reasonably large plots to provide a pleasant open feel then development should not be allowed to develop sites to remove this character and cram more, or significantly extend properties, especially for pure financial gain and then move on. It would result in far more content communities if people were encouraged to purchase properties in an area they like knowing that the character isn't going to be eroded around them. If someone wants a large property crammed onto its site, go and buy one, don't buy a property in an area with a nice open feel and build an absurd extension. The same restrictions should be rigorously enforced on dormer extensions, which look horrific and the council needs to stop being shy in denying them when the fall back of permitted development is only slightly less awful – the slightly less awful needs to be accepted otherwise others are encouraged to make similar horrible extensions. Similar policies should exist to stop properties being bought on the garden split of to add in another property leaving two properties with garden space highly different from that of those all around and running the feel of the area. Preventing the building of fences and walls around front gardens and building of garages and outbuildings in front gardens should be included in the policy again to stop the character of areas being ruined by selfish individuals or companies profiteering. Planning policy should be established which benefits the whole community and makes places one where people want to live and not allow discontent to grow as awful development is continually allowed to encroach on the place they chose to make a home. This document is the council's single chance to achieve these perfectly good aspirations.

If you have no more representations to add, please select this box

Your representation (7)

The draft Gosport Borough Local Plan 2038 contains a vision, objectives and policies with explanation text. Please use the boxes below to let us know what you are commenting on and whether you support or object along with your comments.

Paragraph/Policy Number: D11

Support or Object? Object

Please summarise why: The plan needs to be far more forthright in making sure that the infrastructure needed to support Gosport is put in place. Particularly the road network, as mentioned previously the stubbington bypass will have no benefit to the traffic in Gosport, and will in fact make exiting and entering Gosport far more difficult, whilst freeing up stubbington (note this is in Fareham borough council area, and that council has no concern about making life better in Gosport borough). The plan should write in the major improvement of the junction in fareham at Tesco so that the A32 has a free-flowing two lanes into and out of Gosport. Tinkering with other junctions here and there will have absolutely no impact if major bottle necks aren't removed (or even new ones created such will be the case at Peel Common roundabout when the stubbington bypass opens). The local highway authority have shown time and again that they are incompetent at ensuring road schemes actually work and preventing poor design and development so this plan needs to ensure that good, well designed infrastructure is provided to support Gosport, and a lot of this needs to happen in Fareham being the only way to exit Gosport.

If you have no more representations to add, please select this box

Your representation (8)

The draft Gosport Borough Local Plan 2038 contains a vision, objectives and policies with explanation text. Please use the boxes below to let us know what you are commenting on and whether you support or object along with your comments.

Paragraph/Policy Number: D4

Support or Object? Object

Please summarise why: The Plan should be far more ambitious in supporting cycling as a means of transport, and not just concentrate on a very small, headline grabbing 'green network'. The infrastructure in Gosport is awful for cycling, yet with its generally warm climate and flat landscape it is the ideal place for cycling to be far more widely used. Cycling should be encouraged on all existing paths of a suitable width including the high street, Stokes Bay sea front, Lee-on-Solent sea front etc. Currently Gosport Borough says it wants to support cycling but the infrastructure suggests otherwise, with narrow gaps placed on cycle routes to make them less convenient to use, traffic light settings significantly favoring minor traffic routes over cycle routes, cycles banned from major seafront paths etc. This sort of prioritization needs to be written into policy as the local highways authority can not be relied upon to provide adequate provision as they have an inability to set up traffic signals in a sensible fashion. There are numerous examples across the borough and the county. So Gosport needs to take this into its own hands and make sure signalization priority for cycleways is written into policy. Development shouldn't be allowed which erode any cycle or pedestrian infrastructure provision, such as creating a sharp corner or limiting the visibility at junctions. These all contribute to putting people off using their bike as a regular means of transport.

If you have no more representations to add, please select this box

Confirm