

## APPLICATION P/18/1118/OA

There are very many similarities between the application documents submitted for P/18/1118/OA and P/19/0460/OA. Many of my comments, therefore, would be duplicated, so I have decided to make my submission to oppose P/18/1118/OA shorter. However, this should not be read that I am any less opposed.

I would like to go through the Applicant's Planning Statement for this application and make some points from my perspective as the borough councillor for the Peel Common Ward in the Borough of Gosport and as county councillor for the Bridgemary Division on Hampshire County Council.

The proposed development site is a short distance from both my borough ward and county division and, I submit, would have a detrimental impact on both.

There is an acceptance by the Applicant throughout the Planning Statement that the application P/18/1118/OA is to be seen as part of a much larger development proposal incorporating application P/19/0460/OA as well as a housing allocation formerly identified by Fareham Borough Council known as HA2. Examples of the link can be seen at various points in the Statement including at Paragraphs 1.4, 1.5, 1.7, 7.21, 7.22, 7.23 and 7.24.

As well as linking several housing development proposals to effectively present them as one very large housing development, the Applicant has also made numerous references to facilities (including community facilities) in my borough and county areas. These references can be seen at Paragraphs 2.13, 2.16, 2.17, 2.20 and 2.21.

Part 4 of the Planning Statement details pre-application discussions and includes reference to Section 106 agreement (Paragraph 4.4).

Part 4 also refers to community consultation and leaflet drops (Paragraph 4.15) which culminated in a consultation event held at St Matthew's Church on 22 May 2018 in my Bridgemary Division. I believe the bulk of the leaflet drops were to properties in my county division.

So, the Applicant advertised their proposals to Gosport residents; held a consultation event in Gosport; and makes repeated references to facilities within Gosport (many provided by Gosport Borough Council for Gosport residents), yet all pre-application discussions excluded Gosport Borough Council and there is no indication that Gosport is to be given any consideration in planning terms by the Applicant.

I have submitted a paper as part of this (joint) appeal in respect of P/19/0460/OA where I have detailed Gosport's particular issues: 20,600 daily out-commuters; 0.51 job density ratio; lack of fixed-link public transport; traffic congestion and pollution etc, so I will not repeat these in detail.

All of my detailed examination of the Planning Statement in respect of P/19/0460/OA apply equally to this application and, it is fair to say, that both applications were in any case intended to be read together.

I would conclude that this application, like the other, is in my view contrary to Fareham Borough Council policies CS6, CS11, CS14, CS22 and DSP40. If you wish to read my detailed grounds for objection on these and other points I would refer you to my submission to this Inquiry in respect of application P/19/0460/OA.