

SUBMISSION – PROOF OF EVIDENCE

1. I am the county councillor for the Bridgemary Division on Hampshire County Council and borough councillor on Gosport Borough Council (GBC) for the Peel Common Ward. The Peel Common Ward forms part of the Bridgemary County Division. I am also currently Chairman of the Economic Development Board of Gosport Borough Council. I feel strongly that my comments, on behalf of the people I represent on both authorities, should be considered given that the Applicant has made numerous references to the Bridgemary area in his application statements.
2. At various paragraphs in both the Design & Access Statements and the Planning Statements (for both applications) the Applicant refers to my borough ward and county division:
 - The majority of services (including community services) alluded to are in the Borough of Gosport
 - The leaflet drop by the Applicant as part of the consultation were mostly to properties in my county division in Gosport
 - The public consultation event in May 2018 was at St Matthews Church in my county division
3. The Applicant engaged in pre-application discussions with Fareham Borough Council (FBC) which included matters relating to Section 106 Agreements but did not engage with GBC.
4. **I object to these applications and want to see them refused but, were they to go ahead, I wish to see some redress for the blatant attempt to exploit community facilities in the neighbouring Borough of Gosport. I believe the impacts on my ward and county division “significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits”. Indeed, there are no benefits at all for the community I represent. I would, therefore, contend that this application is not in line with the NPPF “tilted balance”.**
5. Documents associated with both applications make numerous mentions of housing allocation HA2. HA2 was withdrawn from FBC’s emerging Draft Local Plan in October 2020.
6. The Applicant says the applications have been brought forward “in advance of the proposed HA2 allocation”.
7. The Applicant refers to P/18/1118/OA, P/19/0460/OA and HA2 as being three parts of the same development. He asserts that the “design and layout of the scheme has been specifically designed to work with ...the proposed HA2 allocation” and that the entire scheme is “a logical extension of the settlement of Bridgemary”.
8. The Applicant also states that the developments will:
 - *Not result in the coalescence of local settlements;*
 - *Allow a visual ‘sense’ of separation to be maintained;*
 - *Retain the character and identity of the adjacent settlements; and*
 - *Protection of value of green infrastructure”*
9. This statement is made as part of claim that Fareham Borough Council’s Policy CS22 is met. I contend that CS22 is clearly not met.
10. **I object to the principle of development in the Strategic Gap between Fareham and Gosport because it is contrary to Policy CS22 of FBC’s Local Plan and assert that it is the Applicant’s clear intention to develop housing in the entirety of the Gap where it borders Newgate Lane East.**

11. The Applicant believes that Newgate Lane East was designed and conceived with the intention of facilitating housing development. For example, he says, “the relief road ensures that there is capacity for all three developments”. This is an incorrect assumption.
12. *The Newgate Lane (South) Transport Assessment* was published by Hampshire County Council in June 2015. The purpose of the new Newgate Lane East relief road was clearly stated:

“The Newgate Lane southern section scheme aims to improve journey times, journey reliability and safety along the corridor for the benefit of drivers, cyclists and pedestrians. This will assist movement in a north-south direction between Fareham and Junction 11 of the M27, and the Gosport Peninsula. Accordingly, the objectives of the scheme are:

- To reduce peak period congestion and improve traffic speeds along the B3385 Newgate Lane corridor by providing a wider carriageway and a separate route for cyclists;
- To help encourage regeneration, investment and growth in the Gosport Peninsula;
- To help remove the transport barriers to growth;
- To help unblock critical bottlenecks and congestion hotspots on strategic routes, in town centre areas and in areas of employment; and
- To provide new and improved existing infrastructure to help better manage traffic flows, particularly during peak periods.”

13. I object and assert that Newgate Lane East was built with the intention of addressing an existing transport infrastructure deficit.

14. The Planning Statement states, “*There are a significant number of employment opportunities within Fareham and Gosport town centres.*”
15. The *Gosport Infrastructure Investment Plan*, published Spring 2019 by the Solent LEP in conjunction with Lichfields, sets out in detail the employment challenges faced by Gosport. 20,600 people out-commute every day from Gosport; it has a job density ratio of 0.51 – amongst the five lowest in Britain; it is the largest town by population anywhere in the UK without a railway station; there is just one ‘A’ road which is in the top 10 most dangerous and the top 23 most polluted in the country; it’s peninsular location means that the vast majority of workers have to commute by car through Fareham; in order to reach the average job density for the south-east Gosport would have to create an additional 14,500 jobs – an increase of 50%.

16. The suggestion that there are significant job opportunities in Gosport is not supported by the facts.

17. The Applicant goes to some length to justify that **Policy DSP40** of FBC’s Local Plan is satisfied. However, I am not convinced. Although Fareham does not currently have a demonstrable five-year housing land supply, certain criteria have to be met for the Council to allow development outside the urban settlement boundaries.
18. At *ii*) It is argued that the site is “well integrated” with Bridgemary and Peel Common. The Applicant justifies his argument by including HA2 which, as previously stated, was part of the Draft Local Plan, but has since been deleted. As the councillor and county councillor for the neighbouring area of Peel Common and Bridgemary I would categorically assert my belief that the planning application site is NOT well integrated.
19. At *iii*) the assertion by the Applicant is that the Strategic Gap can be redefined as commencing to the west of the application site. This is another example of an attempt to bolt-on their development to my borough ward and county division. I utterly reject this.
20. At *v*) the Applicant is on thin ice. Air quality and traffic congestion are high on the agenda at present. Residents of this development would be heavily reliant on the motor car. All

vehicles would have to feed into what is currently an area with air quality below the legally acceptable minimum. Fareham Council was one of 23 authorities named within the government's NO2 plan as having to assess options for improving air quality, in order to comply with legal limits on nitrogen dioxide air pollution with readings of more than 40 µgm-3. It is, in my view, very difficult for the Applicant to argue that this condition is met.

21. **As all five of the criteria have to be met and I contend that only two can be, this application is, therefore, contrary to Policy DSP40.**
22. **Policy CS6** specifically for Stubbington, Hill Head and Titchfield says, *"The Council does not expect these settlements to play a significant role in providing further housing provision. The SHLAA identifies these settlements as capable of providing limited development (around 90 dwellings in total, around 60 of which are within Stubbington and Hill Head)".* This is a sensible policy. **I support it and for this reason I contend that this application is contrary to Policy CS6.**
23. **Policy CS11** refers to development in Portchester, Stubbington and Hill Head and says there should be *"small scale development with clearly laid down caveats"*. Given that the Applicant has decided to link P/18/1118/OA with this application and with, what he sees as, a further development at HA2, **I would contend that this is not a small scale development and is, therefore, contrary to Policy CS11.**
24. **Policy CS14** is designed to strictly control and protect the countryside. As with Policy CS6, the Applicant would seem to acknowledge that this application is **contrary to Policy CS14** for the reasons they seek to dismiss it as irrelevant.
25. The Applicant says that *"consultation responses received in respect of the live planning application P/18/1118/OA apply equally to this proposal and have also been relied upon to inform this planning application."* This is a strange statement given that Fareham Borough Council reported on 24 June 2020 that they had received a combined total of 517 objections, plus petitions, but only one letter in support.
26. For the reasons stated above **in bold** I object to both applications.

Cllr Stephen Philpott
GBC Councillor
HCC Councillor

Reference notes by paragraph:

2 Examples can be found in Design & Access Statements at page 13, 2.15 (both); page 15 2.20 (both); pages 25 (southern parcel); page 33, 4.3 (both); page 41 (southern parcel).

3. See design & Access Statement page 33, 4.1.

6. See Planning Statement paragraph 7.18.

7. See Planning Statement paragraphs 7.24 and 10.3.

8 See Planning Statement paragraph 9.9.

11 See Planning Statement paragraph 7.23. Also 3.6

12. *The Newgate Lane (South) Transport Assessment* June 2015, page 1, 1.1 (pdf version of document sent separately).

14 Current vacancies in Gosport (as at 9/2/21) 236. Fareham 360. Portsmouth 1,117. (source: Jobcentre Plus).

15 *The Gosport Infrastructure Investment Plan* published February 2019. Page 4, 2.2; page 5, 2.8; page 7, 2.13; page 13, 3.13; pages 23-24, 4.26. Copy forwarded separately.

15 Source: Auto Express 16 November 2018.

20 2019 Air Quality Annual Status Report published by Gosport and Fareham Councils June 2019. Page iii