

**Kneen, Peter**

---

**Subject:** FW: P/22/0165/OA: Land east of Newgate Lane East (Consultee Responses)

---

**From:** Wootton, Gayle <GWootton@Fareham.Gov.UK>

**Sent:** 19 April 2022 10:37

**To:** Kneen, Peter <PKneen@Fareham.Gov.UK>

**Subject:** P/22/0165/OA: Land east of Newgate Lane East (Consultee Responses)

Morning Peter,

Thank you for consulting Planning Strategy on the application for 350 dwellings at Land east of Newgate Lane East. From a planning strategy point of view, this proposal is not supported as it conflicts with the development strategy of the Borough.

As you are aware, in both the Adopted Plan and the Emerging Local Plan the site is not allocated for development. It is in designated countryside, within the strategic gap and is also designated a low use site for Solent Waders and Brent Geese. The site is id 3057 in the SHELAA and was discounted for the reasons identified in that development in this location would have a detrimental impact on the Strategic Gap.

The site has never been allocated. It was one of a number of sites consulted upon as part of a Regulation 18 consultation on the Local Plan in 2017, a consultation that was superseded by subsequent Regulation 18 and 19 consultations in 2020 and 2021. The proposed site received 517 objections including a number of strategic objections from Gosport Borough Council and the Highway Authority, on the basis of the points already raised in relation to the strategic gap and highways, particularly in relation to access onto the new Newgate Lane bypass. The summary of these can be seen in Appendix 2 of the Statement of Consultation (CD005) on the examination library [http://planningpdf.fareham.gov.uk/PDF/planning/local\\_plan/CD005Ap2.pdf](http://planningpdf.fareham.gov.uk/PDF/planning/local_plan/CD005Ap2.pdf) (page 121) . This led to the site being removed from the list of potential sites as it was contrary to the emerging development strategy.

As part of the Local Plan evidence base, the Council Commissioned a 'Technical Review of Areas of Special Landscape Quality and the Strategic Gaps' (DS003 in the Local Plan examination Library) [http://planningpdf.fareham.gov.uk/PDF/planning/local\\_plan/DS003\\_Technical\\_Review\\_Of\\_Areas\\_of\\_Special\\_Landscape\\_Quality\\_and\\_the\\_Strategic\\_Gaps.pdf](http://planningpdf.fareham.gov.uk/PDF/planning/local_plan/DS003_Technical_Review_Of_Areas_of_Special_Landscape_Quality_and_the_Strategic_Gaps.pdf). In relation to this part of the Strategic Gap, the study concluded that *'Further development within the gap in addition to the road scheme, together with existing urban fringe activity, is likely to cause visual, or even physical, coalescence of settlements on either side of the new road corridor.'* The report goes on to say *'Even with the development of Newgate Lane South (the new bypass), the previous analysis carried out by LDA and described in Chapter 3 of the Fareham Borough Landscape Character Assessment 2017, is still relevant: "A cohesive area of undeveloped landscape which performs an important role in respect of the primary purposes of the Strategic Gap, i.e. in defining the edges, separate identity and settings of Fareham and Gosport, preventing their coalescence. Even minor encroachment beyond existing settlement boundaries could have an adverse effect on these functions and the overall integrity of the landscape and Strategic Gap."* (page 43).

The Council maintains the importance of the strategic gap in this location. I would draw your attention to the appeal decisions for APP/J1725/W/20/3265860 and APP/A1720/W/21/3269030 for Land East of Newgate Lane East for 99 dwellings. Notwithstanding the determination of the appeals (which was decided on Planning Balance), the Inspector stressed the weight to be applied to these designations *'on this basis, given the extent of harm identified in the relevant*

*subsection above, the detrimental effect that the appeals development would have on the character and appearance of the area, including in terms of the Strategic Gap, and the associated development plan policy conflict carry significant weight against the appeals proposals. In conclusion, the proposed development would be at odds with the area's strategy for the location of new housing, cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, including in terms of the Strategic Gap, and lead to the loss of BMV land in conflict with the development plan'.*

Kind regards,  
Gayle

Gayle Wootton  
Head of Planning Strategy and Economic Development  
Fareham Borough Council  
01329824328  
07787685925

