

THIS IS AN EMAIL FROM CLLR STEPHEN PHILPOTT, GOSPORT BOROUGH AND HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCILLOR

Please accept my apologies for this blanket email which I am sending to more than 100 people who have previously contacted me on this subject.

Some of you may have received letters from Fareham Borough Council about two planning applications for 75 and 115 houses on Newgate Lane. These letters explain that the Applicant has appealed them due to "non-determination" by Fareham Borough Council. As a result both these applications will now proceed to an inquiry. As yet we do not know when the inquiry will be held, or quite how it will be done during the Covid19 period.

However, although these applications: P/18/1118 and P/19/0460 will be decided by an Inspector at an appeal, Fareham Borough Council will be discussing them at their next Planning Committee meeting this coming Wednesday at 1pm. This meeting is to be conducted as a video conference and will be live streamed on the Council's website.

People have been given the chance to make a deputation if they wish to the Planning Committee, but any deputation is limited to 500 words and must be received by Fareham Council by Monday. This is clearly a very tight deadline and if you had thought of making a deputation please don't worry because the meeting on Wednesday will not decide anything. The real decision will be made later at the inquiry.

Anyone can apply to address an inquiry. I have attached the letter I received about this explaining that you have until 7 July to write to the Planning Inspectorate if you want to "attend" the inquiry and give evidence. As the Gosport Councillor for Peel Common and the County Councillor for the whole of Bridgemary I would like you to know that I will be applying to attend and speak at the inquiry whenever it is held.

If you have read my previous (and rather long) emails on this subject you will know that P/18/1118 and P/19/0460 are not the only outstanding planning applications for houses on Newgate Lane. There is also P/19/1260 for 99 houses from Bargate Homes which has yet to be determined by Fareham Council. The application for 99 houses differs from the other two in that it is for development on the eastern side of Newgate Lane East and proposes exclusive vehicular access via Brookers Lane. I intend to write to you with more information about how this application is to be dealt with nearer the time when it is due to be considered.

You may also have heard that the Gosport MP Caroline Dinenage has put in a request that P/18/1118 and P/19/0460 be "called-in" by the Secretary of State. This call-in application has, to some extent, been superseded by the appeal for non-determination, but Caroline has still exercised her right to apply to the Secretary of State to make the absolute final decision after the Inspector has conducted an inquiry.

The emails I have sent you have sought to give you the fullest possible information on what is a complicated situation. But I would wish to assure you that Gosport Borough Council, Hampshire County Council and even Fareham Borough Council all oppose the planning applications P/18/1118 and P/19/0460. I would reiterate that I have also expressed my objection.

As for P/19/1260 (the 99 houses) that seeks vehicular access directly into my Peel Common Ward I remain implacably opposed and I have received backing from my colleagues on Gosport Borough Council. Hampshire County Council has yet to reveal its final position, but I have been lobbying hard. I fear that Fareham Borough Council may decide to support P/19/1260. Regardless I will do everything I can to resist it and I intend to write to you separately setting out my reasons.

In the meantime I hope you find this update useful. If you wish to ask me anything about these or other matters please drop me a line on either stephen.philpott@gosport.gov.uk or stephen.philpott@hants.gov.uk or call me on 01329 310781.

Kind regards,

Stephen Philpott.

On 15 December 2019 at 17:26 "e-mail stephen.philpott8" <stephen.philpott8@ntlworld.com> wrote:

Dear All,

This is an email from Cllr Stephen Philpott, Gosport Borough and Hampshire County councillor

I am sending this letter to you because you have either written to me previously about planning applications in Newgate Lane or you attended one of my public meetings on the subject and gave me your email address.

This latest email is very long. Many of you asked such a variety of questions that I thought it best to consolidate everything in just one letter. As there are more than 100 people blind copied on this email, writing to everyone individually would have been a very difficult task, so I hope you will forgive me for writing just one letter to all of you.

However, if you have any questions arising from this correspondence, or you require more detail, please feel free to get in touch with me and I promise I will do my utmost to get answers for you.

If you don't want to read the entire essay then I will, first, give you an executive summary:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Bargate Homes have submitted a planning application for 99 houses. They are proposing exclusive access via Brookers Lane. They need planning permission from both Fareham and Gosport Councils, though the proposed development is in the Borough of Fareham. There are already two other outstanding planning applications for 200 more houses alongside Newgate Lane, so this brings the current total to 299. Bargate Homes also need Hampshire County Council to agree to remove the path between Brookers Lane and Newgate Lane East. I, and my fellow ward councillor in Peel Common, Lynn Hook are opposed to all the outstanding planning applications.

If you want more detail and a full appraisal please read on.....

In September 2019 Bargate Homes hosted a public consultation event in St Matthew's Church in Bridgemary. I know many of you attended, but I am aware that not everyone knew about it. Bargate Homes gave very short notice for the event and, I understand, only delivered around 500 fliers. I did my best to inform as many people as possible by delivering an *In Touch* newsletter to as many homes as possible.

I had a huge response to the newsletter and many of you completed the *Feedback* slip and returned it to me. Others contacted me by email, letter and by telephone. I had intended, by the end of October, to contact everyone, but the general election intervened. Rules relating to “purdah” do not allow councillors to publish what could be construed as campaign material during a general election. Along with the sheer volume of letters I needed to send, this is the reason it has taken me so long to get back in touch with you.

NEW PLANNING APPLICATIONS

There has been more news since September. Bargate Homes have now submitted a planning application. It was submitted on 5th December 2019. They intend to build 99 houses on land immediately to the north of Brookers Field with exclusive vehicular access via Brookers Lane. In fact, there are two applications associated with the 99 houses: one to Fareham Council and one to Gosport Council. This is unusual, but Bargate Homes require access over land within the Borough of Gosport, so they need the permission of both councils. They will also need to apply to Hampshire County Council to change a traffic regulation order that applies to the footpath between Brookers Lane and Newgate Lane East.

The reference numbers for the planning applications are: 19/00516/OUT for Gosport and P/19/1260/OA for Fareham. Details of these applications and how to make a representation can be seen on each council’s website, or by contacting the council directly.

OUTSTANDING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

These applications for 99 houses are the latest in a series of planning applications for new houses along the Newgate Lane corridor. Just over a year ago Fareham Council received an application (P/18/1118/OA) for 75 dwellings on land immediately to the west of the new Newgate Lane. This was followed, in May 2019, by a further application (P19/0460/OA) for an additional 125 dwellings also on land between the old Newgate Lane and the new Newgate Lane.

So, there are now three planning applications for housing adjacent to Newgate Lane totalling 299 dwellings. All these applications have yet to be determined by Fareham Borough Council.

On 5th July 2019 Gosport Borough’s councillors unanimously approved a letter requesting the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG) “call-in” the planning application P/19/0460/OA. This was a request for the application to be taken out of the hands of Fareham Borough Council and, instead, be presented to an Inspector. Fareham Council would still be required to deliberate on it, but the final decision would not rest with them.

On 17th July 2019 MHCLG agreed not to let P/19/0460 be passed by Fareham Council without “special authorisation”. MHCLG confirmed that application P/18/1118/OA was “also under consideration for call-in.

NEWGATE LANE

It is a widely held view that the local councils (Fareham, Gosport and Hampshire) only ever wanted to build a new Newgate Lane to facilitate housebuilding. I have read extensively on this and have found no evidence that supports this view.

The myth of the councils’ thirst for major housebuilding on Newgate Lane emerged quite early on, but gained considerable traction when Fareham Borough Council published their Draft Local Plan in October 2017.

The true reason for the construction of a new Newgate Lane lies in the decision by the Government in 2010 to make Daedalus an Enterprise Zone. Part of the deal, which involved public investment of tens of millions of pounds, was that improved road access was essential in order to meet the ambitious job creation aspirations and targets.

By the spring of 2011 detailed designs for improvements to the northern section of Newgate Lane had been drawn up. It was to cost £2.5 million.

Shortly after, attention turned to the southern end of Newgate Lane. In a letter dated 30th June 2011 the Head of Highways at Hampshire County Council said,

“The Highway Authority (HCC) has been working with Fareham and Gosport Borough Councils to ensure that the redevelopment of Daedalus and any other major employment centres on Gosport peninsular that may come forward are able to compete with other sites within South Hampshire on an even footing. Obviously key to the success of the regeneration of the Daedalus site is the need to ensure improved accessibility hence the need to upgrade the southern section of Newgate Lane.”

Approval for major works on Newgate Lane was given in November 2013 by Cllr Sean Woodward, Leader of Fareham Borough Council, and (then) Executive Member for Transport at Hampshire County Council. On 8th November 2013 he told *The News*,

“The improvements to the northern part of Newgate Lane mark the first stage of a wider strategy to provide better access to the Gosport Peninsular and the Solent Enterprise Zone. We aim to follow this first phase of works with improvements to the southern section of Newgate Lane and the Peel Common roundabout. These improvements will greatly improve congestion in Fareham and Gosport, making them more desirable locations to live, work and visit.”

As Member of Parliament, Caroline Dinenage, played a key role in securing Enterprise Zone status for Daedalus. In January 2014 she said,

“I’m thrilled that work on Newgate Lane will finally get underway next week. Having campaigned tirelessly, I hope that this will mark the beginning of widespread improvements to the road network. Newgate Lane will become of even greater strategic importance as development at the Daedalus Enterprise Zone gains pace.”

These sentiments were echoed by Cllr Woodward on 18th January 2014 when, speaking of the forthcoming disruption during construction, he said,

“As someone who regularly uses Newgate Lane and queues in the appalling congestion, the improvements in traffic flow will I hope be well worth it.”

Hampshire County Council held a public consultation exercise on the proposals for the southern section of Newgate Lane between 9th June and 4th August 2014, including an exhibition on 30th June 2014. This followed a public consultation exercise in September 2013. Both consultations were presented in these terms:

“The proposals aim to help address existing traffic problems on the Gosport peninsular to improve strategic east west and north south routes and to enhance access to the Solent Enterprise Zone.”

At no stage during any of the planning meetings, consultation events, public pronouncements and official documents during the design stage for both the northern and southern section of Newgate Lane was housing ever proposed.

FAREHAM COUNCIL'S DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

In October 2017 Fareham Borough Council dropped a bombshell.

All local planning authorities are obliged, by law, to have an up to date local plan. Fareham's Local Plan is called the "Core Strategy".

Local Plans have to go through two consultation stages before being submitted to the Secretary of State for approval. The whole process can take up to two years. The same applies to revised Local Plans.

Fareham's Draft Local Plan of October 2017 was a major departure from its previous (and existing) Core Strategy. The new DLP identified a number of specific areas in Fareham which the Council would consider appropriate for development. These "housing allocation" sites were on land previously considered inappropriate for housing development. One of them was named HA2 and encompassed a large swathe of open land in the Strategic Gap sandwiched between the existing settlements of Bridgemary and Peel Common and Newgate Lane East (which, at that time, was still under construction).

HA2 was considered appropriate for up to 475 houses and residents in those houses, it was envisaged, would use facilities and amenities within the Borough of Gosport even though they would be Fareham residents.

Vehicular access would be via a new roundabout in the middle of Newgate Lane East; through Brookers Lane; and by constructing a new access through to Tukes Avenue by demolishing two existing residential properties in the Borough of Gosport. The plans were a fiasco as well as an outrage since the two unfortunate householders in Tukes Avenue had no prior knowledge that their houses were earmarked for the bulldozer and only found out after the publication of the DLP.

Fareham Council's woes mounted following the publication of the Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) document in the summer of 2018. Fareham were forced back to the drawing board and in December 2018 decided to tear up the DLP.

They are now, imminently, due to publish a new and revised DLP and it is widely expected to include very similar proposals to HA2.

FAREHAM'S CORE STRATEGY AND THE STRATEGIC GAP

When considering applications for housing along Newgate Lane a lot has been said about the Strategic Gap. It would be useful to define it.

Firstly, Strategic Gap is not Greenbelt. It does not enjoy the same level of protection in planning terms as Greenbelt. However, that is not to say that the Strategic Gap is not important, or that it serves no useful purpose.

Central to any objection to housing development along Newgate Lane is a clear understanding of Fareham Borough Council's existing planning policy. These policies are enshrined in a document called the Core Strategy.

The Core Strategy contains a series of policies that have direct relevance to all three outstanding planning applications as well as any future proposals for HA2. Full details can be found in the Core Strategy document but, in summary, these are the policies of Fareham Borough Council that I consider relevant:

Policy CS6

CS6 specifically mentions Stubbington, Hill Head and Titchfield. It says,

“The Council does not expect these settlements to play a significant role in providing further housing provision. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (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).”

Policy CS11

CS11 deals specifically with Portchester, Stubbington and Hill Head and says there should be “small scale development with clearly laid down caveats.” Taken together, I would not consider 299 dwellings to be “small scale”, especially when there is a clear intention of a further 375.

Policy CS14

CS14 is aimed at protecting the countryside and controlling development within the countryside. The land in question is, undoubtedly, countryside.

Policy CS22

CS22 is important because it explains, in detail, why the Strategic Gap is important. It says,

“Gaps between settlements particularly between Fareham and the Western Wards and Fareham and Stubbington, help define and maintain the separate identity of individual settlements and have strong local support. Strategic gaps do not have intrinsic landscape value but are important to maintaining the settlement pattern, keeping individual settlements separate and providing opportunities for green infrastructure/green corridors. Continuing pressure for high levels of development mean that maintaining gaps continues to be justified.”

In addition to the Core Strategy Fareham Council also rely on a further document referred to as their Local Plan Part 2. It is entitled “Development Sites & Policies”. It was published in June 2015 and, in addition to the Core Strategy, contains policies of relevance when considering the three applications along Newgate Lane.

Policy DSP6

DSP6 says, “There will be a presumption against new residential development outside the defined urban settlement.” Whilst DSP6 sets out what it considers to be three exceptions, I would contend that none of these exceptions apply in the case of development on Newgate Lane.

Policy DSP40

DSP40 sets out five criteria that need to be met for the Council to accept development outside the existing urban settlement boundaries. All five have to be met and it is clear to me that the applications for Newgate Lane are only capable of meeting two of them.

NITRATES

There has been a considerable amount of publicity in recent months regarding the impact of nitrates on sheltered habitats within the Solent region. The problem stretches from Poole Harbour to Chichester Harbour and encompasses all the local councils along that length of coast.

Expert advice has been sought from Natural England, the Environment Agency and Southern Water. Various ideas have been put forward as to how “nitrate neutrality” might be achieved but, as yet, this massive problem remains unresolved.

In summary, human activity produces nitrates. Those nitrates leach into the soil and get into the water courses causing major harm to certain wildlife habitats. Farming is considered to be the worst culprit, but housebuilding also contributes as more and more people use water and wastewater services.

The guidance from Natural England to councils in the Solent area has been to stall planning permissions unless and until a solution can be found. This has already led to a backlog of more than 4,500 residential properties awaiting decision on planning applications.

This could be relevant to Newgate Lane in that the developers will be required to demonstrate nitrate neutrality in order to get the go-ahead to build houses.

WHAT HAVE YOUR COUNCILLORS BEEN DOING?

As the Borough Councillor for Peel Common and the County Councillor for the wider Bridgemary Division I have been working with colleagues to build opposition to the planning applications. These colleagues include Cllr Lynn Hook, my fellow Peel Common Councillor, and Pal Hayre, who is the County Councillor for the Crofton Division that incorporates Stubbington and Hill Head.

I have written to oppose P/18/1118/OA and P/19/0460/OA and I will be writing to oppose this latest application; I organised two public meetings – at Peel Common School and Woodcot School; I and my colleagues and helpers delivered thousands of newsletters informing residents; I have held meetings with planning officers from Gosport Council and Fareham Council; I have met with Executive Member for Transport at HCC, Cllr Rob Humby, and with senior County highways officers; I have discussed the issues in detail on a number of occasions with the MP, Caroline Dinéage, who is fully on board.

I feel there will be a need for another public meeting once Fareham Borough Council have republished their revised Draft Local Plan.

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER & PROHIBITION OF DRIVING ORDER

One aspect I am very keen to pursue is the status of the existing Prohibition of Driving Order at Brookers Lane.

In February 2016 Hampshire County Council affixed a notice to the steel barrier at the western end of Brookers Lane adjacent to the entrance to Brookers Field. This Public Notice sought information as to the ownership of the path that runs from the end of Brookers Lane to Woodcote Lane. At that time the path was a mud ditch.

No one came forward with any evidence of ownership, so Hampshire County Council incorporated it into the compulsory purchase order that allowed for the new Newgate Lane to be constructed.

Following the statutory period of consultation a traffic regulation order (TRO) was made on 14th May 2018. This Order was for “The prohibition of driving in the Newgate Lane area at Fareham and Gosport”. This Order prohibits driving (except for pedal cycles) at “Brookers Lane between a point 31 metres west of its junction with The Drive and its eastern junction with the B3385 Newgate Lane East, an approximate distance of 145 metres.”

In order for them to secure approval for the 99 houses in applications 19/00516 and P/19/1260/OA Bargate Homes must secure an amendment to this TRO. As the county councillor for Bridgemary and Peel Common I am implacably opposed to any suggestion to amend or rescind this Order.

GOSPORT BOROUGH COUNCIL'S POSITION

Gosport Borough Council's Regulatory Board has yet to debate the latest planning applications. However, the Board has voted unanimously to oppose both P/18/1118/OA and P/19/0460/OA.

Letters of objection were sent on 19th October 2018 and 17th June 2019.

Gosport Borough Council has its own Local Plan and Policy LP3 is aimed at protecting the Strategic Gap. Policy LP3 says,

"The character and function of the settlement gaps (as shown on the Policies Map) between Gosport/Fareham and Lee-on-the-Solent/Stubbington will be preserved."

WHY ARE YOU COUNCILLORS OPPOSING THE PROPOSED HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS?

Lynn Hook and I will oppose all the planning applications for housing on the border of Peel Common and Bridgemary. There are a number of reasons:

1. All the applications for housing so far submitted on land adjacent to Newgate Lane are contrary to both Fareham and Gosport's adopted Local Plans.
2. The Strategic Gap is an important component of green infrastructure.
3. The proposed developments would be heavily car dependent with limited public transport provision. The developments would add to traffic on Newgate Lane - and the most recent application would create additional traffic through Peel Common and Bridgemary.
4. The portion of the A32 between the northern end of Newgate Lane and Fareham town centre is an Air Quality Management Area in which emissions from vehicles have been recorded as above safe levels. This portion of road has been measured in the top 23 most polluted sections of road in the country.
5. Developments along Newgate Lane would negate benefits of recent improvements to Newgate Lane and impact adversely on access to the Enterprise Zone at Daedalus as well as to the wider Gosport peninsular.

SUMMARY

This is a very detailed essay, but it sets out in detail the entire story and the position your councillors intend to take.

If you are minded to oppose any of these planning applications it would be best to do so on planning grounds. You do not have quote particular paragraphs or policies, but these will need to be a general guide to help you formulate an objection.

If I can be of any further help please let me know.

Thanks you for reading this terribly long letter.

Kind regards,

Cllr Stephen Philpott

IF YOU DO NOT WANT ANY MORE INFORMATION FROM ME IN FUTURE ABOUT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS ON THE BORDER OF FAREHAM AND GOSPORT PLEASE LET ME KNOW AND I WILL REMOVE YOU FROM MY MAILING LIST

On 29 May 2019 at 18:01 "e-mail stephen.philpott8" <stephen.philpott8@ntlworld.com> wrote:

Dear All,

I said I would write a letter of objection to the latest planning application for houses in Newgate Lane. I have reproduced it below.

It is a very detailed letter because I thought I ought to set out all my objections as the local councillor. If you want to write to object you can do so by sending an email to jchambers@fareham.gov.uk Your objection doesn't have to be detailed, but it is a good idea to give planning reasons as to why you think it should be refused.

I have written an extremely long response which might be useful to you if you are looking for things to say, but it must be your own letter and not a copy of someone else's.

Kind regards,

Stephen Philpott

Dear Mrs Chambers,

I am writing to object to this latest planning application on behalf of Bargate Homes for 125 dwellings on land at Newgate Lane (South).

On 24 October 2018 I wrote to object to planning application P/18/1118/OA and I will revisit a number of those themes in this letter of objection. I intend to lay out my objections in detail, so that my comments are recorded for the record.

I am the county councillor for the Bridgemary Division on Hampshire County Council and borough councillor on Gosport Borough Council 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 especially strongly that my comments, on behalf of the people I represent on both authorities, should be properly considered given that the Applicant has, once again, made numerous references to the Bridgemary area in his application statements.

First I want to address my comments to the two principal documents attached to this application making observations on many of the assertions and proposals contained within. Those two documents are: the Design & Access Statement; and the Planning Statement.

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

Page 13, Paragraph 2.15

I strongly disagree with the assertion that the proposed development “strengthens the strategic gap”. This is a recurring theme and it needs to be challenged. Fareham Borough Council’s Local Plan, the Core Strategy (adopted August 2011) defines the Strategic Gap:

“Gaps between settlements particularly between Fareham and the Western Wards and Fareham and Stubbington, help define and maintain the separate identity of individual settlements and have strong local support. Strategic gaps do not have intrinsic landscape value but are important in maintaining the settlement pattern, keeping individual settlements separate and providing opportunities for green infrastructure/green corridors. Continuing pressure for high levels of development mean that maintaining gaps continues to be justified.”

I would be inclined to agree with and accept this definition. Whilst any developer could attempt to argue that they might consider it acceptable to build residential units in the Strategic Gap, it is not logical to argue that such building could “strengthen” the Strategic Gap.

Page 15, Paragraph 2.20

This section refers to “convenient access to the neighbouring ward F”. I assume that this careless sentence is suggesting that “ward F” is the Peel Common Ward in Gosport.

Page 22, Paragraph 2.39

This states, “Development proposals will be formulated having due regard to the policies that make up the local plan”. This is as one would expect. However, it is written in the context of a number of pages immediately preceding it that refer entirely and exclusively to Bridgemary along with a number of photographs of housing throughout both my county and borough wards. I will return to this theme later.

Page 25

The comparison of constraints and opportunities alludes to the “lack of pedestrian points along Newgate Lane”. However, it also identifies an “opportunity to provide a pedestrian link at Woodcote Lane to enable greater permeability and access to services”. This is a theme that is repeated throughout the planning statement documents. The services referred to here are exclusively within the neighbouring Borough of Gosport and in my borough ward and county division in particular.

Page 28

Under the sub-heading “Response to Context” the Applicant’s Design & Access Statement says, “Seek to reflect the form of built development found within Charminster locally”. This is another example of carelessness on the part of the Applicant and demonstrates that this Design & Access Statement is not the bespoke document it pretends to be.

Page 33, Paragraph 4.3

This paragraph refers to the consultation process on application P/18/1118/OA. The public consultation event alluded to here took place at St Matthews Church in my county council division of Bridgemary in the Borough of Gosport.

Earlier at Paragraph 4.1 it says that the Applicant has engaged with the Council. Indeed, I am sure he has. However, that would be Fareham Borough Council and not Gosport. As the Applicant continually refers to Bridgemary and to Peel Common throughout his planning statements then so shall I.

Page 35, Paragraph 4.5

In my objection letter of 24 October 2018 to application P/18/1118/OA I said that the Applicant had

clearly set out his future intentions to bring forward a further application for an addition 125 dwellings. This paragraph is proof of that and goes as far as to say that both applications form “a cohesive scheme between the two”.

Page 35, Paragraphs 4.9 – 4.11

This section is dedicated to the HA2 proposal which formed part of the Fareham Borough Council Draft Local Plan published in October 2017. This Draft Local Plan was scrapped by Fareham Borough Council in December 2018 following publication of the NPPF in July 2018. However, the Design & Access Statement persists in asserting the existence of HA2. This is another recurring theme of the Applicant’s planning statements.

Page 41, Paragraph 5.13

It is tedious to mention all the references to “nearby facilities in Bridgemarky”, but here is yet another example.

PLANNING STATEMENT

This is the more substantive document of the two and I shall make my comments in a similarly chronological manner.

Pages 4 & 5, Paragraphs 2.13-2.26

Under the headings of:

- Convenience Shopping and Retail
- Health and Education
- Leisure and Open Space
- Employment
- Public Transport

there are references under each sub-heading to facilities within Gosport and mainly within the Bridgemarky County Division that I represent.

There is an explicit and repeated intention for this *Fareham* development to benefit *Fareham* Borough Council in terms of housing numbers and Section 106 agreement by exploiting facilities within the neighbouring Borough of Gosport.

Without going into detail on all these references, I will highlight the one entitled *Employment* in which the Planning Statement states, “There are a significant number of employment opportunities within Fareham and Gosport town centres.” Whilst it would be fair to say that Gosport is not an area of high unemployment (although the Planning Statement does not say this), it is not accurate to say there are significant employment opportunities in Gosport.

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%.

It is patently ridiculous to suggest that there are significant job opportunities in Gosport.

Paragraph 2.24 refers to Fareham Borough Council's ambition to generate employment at the Enterprise Zone at Daedalus. I fully support Fareham Borough Council in this endeavour. However, the success of the Enterprise Zone depends upon there being good and reliable road links. Part of that strategy for improved road links is the recently completed Newgate Lane. Far from residents being able to benefit from employment opportunities at the Enterprise Zone, the proposed developments by the Pegasus Group would clog up the new Newgate Lane and greatly contribute to the destruction of jobs.

Paragraph 2.25 further enforces the obvious conclusion that the author of the Planning Document is delusional as well as ill-informed. The IFA2 interconnector facility will create no more than ten jobs.

Page 7, Paragraph 3.6

Like page 35 of the Design & Access Statement this paragraph refers to the "HA2 Allocation". As previously mentioned, there is no HA2 allocation at present. That document was torn up in December 2018 and, at the time of writing, has not been replaced.

This paragraph, however, goes further and says, "The relief road (the new Newgate Lane) has been designed with regard to the emerging residential allocation to the east known as Peel Common or 'HA2' which is proposed for allocation in the Draft Local Plan". This statement is completely untrue and must not be allowed to stand.

The Newgate Lane (South) Transport Assessment was published by Hampshire County Council in June 2015. The purpose of the new Newgate Lane 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."

There was no suggestion at any time that the new Newgate Lane should accommodate housing development on Newgate Lane. It may suit the Applicant's purposes to assert this, but there was no mention of it in any of the documents that were published when planning consent was sought, so the public and the statutory consultees were never alerted to the possibility. Newgate Lane (South) was conceived and designed to address an existing infrastructure deficit.

Pages 10 & 11, Paragraphs 4.9-4.16

It would have been interesting to have been a fly on the wall during these pre-application consultations. The Applicant in paragraph 4.9 again speaks of the Draft Local Plan. Although the meetings took place over a year ago with Fareham Planning Officers it seems careless, sloppy and incompetent of the Applicant to keep referring to and relying upon the validity of a document that was so publicly disposed of in December 2018.

The pre-application meeting that took place on 10th April 2018 with Hampshire County Council Highways must surely have discussed the original purpose of Newgate Lane. It is inconceivable that Highways officers did not mention that there was never any intention to build a road to facilitate housing. If this is the case then it is duplicitous of the Applicant to say, as they have, that the "road has been designed with regard to the emerging residential allocation to the east known as...HA2". Given that the County Council Transport Assessment was published more than two years before HA2 emerged in the October 2017 (now debunked) Draft Local Plan, then the statement by the Applicant has to be untrue.

Paragraph 4.16 is also worthy of mention. It says that "consultation responses received in respect of the live planning application P/18/1118/OA...have also been relied upon to inform this planning application." The Applicant couldn't have read many. There were hundreds of responses opposed and only four in favour – and all four came from either the Applicant or the landowner. They clearly didn't read mine, but I would be happy to furnish them with a copy.

Part 5, pages 12-22

This section of the Planning Statement sets out what the Applicant sees as the relevant planning policies.

Paragraph 5.41 says that "the Draft Local Plan can be afforded weight in accordance with its stage of preparation". I would agree and, as there is no Draft Local Plan in existence, it cannot be given any weight.

Section 6, pages 23-29 and Section 7, pages 30-46 set out to rubbish Fareham Borough Council's existing Local Plan concluding at Paragraph 7.2 that "in the absence of a five-year supply, policies CS6, CS14 and DSP6 which control development outside the defined settlement boundaries do not represent up-to-date policies". I would strongly urge you to dispute this aggressive assertion and to defend your Local Plan against this unwanted development.

Paragraph 7.18 contains a significant admission which is repeated elsewhere in the Planning Statement, that this application has been brought forward "in advance of the proposed HA2 allocation".

The following paragraphs expand upon this. For instance, paragraph 7.23 says "the relief road ensures that there is capacity for all three developments". (as previously stated, the Applicant may say this, but it is not true that the road was designed to accommodate development on Newgate Lane).

Paragraph 7.24 asserts that the "design and layout of the scheme has been specifically designed to work with ...the proposed HA2 allocation".

So as to guarantee there is no confusion and that the whole intention is develop a 675 dwelling housing estate bolted onto Bridgemark, the Applicant says in paragraph 10.3 that the entire scheme is "a logical

extension of the settlement of Bridgemary”. This totally ignores the obvious fact that Bridgemary is in Gosport and that P/18/1118/OA, P/19/0460/OA and HA2 are all in the Borough of Fareham.

Part 8, page 47

In this part the Applicant sets out all the planning goodies heading the way of Fareham borough Council should this application be accepted. As a Gosport Borough councillor I intend to dispute and pursue this. I want this application refused, but if it goes ahead I intend to seek some form of redress for the naked and blatant attempt to exploit community facilities provided by Gosport residents. I utterly reject any suggestion that this proposed development would be good or beneficial for my residents and for my community.

Part 9 pages 48-50

As previously stated, I believe the impacts on my ward and county division “significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits”. I would, therefore, contend that this application is not in line with the NPPF “tilted balance”.

PALANNING GROUNDS FOR OBJECTION

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**.

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**.

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.

Policy CS22 is central to this application and that explains the reason why the Applicant has gone to such convoluted and perverted lengths to dismiss it as irrelevant. CS22 is not irrelevant. I would re-emphasise the quote from earlier:

“Gaps between settlements particularly between Fareham and the Western Wards and Fareham and Stubbington, help define and maintain the separate identity of individual settlements and have strong local support. Strategic gaps do not have intrinsic landscape value but are important in maintaining the settlement pattern, keeping individual settlements separate and providing opportunities for green infrastructure/green corridors. Continuing pressure for high levels of development mean that maintaining gaps continues to be justified.”

In addition these settlement gaps are also considered vital by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH). Fareham Borough Council’s Core Strategy says,

“The PUSH authorities have agreed a joint policy framework which underpins the designation of settlement gaps in South Hampshire. The PUSH settlement gap designations within Fareham are known as Strategic Gaps.”

I would, therefore, contend that CS22 is highly relevant to this application and that the application is **contrary to Policy CS22**.

In June 2015 Fareham Borough Council produced their Local Plan document Development Sites & Policies. Policy DSP6 states:

“There will be a presumption against new residential development outside of the defined urban settlement boundaries”

There are three exceptional circumstances in which development under DSP6 would be permitted and none of these apply. I believe, therefore, that you should reject the Applicant’s assertion that DSP6 is out of date and assert that this application is **contrary to Policy DSP6**.

The Applicant goes to some length to justify that Policy DSP40 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.

Atii)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 a now deleted Draft Local Plan. As the councillor and county councillor for the neighbouring area I would categorically state that the planning application site is NOT well integrated.

Atiii)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.

Atv)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, impossible for the Applicant to argue that this condition is met.

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**.

Yours sincerely,

Cllr Stephen Philpott
Hampshire County Councillor - Brdgemary Division
Gosport Borough Councillor - Peel Common Ward

108 Long Drive, Gosport, PO13 0QX

On 06 May 2019 at 20:25 "e-mail stephen.philpott8" <stephen.philpott8@ntlworld.com> wrote:

Dear Resident,

Once again, apologies for the impersonal nature of this email, but I am blind copying all those who gave me their email address following the public meetings I held last September.

I am also sorry to bring you some depressing news. The Pegasus Group have submitted a further planning application on behalf of Bargate Homes. This is for an additional 125 homes on land to the west of the new Newgate Lane.

You will recall that they have already put in an application for 75 homes in the same location. That application, made last September, has yet to be determined by Fareham Borough Council.

These two applications, for a total of 200 homes, are separate and additional to the plans that emerged towards the end of 2017 to build 475 homes on land to the east of the new Newgate Lane. That proposal, which became known as HA2, was withdrawn last December, but there is every indication that it will return. So residents face the very real prospect of 675 houses being built directly onto Newgate Lane in the Borough of Fareham, but right on Gosport's doorstep.

A short distance away at Newlands Farm there is another outstanding planning application that Fareham Council has yet to decide upon. That is from a company called Hallam Land. If approved by Fareham Council this will fill up the area south of Longfield Avenue with 1,027 more houses.

These applications should not be confused with ones also being actively pursued for 350 homes on the western side of Mays Lane and a further 261 near to the cemetery in Stubbington.

Should these developments go ahead - and there is every chance they will - these extra thousands of houses will prevent a western relief road ever being built (the so-called Stubbington Bypass) and exacerbate an already appalling traffic problem. This, of course, is quite apart from all the other infrastructure these many thousands of people will require: work places; schools; hospitals etc.

You may ask why it is that so many new houses are being threatened in Stubbington when Fareham's Local Plan only makes provision for an additional 64 during the whole of its life span. It is mainly because Fareham Council lost an appeal in August 2017 and it was deemed that they did not have a demonstrable five year housing land supply - a legal requirement. And they still don't, so ever since the summer of 2017 it has been open season on Fareham so far as developers are concerned.

Whist all this is bad news for Fareham, it is a potential disaster for Gosport.

Like many of you I have opposed these applications and I have lobbied both Gosport and Hampshire Councils to do likewise. I will be writing to oppose this application too. Full details of it can be found on Fareham Council's website, but I have attached two of the documents: the Design & Access Statement and the Planning Statement, which you might not be able to open because they are very large files.

I spent a good deal of time and effort beseeching residents to write letters of opposition to the IFA2 interconnector and the HA2 proposal when it first came out and was rewarded with an enormous response. For instance 1,139 people wrote letters to oppose IFA2. Only ten wrote in favour, but Fareham Council still approved it.

I only heard about this latest planning application today. I intend to put out a newsletter as soon as I can outlining what I see as the principal arguments against the plans by Pegasus Housing Group.

Thank you for reading this.

Regards,

Cllr Stephen Philpott
Gosport Borough Councillor for Peel Common
Hampshire County Councillor for Bridgemary

On 24 October 2018 at 22:05 "e-mail stephen.philpott8" <stephen.philpott8@ntlworld.com> wrote:

Thank you for attending one (or, in some cases, both) the public meetings held during September.

Since those meetings the Pegasus Group have submitted a planning application for 75 houses on land adjacent to Newgate Lane. I have written a letter of objection to Fareham Borough Council. If you wish you can also write a letter or email.

I have blind copied all of you who left your email addresses with me at the public meetings. I am writing to let you know the latest situation regarding the ongoing development proposals on land immediately to the west of Bridgemary and Peel Common. If you do not wish to receive communications from me please let me know and I will remove your email address from my list. If you are happy to receive further communications from me on this subject then I promise I will never divulge your email address to anyone else.

You will have gathered from the meetings that I am totally opposed to development on the Gosport boundary for the reasons set out in the email below. I promise to continue to use every means to resist development, but I have little influence and no jurisdiction over the border in Fareham.

If you would like to write to me, or need further information please feel free to use my private email address or my Gosport or Hampshire email addresses: stephen.philpott@gosport.gov.uk or stephen.philpott@hants.gov.uk

Once again thank you for your support at the public meetings.

Kind regards,

Cllr Stephen Philpott

----- Original Message -----

From: "e-mail stephen.philpott8" <stephen.philpott8@ntlworld.com>

To: devcontrol@fareham.gov.uk

Date: 24 October 2018 at 16:30

Subject: Application P-18-1118-OA

Dear Sir,

In raising an objection to this application I, like the Applicant, would wish to highlight certain aspects of this application that I believe are relevant. In particular, these are: the application is clearly only part of a much larger application yet to be submitted; the host local authority are in the process of developing a

new local plan; and there is, unusually and arguably, a greater impact upon a neighbouring local authority - its community and its own local plan - than on the local authority in whose area the land stands.

An acceptance of a wider intention by the Applicant can be seen throughout the documents submitted to Fareham Borough Council (FBC): in the Planning Statement at 1.4; 1.5; 1.7; 7.21; 7.22; 7.23 and 7.42 as well as in the Applicant's Transport Assessment which goes so far as to say "a planning application has been submitted separately for the development of Newgate Lane (South) for up to 125 dwellings". So, as the Applicant has clearly set out his future intentions, it is legitimate to refer in this objection to the further proposals he intends to bring forward.

Much is made throughout the application documents of the perceived weakness of the position of FBC in respect of their existing Core Strategy as well as their emerging Local Plan, especially in the light of recently published documents by the Government. I intend in this objection to challenge the Applicant's position which seems to imply that pretty much any development anywhere in Fareham should be allowable given the so-called vulnerability of the Council.

Thirdly, the Applicant has made numerous references to land and community facilities that could be utilised by residents occupying the properties they intend to build, but in many cases these facilities are outside the Borough of Fareham and within the Borough of Gosport - especially within the borough and county wards of Peel Common and Bridgemary that I represent on Gosport Borough Council (GBC) and Hampshire County Council (HCC). In this objection I shall highlight the fundamental flaw in the Applicant's position on this and challenge their arrogance in the way in which the application has been put together.

I would also wish to challenge the veracity of statements made by the Applicant such as in paragraph 3.6 of the planning Statement which says, "The relief road has been designed with regard to the emerging residential allocation to the east known as Peel Common or 'HA2'". HCC issued an objection to the FBC Draft Local Plan (DLP) published in October last year on the basis that the Newgate Lane relief road was not designed or conceived as a road intended to facilitate house building. The justifications for the road were set out, discussed and planning consent given after extensive statutory consultation. I would invite the Applicant to review their statement and consider its accuracy.

I mentioned previously that the Applicant had set great stall in justifying the proposed development on the basis that there are nearby amenities. I pointed out that many of these are within the Borough of Gosport. I will now seek to demonstrate this by quoting from the Applicant's submission documents.

Planning Statement paragraph 2.13 says, "Local services within Bridgemary include convenience stores, a pub, take-away and places of worship, with a local centre on Carisbrooke Road."

Paragraph 2.16 says, "A selection of GP surgeries and dentists are located in Bridgemary and Stubbington".

Paragraph 2.17 says, "The nearest primary school is Peel Common (infant nursery and junior) approximately 250m south-east of the site."

Paragraph 2.17 says, "Crofton and Bridgemary are the nearest secondary schools, both of which are within 1km of the site."

Paragraph 2.20 states that "Council leisure centres are located in Fareham and south of Bridgemary".

Paragraph 2.21 identifies that "the site is within walking distance of public open spaces including HMS Collingwood playing fields and Brookers Field Recreation Ground and the Alver Valley County Park".

There are further and regular references throughout the submission documents to facilities within the Borough of Gosport. I do not dispute the accuracy, description or relevance of these references. I note, however, that the Applicant intends (see paragraph 4.4) to secure a Section 106 agreement with FBC. I also note that paragraphs 4.9 to 4.16 deal with the matter of pre-application consultation. My investigations have revealed that none of these discussions have taken place with GBC planning officers. The Applicant carried out a leaflet drop in May to addresses in my ward (alluded to in paragraph 4.15) and then held an open consultation event on 22nd May 2018 also in my Bridgemary County Division.

So an Applicant, and an application, advertised to residents in Gosport, with a consultation event held in Gosport and with a stated intention to utilise local authority and community facilities almost exclusively in Gosport has been presented for approval to FBC without any prior consultation whatsoever with GBC. I would contend that this state of affairs alone should render this application void.

However, there are other reasons - apart from blatant inaccuracies and sheer arrogance - that this application should be refused. I shall deal with them in chronological order as they appear in the Applicant's Planning Statement.

2.23 refers to "a significant number of employment opportunities" in Gosport town centre. A recent research document by the Solent Local Enterprise Partnership highlighted a 0.53 ratio of jobs to working people in Gosport. This is the second lowest in Britain. The investigation by the LEP concluded that more than 14,000 jobs would need to be created in Gosport to bring Gosport up to the average ratio of jobs to working people in the south-east.

Part 5 deals with planning policy and guidance where a number of policies within FBC's Core Strategy are mentioned. However, I would contend that in most cases these policies have been quoted selectively and out of context.

For instance, Policy CS6 (paragraph 5.7) fails to mention what it actually says about Stubbington and Hill Head. For clarity the Policy 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)"

Policy CS11 is not mentioned by the Applicant, but it says of Stubbington and Hill Head that they are identified by FBC for "small scale development within clearly laid down caveats".

Within the Core Strategy there are a number of references specifically for Stubbington and Hill Head. Paragraph 2.12 says, "The key factors shaping future development in Stubbington and Hill Head include....poor transport access....addressing the shortfalls in natural greenspace". Paragraph 2.21 on Transport says, "There are high levels of local congestion around the motorway junctions and links as well as along the A27 and the A32/B3385 to Gosport. This affects economic competitiveness, quality of life and associated poor air quality on sections of Gosport Road and Portland Street. Transport interventions will focus on reduce and manage measures, particularly along key corridors". Paragraph 3.10 says, "Portchester, Stubbington & Hill Head will play limited roles in accommodating future development." Paragraph 4.18 shows a table with the heading "Housing need/housing provision". The table shows the number of houses earmarked for Stubbington and Hill Head: 2010-2015 52 houses; 2015-2020 12 houses; 2020-2026 no houses. Paragraph 6.43 refers to the Fareham Greenspace Study (2007) and "identifies that there are significant shortfalls in open space provision in Fareham, and Stubbington and Hill Head."

I have quoted a number of paragraphs and policies from the Core Strategy that would clearly show that this application is not in accordance with these policies and should be refused. I have not yet mentioned

Policy CS22 on Strategic Gaps which is addressed at paragraphs 5.16 to 5.20 of the Applicant's Planning Statement. Once again the Applicant is seeking to mislead by being selective. The Planning Statement speaks of an Inspector's report of July 2011 implying that Policy CS22 somehow lacks credibility. However, there was a subsequent Inspector's report in May 2015 into the Examination in Public for the Fareham Local Plan Part 2 which gives a clearer and more accurate position. He said, "Although the review did not specifically take into account the route of the Stubbington bypass and the Newgate Lane improvements, there is no reason to conclude that these proposals would justify altering the boundary of the gap in those locations. Having visited the area I agree with the Council that the gap between Fareham and Stubbington is justified in order to retain visual separation and that the proposed road improvements would not justify a revision to the boundary. The Council's approach is sound."

I note that, despite trying to argue that building in the Strategic Gap (as this proposal would do) is justified, the points made in the Applicant's Planning Statement at paragraphs 5.17(a) and 5.33 would appear to accept that it is not.

Paragraph 5.22 of the Applicant's Planning Statement addresses the issue of air pollution. This is further discussed at 7.13. The assertion that there would be "no adverse impacts" in respect of air pollution needs to be challenged in the current context. Just 500m from the proposed development site is one of 23 areas identified as having dangerously high levels of nitrogen dioxide. FBC will be fully aware of this and of the urgent measures that are under consideration to address this. I need not go into detail here, but I would vigorously challenge the Applicant's complacency on this matter. FBC Environmental Health officers may well be aware of the DEFRA report published earlier this month which concluded that nitrogen dioxide levels are worse than originally thought and are "set to remain dangerously high for at least another decade."

Paragraphs 5.31 and 5.36 of the Applicant's Planning Statement give the first indication that it is their intention to challenge the entire basis of the Core Strategy. Their argument is set out in much more detail in Part 6.

In Part 6 the Applicant is arguing that a presumption in favour of development applies because FBC can neither demonstrate a five year housing land supply (5YHLS) nor pass the Housing Delivery Test set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This attempt to bypass the local planning authority is based upon temporary and transient circumstances. The inability of FBC to meet arbitrary criteria at any given point of time is presented by the Applicant as being justification enough for development that is, arguably, unsustainable. Whilst this is, in my view, wrong in itself, it also ignores the status of the neighbouring local authority and its population. I am not arguing that GBC should have a veto, but I am suggesting that they should have a say beyond that of statutory consultee. This is because the impact of any development on Newgate Lane would have a marginal, negligible and superficial impact on Fareham and Fareham residents, but a disproportionately high impact on Gosport and Gosport residents. It is the people who live in these communities that will suffer the long-term irreparable consequences of speculative, unsustainable development - and in this case that means by and large Gosport residents, not Fareham residents. The chilling irony is that GBC does have a 5YHLS and will pass the Housing Delivery Test. Furthermore, Gosport, unlike Fareham, does not have the same affordability issues. But it will be Gosport that suffers with this development, not Fareham.

It is worth mentioning too that this application is not consistent with FBC's emerging DLP either. Policy SP6 continues to support the principal of the Strategic Gap between Fareham and Bridgemary.

In conclusion I would argue that this application is not consistent with existing Core Strategy Policies CS11, CS14 and CS22 and with policy DSP2. I would also argue that it is not consistent with Policy SP6 of FBC's emerging DLP and should be refused.

Should this application be refused and go to appeal I will be demanding a much greater say on behalf of the residents I represent because an application that nakedly seeks to exploit amenities and community facilities provided by Gosport for Gosport residents without so much as a "by your leave" to GBC is totally unacceptable. Plus the impact will be far greater on Gosport than Fareham because it will be a step towards the asphyxiation of Gosport.

Yours faithfully,

Stephen Philpott
108 Long Drive
Gosport
PO13 0QX