

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** John Jeffrey [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 01 March 2015 11:36  
**To:** Planning Policy  
**Subject:** Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 2 - Development Sites and Policies

I have seen details of the 29 October 2014 FBC response to Lidl's application , and I am concerned that much of what I read makes little or no sense.

- A food store 'is not classified as an employment use' - this is Alice in Wonderland language. How are the people who work in a food store classified, if not as 'in employment'?
- There is no 'overriding unmet retail need'. 'Overriding' in this context is not defined, but the fact that over 80% of Portchester residents carry out their food shopping outside the town is surely relevant?
- 'The fact that the site is currently well used as a car park does not prevent its use for some retail development'. This is undeniable, but barely credible as a sensible line to follow. The fact that it **could** be done does not imply that it makes any kind of sense to do it. The availability of this parking is a major factor, perhaps even the most important one, in attracting shoppers to Portchester. To degrade it would be to condemn the shops already there to a slow - or not so slow - disappearance of their business. You state that a Lidl store 400 metres away **may** have a significant adverse impact on Portchester District Centre, but a removal of parking facilities in the centre itself most assuredly **would** have such an impact.

Thus I can find no logical basis for any of the 3 reasons stated for refusing the Lidl application.

Sincerely,  
J Jeffrey