

With Reference to CROWN/2026/0000005I object to this application on the following grounds

- 1) There are significant changes to the site post public engagement
- 2) The expanded works cause a loss of housing opportunities in a town that is far below its target of accommodation creation
- 3) Heritage scale and design. There is a significant impact to the area with this amended work affecting an area of Historic significance, the impact of the work will be colossal.
- 4) Transport assessment. This is inadequate, it even quote a bus service which doesn't exist and doesn't even have a provider!
- 5) Ecosystems and Protected species. These EXTENDED works are a danger to the wildlife of the Solent area, including the maritime wild life. There has been no assessment of the bat population impact
- 5) Flood risk. the extended works are in an area prone to flood and have to demonstrate flood resilience throughout the life time of the development
- 6) Pressure on local health services. Gosport is an under-resourced Primary care area and the impact of 600 people on a broken system will be significant. The proposal is ambiguous by saying that no emergency care will be routed to local hospitals only in exceptional circumstances and that comprehensive on-site care will minimise pressure on local NHS services. However, paragraph 3.25 states that the unpublished Health Needs Assessment has identified that 4.1% of detained people will require treatment at local hospitals.
- 7) Noise and disturbance. The application does not adequately assess the potential effect on nearby residents of vehicle movements, engines, doors, security activity, lighting, staff movements and other operational noise during night-time and early-morning hours.
- 8) Operational Turnover. The Planning Statement indicates that detained people will leave the site by vehicle, but it is unclear whether this commitment extends to people released on immigration bail and, if so, where they would be taken. Transporting someone to Gosport Ferry, a railway station or

another public transport interchange would not necessarily remove that individual from the

local area