

**A MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD
WAS HELD ON 14 MARCH 2018**

Subject to Approval

The Mayor (Councillor Mrs Batty) (ex-officio), Councillors Hook (P), Ms Ballard (P), Bateman (P), Beavis (P), Mrs Cully (P), Ms Diffey, Edgar, Farr (P), Mrs Forder, Mrs Furlong, Mrs Huggins (P), Miss Kelly (P), Philpott (P), Mrs Prickett, Raffaelli (P).

It was reported that in accordance with Standing Order 2.3.6 Councillors Hook, Mrs Hook, Jessop Earle and Hammond had been nominated to replace Councillors Edgar, Mrs Forder, Mrs Furlong, Ms Diffey and Mrs Prickett respectively for this meeting

38. APOLOGIES

Apologies for inability to attend were received from the Mayor, Councillor Ms Diffey, Councillor Edgar, Mrs Forder, Mrs Furlong and Councillor Mrs Prickett.

39. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Hook and Mrs Hook declared a non-pecuniary interest in the Gosport Town Centre and Waterfront SPD as they owned a business on the High Street. They advised at the point the High Street was discussed, they would not take part in any discussion.

40. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD HELD ON 31 JANUARY 2018

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Economic Development Board meeting held on 31 January 2018 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a true and correct record.

41. DEPUTATIONS

A deputation had been received on agenda item 6 -Gosport Waterfront and Town Centre SPD: Adopted Version.

42. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no public questions.

PART II

43. GOSPORT WATERFRONT AND TOWN CENTRE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD): ADOPTED VERSION

Consideration was given to the report of the Deputy Head of Planning Services, (Policy) requesting that consideration be given to adopting the Gosport Waterfront and Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document, as set out in Appendix 1.

Kathy Azopadi was invited to address the Board. She advised that the reason for her deputation was that she had attended the consultation and responded to it and felt that when reading the report insufficient provision had been given to cycling. She advised the Board that there could be stronger recognition for the importance of cycling in the Town.

The Board was advised that Gosport had a cycle rate where at least 75% of residents

cycled once a month and that many towns and cities had invested heavily to try and achieve similar results. The Board was advised that it was hoped that Gosport would have more aspirations for cyclists and cycle routes and that the SPD could help improve bad elements of the current network and make areas safer.

Ms Azopadi advised the Board that electric bikes, trikes and mobility scooters were allowing more people to stay active longer and that electric bikes in particular supported this.

The Board was advised that the importance of cycling should not be overlooked and that benefits it could bring to the Borough and the economy were important. The Board was advised that cycle ways should run parallel to pedestrian paths to provide opportunities for cyclists to enjoy routes and view points, and that the separation of the two separate paths would help to remove any potential conflict before it arose.

The Board was advised that key elements that should be included in the SPD were, examining the storage provision for bicycles at the ferry. It was requested that different types of cycle storage be installed as many people were reluctant to use two tier storage racks.

Ms Azopadi requested that more detail be given to proposals for Mumby Road as there was a large number of accidents on the road and it requested that consideration be given to the removal of the free car parking spaces along Mumby Road and South Street, as there was additional capacity within the car parks. This would allow for nicer streetscapes and safer cycle lanes and it was also requested that consideration be given to the development of a cycle strategy.

In answer to a Members question, Ms Azopadi advised the Board that she had responded to the consultation and that some, but not all of her comments had been included in the SPD. She advised that she would have liked to have seen more reference and inclusion for policies on cycle parks, shared use paths, green infrastructure, green space access and proposals for Walpole Park. The Board was advised that the Ex estuary in Devon previously only had walking routes and that this had created conflict as cycle users would also use the pedestrian path. This had been resolved by the addition of a cycle path, on a lower route but with viewpoints to allow for stops and picnics. The Board was advised that to do this in Gosport may require a change in policies or bylaws but advised that it may help reduce traffic on the A32 as currently there was no safe route for cyclists to the ferry.

The Board was advised that 11,000 cyclists passed through the continental ferry port in Portsmouth annually, many travelling onwards to the South Downs National Park and the New Forest to cycle. It was felt that Gosport and Portsmouth could capture cyclist tourism and benefit from it economically.

The Deputy Head of Planning, (Policy) advised that Ms Azopadi's comments had been included in the accompanying summary and analysis of consultation responses document and that a section on potential cycle improvements could be found on page 39 of the SPD and that it specifically mentioned the enhancement of provision, including links with wider areas and the national cycling routes, cycle parking, cycle safety, signage, cycle crossings and provision at junctions, surfacing and improvements of Mumby Road and South Street.

The Board was advised that the role of the SPD was not to provide the detailed points of plans but to provide a vision for the Town Centre and that cycling was important to this and

had been recognised.

The Deputy Head of Planning (Policy) advised the Board that there were a number of small amendments proposed to the SPD, circulated as an addendum to Members of the Board to improve clarity, consistency and address typographical errors in the document. Members welcomed the clarification that the Falklands Gardens would not be redeveloped.

The Chairman advised the Board that he wished to consider each element of the document individually to allow Members to comment.

Housing

The Chairman advised that the Supplementary Planning Document was supplemental to the Local Plan 2011-2029, which had already been agreed. Within the next 18 months to two years the opportunity would arise to statutorily review the Local Plan with the option to extend it until 2036.

Some members expressed concern and objected to the proposals that included provision for 700-900 properties and advised that members of the public had raised concern about this proposal and that with the addition of properties at Haslar and Daedalus, the infrastructure of the Borough would not be able to cope. Members advised that whilst the plan stated that public transport would be used, in reality it would not.

The Board was advised that the proposals for 700-900 properties for the Town Centre had been included within the Local Plan, which had been previously agreed by the Council within Policy LP4 of the Local Plan. It was therefore not a matter for the consideration of the Board as the SPD was a supplementary document to the Local Plan.

The Chairman advised the Board that the document did not state in any form that there would be 1000 luxury flats.

The Board was advised that the Local Plan, including Policy LP4 had been unanimously agreed by the Council and it stated that the required properties would be a mix of housing and property types required, including affordable homes, sheltered accommodation, accommodation for the elderly, and extra care provision all as detailed in the SPD.

A Member advised the Board that the SPD was the beginnings of putting flesh on to the bones of the Local Plan and that it created a vision for the future. It was felt that all Members wished to see the High Street and waterfront area thriving and used to its full potential. The Board was advised that a large number of the properties in the Town Centre were not owned by the Borough Council but that the SPD created the vision for what was desired for the area.

The Board was advised that Councils were obligated to hold a provision for 5 years' worth of housing stock and that if the 700-900 properties were not located within the Town Centre, they would still need to be located within the Borough. The Council were in a strong position in comparison to other authorities who did not have such supply and were as a result now being subjected to planning applications for properties in areas in which they were not desired. It was noted that planning powers were being removed from Local Authorities who were not approving and supplying suitable housing stock and in having a robust plan in Gosport, the decision making powers would remain within the Authority.

A Member questioned the provision of medical care and infrastructure for the additional properties and was advised that the Inspectorate had examined the Local Plan in 2015 and deemed it sound, not only for 2015 but until 2029 and it was considered robust.

It was reiterated that nothing additional in the form of properties was being added to the existing proposals in the Local Plan and it had included the provision for a mixture of types of properties. The Board was advised that the provision for additional GP's surgeries was the responsibility of NHS England and that most surgeries were private businesses. One of the key problems with doctor's surgeries in Gosport was attracting GP's to work in the Borough. It was hoped that improvements to the Borough and the Town Centre would help make the Borough more attractive to GP's.

The Chairman advised the Board that there was provision for improved infrastructure as the Local Plan required there to be provisions for analysis of flood risk, high quality outdoor space, provision for sewerage and water and utilities, but that these would all be delivered by private companies.

CAR PARKING

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that the multi-storey car park had been mentioned as an option that could be looked at in terms of feasibility, amenity of residents, townscape. No site had been identified and it had been included only as a potential option.

The Board was advised that parking surveys, undertaken at various times in 2016 and 2017, had shown that at the peak time (3/12/16) there was a total of 496 publicly available spaces unoccupied which included 332 empty spaces in the Council's town centre car parks. There was a lot of unused space that could be better used.

A Member advised the Board that they had concerns at the combination of the car parks to be removed and redeveloped as many of them were close to the town centre and facilitated access for those that could not walk great distances or were disabled.

It was suggested that the top tier of the Walpole Park Car Park (adjacent South Street) be designated as short stay and the bottom remain long stay and that a car parking strategy be introduced. Concern was also expressed that a number of the car parks that serviced the Waterside Medical Centre were listed as those potentially being redeveloped and that the removal of the Mumby Road lorry park would cause lorries to queue and park outside residential properties.

The Board was advised that the proposals for amendments to North Cross Street would improve and enhance the frontages of the area, reinstating the shopping area.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that the car parks situated at Morrisons and Aldi had been included as they were facilitators in the provision of linked trips to the High Street, with people visiting the supermarket and shopping. The Board was advised that consideration had also been given to those spaces available at the Cooperage and Haslar Marina

BUS STATION

The Chairman advised the Board that the Bus Station site had been marketed and that any development that was brought forward would be the subject of a full and open discussion and consultation with the public on any proposals.

Members advised that they felt that members of the public had indicated their wish not to see a high-rise residential property on the bus station site and expressed concern that £7million had recently been used to extend the bus route, without improving the bus station.

Members expressed concern that a high rise building would overshadow the Falklands Gardens and interrupt the views of existing residents. It was also advised that the existing high-rise buildings were subject to interference by the high winds in that location.

Some Members felt that the site should be used as a hub incorporating facilities for cyclists and pedestrians combining a visitor's centre and the tourist information centre and providing a start point to allow people to enjoy the historical tourist elements of the Borough.

The Board was advised that any proposal would need to be presented to and approved by the Regulatory Board and that there were many different design options available that could be considered. Members appreciated that there was a desire to retain the open elements of the site. It was also recognised that a key factor in the redevelopment of the site would be securing the funding to allow the development to proceed. It was acknowledged that a key factor of this would be the inclusion of a residential element as without it, redevelopment would not be viable.

Members agreed that there was no wish for the bus station to remain in its current form.

It was reiterated to the Board that there was no plans currently proposed and that when any were forthcoming, they would be subject to consultation and the Regulatory process.

The Board was advised that the £7million extension to the BRT route had been a provision awarded to the County Council from central Government for the specific use of extending the BRT; the money had never been available for any redevelopment works.

The Board was advised that the ferry ticket office remained an integral part of the site and that discussions would be held with the ferry company about its relocation and siting within the proposal.

It was recognised that all Members agreed that the Falklands Gardens should not be overshadowed and that there would be a provision for a transport interchange and that given the location of the site, it was important that any proposal was suitable for the site.

Members advised that they felt the presumption of a tower block had derived from the listing of 95 residential units as part of the marketing of the site. The Board was advised that this was to test the market for potential developers to see what proposals might be forthcoming. It was reiterated that any proposal would be subject to the planning process and be subject to consultation and would need to be viable, and valuable to all.

FALKLANDS GARDENS

Members felt that there was an opportunity to enhance the gardens, perhaps including a

visitor's area, some enhanced planting and some more detailed information regarding the history of the gardens and its previous uses and links to chandlery and the chain ferry.

It was reiterated to the Board that there had never been any intention to redevelop the gardens and that the purpose of them was to provide a shrine to remember the conflict and those that lost their lives. It was reiterated that they were an integral part of the waterfront and that there was potential to enhance them, but they would not be redeveloped.

It was recognised that the gardens were the gateway to Gosport and that their importance as a memorial would not be forgotten.

ROYAL CLARENCE YARD

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that enhanced signage, including brown tourist signs could be included in the proposal. It was hoped that the walkway could be extended to meet the Millennium walk.

HIGH STREET

Councillors Hook and Mrs Hook declared a non-pecuniary interest in the item, remained in the room but took no part in the discussion of the subject.

Members felt that it was unfortunate that the SPD could not deliver the high level retail desired but welcomed the proposal to develop the cultural square and build on the value of the Discovery Centre. The concept of a later opening facility for the Town Centre was welcomed as was the continuation of the developments started as a result of the Portas money. Works undertaken included a new palette for the High Street and additional bicycle racks and seating. There were more aspirations linked to this but funding had not been forthcoming.

Members acknowledged that High Streets across the country were suffering a down turn and that it was key that Gosport looked at the SPD as a whole to help address this. The importance of the Town Centre and Waterfront to this was recognised.

WATERSIDE

Members welcomed that the centre provided a valuable service in times of austerity and hardship. It was welcomed that the site was linked to Coates Road and that the SPD providing a vision for the future of the site.

FORMER POLICE STATION SITE

Councillors Hook and Mrs Hook declared a non-pecuniary interest in the item, remained in the room but took no part in the discussion of the subject.

Members were comfortable with residential proposals for the site.

PRECINCT

A Members advised that there was some good uses of the site and would welcome its retention.

TRINITY GREEN

Members welcomed that the potential development on the green space had been removed. The importance of green living was highlighted and members of the public had welcomed that it would remain.

Some Members expressed concern at the potential for a permanent café on the site adjacent to Harbour Towers, it was recognised that it was suitable for seasonal events such as the marine festival, but it was felt that it was not appropriate for the entire year. It was felt that the Bus Station site would provide a more suitable location for a permanent facility.

The Board was advised that if Barclay House were to be developed the SPD states that appropriate arrangements would need to be made by those that currently occupy the buildings.

HASLAR MARINA

Members welcomed that the training that Gosport provided was now being matched with employment opportunities. It was acknowledged that Gosport provided outstanding levels of training in the marine industry and opportunities and jobs to match were welcome. It was also acknowledged that this also had the potential to reduce traffic on the A32.

GOSPORT LINES

Members welcomed the opportunity to facilitate walking the whole of the lines and recognised that there was a need to bring capital in to progress improvements. It was acknowledged that there may need to be an additional bridge to provide access and that heritage lottery funding may be appropriate to fund works.

Members acknowledged that there were difficulties with the negotiations with the Defence Infrastructure Organisation to release land, but this was common place in negotiations with them.

Members concluded by requesting that the ferry be clearly labelled as a pedestrian and cycle ferry in the SPD so that it was clear that there was no car ferry provision.

The Chairman advised that he welcomed any amendments to the recommendation and that he would adjourn the meeting to allow any amendments to be tabled.

The meeting was adjourned at 20.03 and reconvened at 20.14.

It was proposed and seconded that page 73 of the SPD be amended so that Clarence Road and North Cross Street Car Parks be retained as car parks in the interest of helping the less able users access the High Street and the Waterside Medical Centre.

Members debated the proposed amendment. It was agreed that careful consideration needed to be given to the future use of the car parks and that liaison needed to occur with the medical centre to establish a greater understanding of the provision used and required. It was felt that the provision for disabled drivers needed to be considered, but also that consideration needed to be given to the spaces available at the surgery and further afield.

at the Cooperage.

Members acknowledged that the proposals for North Cross Street would enhance the area, in terms of frontage and street scene, and that this would also need to be a consideration.

Some Members expressed concern that the proposal was to remove a number of short stay car parks and the Board was advised that the car parking study had covered different times of the year, including Christmas.

The Board agreed that the removal of any car park needed careful consideration and that it was important that discussions took place with the medical centre. Members felt that no agreement for the removal of car parks should take place until further consideration had been given. It was suggested that the amendment be altered to require the Town Centre Car Parking Strategy to be in place before any car parking sites were released for development.

It was proposed and seconded that that the SPD be amended on page 73 that there would not be any development of the Car Parks in the Town Centre, including South Street, until a Town Centre Car Parking Strategy was in place.

This was unanimously agreed by the Board.

It was proposed and seconded that on Page 83 of the SPD the paragraph detailing the space between Harbour Tower and the Millennium promenade be replaced with 'That the use of the space between the Millennium promenade and Harbour Tower is not a permanent building but can be used seasonally and for events such as the Gosport Marine Festival.

Members discussed the amendment, it was recognised that there may be provision for a permanent facility within the Bus Station redevelopment and that residents were concerned that a permanent facility in the location would be detrimental to the amenity of residents and cause harm. It was hoped that any facility could be seasonal, similar to Southsea sea front. The Board also discussed the proposal for a temporary building on the site, such as a pod. The Board also recognised the importance of allowing correct access to the tower by the emergency services.

It was reiterated that any proposal for a building would need to be considered by the Regulatory Board and concern was expressed that the removal of the provision would be detrimental to the wider proposals. It was suggested that a more comprehensive decision on the facility could be made following a more detailed proposal being agreed for the bus station site.

The proposed amendment was put to the Board and was subsequently lost.

Members debated the provision for cycling within the SPD. It was reiterated to the Board that the document contained provision for cycle ways, improvements to Mumby Road and South Street, the linking of routes to the national cycle ways and improved signage.

It was suggested that a Cycle Strategy was included within the proposal. The Board was advised that the proposed realm audit work would consider the facilities for cyclists and

would audit any proposals.

It was proposed and seconded that an amendment be made the second paragraph to read;

The proposed public realm work and cycle strategy will consider opportunities and improvements to the quality of the network.

This was subsequently agreed.

A vote was taken on the recommendation to adopt the SPD, subject to the amendments agreed above and those presented by the Deputy Head of Planning Services, (Policy) at the beginning of the item. This was agreed.

RESOLVED: That the Gosport Waterfront and Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document as set out in Appendix 1 of the report and agreed approved amendments including those identified by the Deputy Head of Planning (Policy) and those proposed and agreed by the Board.

44 ADOPTION OF PROPOSED CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL, HASLAR BARRACKS (FORMER IMMIGRATION HOLDING CENTRE)

Consideration was given to the report of the Conservation and Design Manager recommending the adoption of the Haslar Barracks Conservation Area Appraisal, as set out in Appendix A.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that the Ministry of Justice had had longer than the six week statutory period to apply for a judicial review and the Board was advised by the Borough Solicitor that a public bodies were unlikely to be granted an extension to this time period if they had not applied within time.

The Board was advised that since the designation of the site, meetings had been undertaken with the Ministry of Justice and that they now had an understanding of the designation and any implications it presented. It was important to acknowledge that the designation did not preclude development of the site.

In 2017 a request had been made to list some of the buildings. Historic England did not feel that was appropriate and this was the subject of an appeal. Notwithstanding this, included in the appendices to the report was a letter from Historic England advising that they fully supported the proposal for the site to be designated as a Conservation Area.

RESOLVED: That the Haslar Barracks Conservation Area Appraisal to support Policy LP12 of the adopted Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011 to 2029 and as a material consideration when determining planning applications be adopted.

45. ANY OTHER ITEMS

The meeting concluded at 9.05pm

CHAIRMAN