

**A MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY BOARD  
WAS HELD ON 7 JULY 2021**

Councillor Burgess

Councillors Bateman, Beavis, Blackman, Carter, Chegwyn (Substituting for Westerby), Earle, Mrs Furlong, Hammond, Hutchison, Miss Kelly, Meenaghan and Raffaelli

**75. APOLOGIES FOR NON-ATTENDANCE**

An apology for non attendance was received from Councillor Westerby.

**76. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN**

RESOLVED: That Councillor Furlong be elected as Vice-Chairman of the Community Board.

**77. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

**78. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY BOARD HELD ON 18TH MARCH 2021**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2021 be signed as a true and correct record.

**79. DEPUTATIONS - STANDING ORDER 3.4**

**80. PUBLIC QUESTIONS - STANDING ORDER 3.5**

A Public Question was received from Mr Jim More

Mr More's question was:

*Chairman and Councillors of the Board, at item 11 on the Agenda you are asked to endorse the proposed allocation of land at Manor Way as 60% allotments and 40% rest garden. The proposal before you shows the rest garden at the front of the site including part of a garden in Olave Close that Council purchased to resolve an issue about treatment of Japanese knotweed. To treat the knotweed problem it was agreed on 6 Sept 2017 Community Board to siphon off money that was allocated for allotment improvements, which was the balance of the proceeds from the sale of statutory allotments at Camden allotment site in the sum of £64,970. At the time this funding was earmarked to treat knotweed at Camden allotment site as well, but this has not happened. Given that the proposed area for the rest garden includes the area that has been treated for knotweed and is not in the proposed area earmarked for allotments, then I ask that you revoke the decision made on 6 Sept 2017 and repatriate the funding for improvements to allotment sites that are desperately needed in the Borough. Finally, while it is not discussed in the report before you, I ask that the new Manor Way allotment site is designated as a Statutory allotment site in accordance with Allotment Acts especially since the other site in Lee is rented, therefore Temporary and not protected by the Allotment Acts.*

The resolution at the Community Board on 6 September 2017 was: "That the utilisation of funds from the capital receipt for Camden Allotments for the treatment of Japanese Knotweed at Camden Allotments and the recently acquired community space in Manor Way, Lee-on-the-Solent be approved" and that was carried.

Since then, and in line with that resolution, GBC has spent £52,294 on knotweed treatment as part of the Manor Way Scheme plus £10,000 on purchasing an adjoining area at Olave Close in order to eradicate the knotweed and prepare that space for community use – a total of £62,294. Additionally, there is currently a further £55,000 earmarked for treating Knotweed at the Camden allotment site should the alternative methods presently being investigated to deal with the knotweed, fail to address the problem.

With regard to the proposal to designate the new Manor Way allotment site as a Statutory Allotment Site in accordance with the Allotments Act 1925, that is a welcome proposal which is in keeping with the discussions GBC has been having with the Stake Holders Working Group with regard to GBC allotments and I am happy to propose a recommendation to the Community Board that they approve that, subject to final planning approval, GBC will then issue a notice to designate the new Manor Way allotment as a Statutory Allotment.

## **81. MANOR WAY OPEN SPACE**

Consideration was given to a report by the Head of Streetscene seeking approval for the provision of a new Allotment site and Rest garden for the open space at Manor way, Lee on the Solent based on the results from the consultation regarding the percentage of split between Allotment site and Rest Garden.

A Member expressed concern that the results of the consultation had not been considered by the Allotments Stakeholders Consultative Group prior to their consideration by the Board and a result proposed that the report be deferred until the Group had had the opportunity to consider the results of the consultation and input as necessary.

The Board was advised that the consultation had been on the proportional split of the space between rest garden and allotments. The project would now move forward to the statutory planning process for final consideration and approval and the final details for the site would be drawn together.

Members recognised that the proposals had been through a number of consultations and it was important that the project progress.

In answer to a Member's question the Board was advised that the waiting list for a Lee on the Solent allotment was comprised of residents across the Borough, and were not limited to residents of Lee on the Solent.

Members welcomed the decision to provide additional allotments and rest space for Lee on the Solent and it was reiterated that the final design approval would be determined through the planning process and requested that consideration be given to ensure there was adequate security to prevent Anti-Social Behaviour and suitable disabled parking was

Community Board  
7 July 2021

provided. It was important to ensure that adequate security measures were put in for the management of the allotments from their first let.

A Member expressed concern that of the 374 responses to the consultation only 181 felt that the proposal was acceptable and that the majority of the responders did not and as a result felt that the views of the public should be considered further, in addition to the Consultative Group.

In addition, they question why the proposal presented included a rest garden when only 65 of the 374 responders welcomed it.

It was clarified that a rest garden was a quiet space for contemplation and that the inclusion of it was already agreed, the most recent consultation was purely for the consideration of percentage split between allotments and the rest garden.

A Member advised that the rest garden would be appreciated as it was a space that could be enjoyed that was away from the winds of the sea front and the uneven terrain of the Alver Valley and was a good resting place when returning from visiting shops.

A Member proposed an additional amendment that the residents currently on the waiting list for allotments at Lee on the Solent be written to establish if they still wanted a plot and that they be invited to pay a deposit to secure a plot on the site, ensuring that there was still the demand and that the site be fully occupied as soon as it was ready.

It was advised that this was an operational matter and did not impact on the proposal and it would not be appropriate to include as part of the recommendation but that it be noted in the minutes for action by the Head of Streetscene.

Members reiterated the importance of the facilities on the site and advised that there was support from residents for the project and that it was uplift to the area, which was an excellent site for the proposals. Members also recognised the mental health benefits of outdoor space, particularly after a difficult year.

A Member questioned how the proposal could be described as having overwhelming support when there were only 374 respondees to the consultation and only 65 of those supported the rest garden.

A Member questioned that appendix b of the report for consideration was a plan that included toilets and a store and questioned whether these were confirmed parts of the proposal. The Board was advised that the plan was indicative of what could be achieved and that the final detail would be considered, taking on board the consultation results and feedback from the consultative group to help determine the final plan for the site and the final proposal. The Board was requested to consider the split between allotments and the rest garden at this stage.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Board authorise Gosport Borough Council to proceed with the provision of a new Allotment site and Rest Garden based on a percentage split of 60/40, 60% Allotment site and 40% Rest Garden.

## **82. RISK UNDERWRITING FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE FLOOD DEFENCE SCHEME AT ALVERSTOKE**

Consideration was given to a report by the Head of Streetscene regarding risk underwriting for the construction of the flood defence scheme at Alverstoke.

A Member advised that they had consulted Mott MacDonalds who had advised that it was very unusual to have a contingency plan such as the one proposed in place and that it was not usual practice.

They also questioned why the risk was that of the Council's and not the company undertaking the work.

The Board was advised that it was usual to have such a contingency in place and that it was usual to consider that there be a risk from unforeseen circumstances like poor ground conditions and that it was the correct thing to do to put aside a contingency for these to ensure there was no delay in the work process and funds were available to address any issues that might occur.

In answer to a Member's question the Board was advised that 20% was the minimum required for such a contingency and 30% was ideal.

The Board was also advised that it was standard to have such a risk pot incase unforeseen circumstances occurred and that in most circumstances it would be used, the Board also advised that it was for the client to bear the risk.

The Board was advised that the contractor would need to justify the use of the risk pot before any of it was released.

**RESOLVED:** That the Board gave formal support of the risk underwriting by the Council for costs in excess of the current approved funding, allocated to the Council by the Environment Agency (EA) and other contributors, for the scheme.

That the Board referred the report to Policy and Organisation Board for the provision of financial allocation of the risk underwriting for the Alverstoke Coastal Defence Scheme at the recommended 30% contingency level (£212,269), with a minimum of 20% contingency level (£108,600), should costs be in excess of the current approved funding.

## **83. COASTAL PARTNERS, THE NOW AND THE FUTURE**

Consideration was given to a report by the Head of Streetscene seeking approval for the Coastal Partners to extend the Partnership to include Chichester District Council as an additional partner and agree in principal to extending further should any other Hampshire or Isle of Wight local authorities wish to join.

**RESOLVED:** That the Community board approved the following:

1. The extension of the Coastal Partners to include Chichester District Council as a member.
2. That the Head of Streetscene in consultation with the Borough Solicitor is given delegated authority to enter into a Section 113 Local Government Act 1972 Shared

Service Agreement between Gosport Borough Council, Havant Borough Council, Portsmouth City Council, Fareham Borough Council and Chichester District Council.

3. That the Head of the Coastal Partners continues to discuss and explore with other local authorities in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight whether there is mutual benefit of extending the Coastal Partners further should the opportunity arise.

#### **84. CONTINGENCY PLANS FOR AQUATIC WILDLIFE IN THE BOROUGH TO ADOPT TO CLIMATE CHANGE**

The Board was advised that following the publication of the report the £70,000 earmarked for the Elmore Lake had been reviewed as there were alternative measures to support the improvement of it. The funds were to be redistributed to the Splash Park improvements. Elmore Lake maintenance would become an operational responsibility of Streetscene.

A Member advised that the Elmore Lake was well looked after by a committed group of volunteers.

In answer to a Members question, the Board was advised that the proposal was to remove the wall between the two lakes at Walpole Lake. This would allow water in both lakes to be replaced when the sluice gates were open and would help to address some of the odour issues. The Board was advised that the model yacht club had been consulted and that there was the intention to replace the wall and path with a Boardwalk across the lake.

The Board was advised that there was various consents that would need to be granted before this work was undertaken, the pond was located in a SSSI and consent, restricted by timing would need to be granted from Natural England and the license granted for the work would reflect that.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that report earmarked as due in June 2021 was still outstanding and would be chased. In addition, it was also confirmed that the report would be an update to the one received from Natural England in 2010.

A Member advised the Board that the problems with Stoke Lake could be predicted as they occurred when the weather was warm and there was a neap tide and that the distress caused by the fish dying could be alleviated by reopening the sluice gates that had been welded shut.

The Board was advised that the Coastal Partnership were working on a report detailing the condition of the sluice gate and it was anticipated that this would be ready in the autumn. Hampshire County Council had admitted that they had held copies of the deeds for the gate, but that these were now missing and as a result it was difficult to prove who owned the gate.

A Member advised that there was email documentation that indicated Gosport Borough Council had previously maintained the gates and offered to provide copies of them.

Members acknowledged that Board reports such as these showed close working links between the Climate Change and Community Boards.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that the Climate Change Officer could be tasked with identifying and investigating any other areas of water such as those located in the oil fuel depot.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Board notes the findings of the report, as described in Appendix A.
2. That the actions identified in Appendix A are taken forward by Streetscene, with further reports to the Board on these as appropriate.

**85. ADDITIONAL REFUSE COLLECTION ROUND**

Consideration was given to a report by the Head of Streetscene seeking approval for an additional waste collection round and associated increase in budget costs.

The Board was advised of an addendum to the report in that at point 2.4 the figure of £2188 should be replaced with £1906.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that there had been a delay in proposing the amendment as it was hoped that the legislation for the standardisation of refuse and waste collection would be released. It had been difficult to consider making a decision when the outcome may not be compatible with unknown plans. The situation was now such that a decision needed to be taken to ensure that the refuse collection service was not compromised.

Members expressed concern at the current recycling rates in the Borough and it was explained to the Board that currently domestic waste was sent for incineration and that recycling waste was sent to the sorting facility. The Borough currently had an extremely low rate of waste being sent to landfill, which mainly was mainly when residents placed non recyclables into the recycling bins.

The Board was advised that Gosport had lower than average rate of domestic tonnage and a Member requested that further details on the tonnage of the waste in Gosport be provided of the details of the amount produced.

Members recognised the importance of the refuse collection service remaining secure as it had been shown in other authorities that there was significant disruption if services were interrupted.

Members recognised that the proposal was important and recommended that any Members offered the opportunity should visit the recycling centre in Portsmouth.  
If the opportunity arose as it was a fascinating insight into process of recycling.

Members were advised that when the 'brown' garden waste bins were not being collected the additional truck was used as a shuttle to reduce the turnaround from the waste disposal site.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Board approved an additional waste collection round for Gosport and Lee-on-the-Solent as a result of operational requirements as detailed in option 1 of the report.

2. That this report is forwarded to the Policy & Organisation Board to approve the additional funding as laid out in this report.

## **86. STOKES BAY D-DAY WAR MEMORIAL**

Consideration was given to a report by the Head of Streetscene updating the Board on the progress of the Stokes bay D-Day War Memorial project; seeking approval of the design in principle and agreement that a planning application should now be prepared and submitted for planning approval.

A Member questioned whether the Canadians had been consulted on the proposal. The Board was advised that a soft stakeholder consultation had been undertaken and this would be followed up with more detailed design consultation as part of the formal planning application.

The Board was advised that the work undertaken by Hampshire County Council formed part of a service level agreement and that the committed spend up to tender was £16000. The Board was advised that this allowed the use of a team of specialists in design and construction of such memorials.

A Member advised the Board that they welcomed the memorial and recognised the importance that it paid tribute to the D-Day Veterans as there were very few left. It was recognised that the 75 anniversary had been missed for the memorial and felt that something significant and special should be erected.

Members questioned why the design had been produced by Hampshire County Council and not veterans, service personnel and the community of Gosport. Concern was also expressed that the proposal would generate Anti-Social Behaviour.

An amendment was proposed and seconded

That the community of Gosport, serving personnel and veterans groups are given the opportunity and support to form a working group to design and raise adequate funding for a D-Day memorial to mark the 80<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Operation Overlord.

A Member advised that the experiences of those onboard the ships on the day was harrowing and that the memorial should be fitting to the horror experienced.

A Member advised that the proposal was acceptable and that focus should be given to ensuring a memorial was in place as soon as possible to honour the Veterans that were still alive.

Members also expressed the importance of ensuring the security of any memorial.

The Board was advised that the detail still needed to be finalised and this would include final design, security, maintenance and materials and at this stage it was still a concept.

The Board was advised that discussions had been held with the D-Day Fellowship, the Friends of Stokes Bay and the Anglesey Conservation Group and that they were all in support of the concept.

Community Board  
7 July 2021

A Members advised that they felt the chocolate blocks should be included as they were a fundamental part of the day and ideas for the memorial should be sought from across the community.

Members also felt that the Community should be given the opportunity to contribute to allow their loved ones names to appear on the memorial, in a similar way to the blocks on the millennium walkway as this had proved successful and that it doing so, the community would have a sense of belonging and ownership of the memorial.

Members felt that as the 75<sup>th</sup> Anniversary had been missed, time and effort should be spent on ensuring the 80<sup>th</sup> Anniversary was appropriate and special and that the community designed memorial fitted in to this.

The Board recognised that there would be a contribution from the tax payer and a Member advised the Board the D Day Fellowship had welcomed the concept of an integrated memorial 8 years ago, with no result as yet.

Members reiterated their desire for the community to be involved.

The amendment proposed was seconded and a vote was subsequently taken.

The proposed amendment was lost.

The Board then voted on the recommendation.

RESOLVED:

That the Board:

1. Noted the progress of the Stokes Bay D-Day War Memorial project;
2. Approved in principle the concept design as prepared by Hampshire County Council; and
3. Agreed that Officers should now prepare a planning application on that basis for planning approval.

## **87. STOKES BAY SPLASH PARK**

Consideration was given to a report by the Head of Streetscene seeking approval for a further £155,000 in addition to the £275,000 funding already approved as part of the 2021/22 Gosport Borough Council Capital programme to refurbish and upgrade the Stokes Bay Splash Park.

RESOLVED:

That the Board approved an additional £155,000 funding be allocated for an enhanced refurbishment and upgrade of the Stokes bay Splash Park.

That the Board agreed to forward the report to the Policy and Organisation Board to approve the additional funding.

## **88. ANY OTHER ITEMS**



Community Board  
7 July 2021

There were none.

**CHAIRMAN**

Concluded at 7.37 pm