

**A MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD
WAS HELD ON 17 NOVEMBER 2021**

The Mayor Councillor Burgess

Councillors Philpott, Bateman, Beavis, Casey, Hutchison, Johnston, Mrs Jones, Miss Kelly, Pepper and Scard

Part II Minutes

75. LOCAL CYCLING AND WALKING INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN - GBC RESPONSE TO HCC CONSULTATION

Consideration was given to a report of the Manager of Planning Policy.

Councillor Westerby addressed the Board as Ward Councillor She advised that she had been talking to residents and businesses in Royal Clarence Yard (RCY).

The report was welcome, but it was felt that there was a missed opportunity on route 268 to take the path directly through the RCY. Doing this would increase footfall in the area and help to support business potential.

The frontage of RCY was large and wide and ideal for cycling and the proposal for route 268 bypassed the opportunity completely. The inclusion of RCY would support the four point plan for the improvement of area, with improved lighting and the development of HAZ sites.

It was hoped that if the path was rerouted then those using it would stop and enjoy the facilities on offer.

The Board was advised that the strategy for RCY had been in place for 10 years but that very little progress had been made in implementing it.

It was hoped that the prom would be opened up and the Victorian Quay utilised, as well as opening up a ferry option to Portsmouth.

It was felt that it would also be useful for the proposal to connect Fort Brockhurst to the Town Centre and that although it was felt that this wasn't acceptable as part of the proposal, it would be considered suitable for inclusion.

It was hoped that the local cycling groups, Hampshire County Council and the local MP would support this.

The Board was advised that there were many areas suitable for cycling in the Borough and that the proposal could be considered weak given the options available. Commitment should be given to creating cycle routes away from busy roads and it was also felt there should be better use of the potential of the Millennium Promenade as a route.

Economic Development Board
17 November 2021

It was requested that proposal 268 be reconsidered to include the Millennium Promenade and that in the introduction to the document that earlier engagement be undertaken with stakeholders. In addition it was requested that consideration be given to improving the lighting along Royal Clarence Yard, highlighting the history of the promenade and improve the signage.

In answer to a Member's question, Councillor Westerby advised that concern had been expressed that the consultation had not been as engaging as it was hoped it would be. Responses had been low and it was suggested that more could be done to improve this as it was felt it had not been publicised enough.

Members sympathised as it was felt there were other areas in which unadopted roads had been neglected by developers that had the potential to be utilised as cycle routes and felt that the amendment suggested should be included.

Members were advised that it was acceptable to add Councillor Westerby's suggestion to the document and would add to the document the exact wording. Consideration would also be given to Hardway and the options that could be possible. It was felt that the proposal wasn't aspirational enough and that Hampshire County Council could have undertaken greater engagement, this would also be included in the response and it would be requested that there be ongoing discussions with cyclists and walkers groups and that further consideration be given to the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.

Members felt that there should be a greater onus on the developers of sites to ensure that roads were in a condition in which they could be adopted and that this was particularly important in areas where there was no public transport.

It was also requested that at 1.10 of the proposal that the document be a working document that covered a longer term and was more ambitious.

Members felt that the proposal should have an aspirational completion date on it that was realistic, but gave an idea of when proposals would be implemented. If the document was purely aspirational a date may not be necessary, but one should be included if the project was to move forward.

The Board was advised that it was the early days of the proposal and that funding would still need to be obtained.

It was suggested that consideration be given to a scheme at the Alver Valley and that there was the potential for Section 106 funding.

The Board was advised that none of the schemes had funding in place but that it was important to have proposals for when opportunities arose and that there was no order of preference.

Daisy Lane had been identified by both Hampshire County Council and Gosport Borough Council as a priority and it was requested that this be looked as part of the cycling to schools project

Members reiterated their desire to see more local engagement with stakeholders.

Members advised that a meeting had taken place with Sustran in 2019 and it was felt important that the attendees of that meeting had been given the opportunity to contribute to the document.

Members acknowledged that Weevil Lane had not been adopted yet and that Berkley Homes were still the owners of it and that the adoption of it to public highway would be a matter for the developer and the Highway Authority to negotiate.

The Board agreed to incorporate the comments mentioned within the GBC response.

Resolved: That the Council:

- i) Supports and welcomes the LCWIP to order to improve walking and cycling infrastructure within the Borough.**
- ii) Recommends to HCC that the LCWIP references a suggested list of additional walking and cycling -related schemes in Gosport Borough and relevant routes into neighbouring local authority areas.**
- iii) Delegates authority to the Manager of Traffic and Transport to provide detailed technical and typographical comments to HCC.**

76. 2021-36 DRAFT CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY, EVIDENCE BASE AND ACTION PLAN

Consideration was given to a report of the Economic Development and Regeneration Manager requesting that the Board considers the contents of the 2021-36 Draft Cultural Development Strategy, Evidence Base and Action Plan supporting it, and give its approval to carry out a short public consultation exercise.

The Board was advised that if approved the consultation would begin the following week and would run for 6 weeks into January, with the results reported at a future meeting of the Board.

Members welcomed that the proposal was aspirational and ambitious and provided great detail.

Members questioned which methods of consultation would be undertaken and how it would be ensured that it reached as many people as possible, particularly if they did not use social media. Members suggested the use of Coastline but it was accepted that this consultation did not fall correctly within publication dates. Coastline was the method that reached every property in the Borough and it was acknowledged that TV and Radio advertising were cost prohibitive and that local news would not be interested unless they were deemed newsworthy to the region. Consistency in approach could not be achieved as the news channels would not cover each consultation equally.

Members were reminded that MIBs were used to inform Members. It was also agreed that more targeted information could be provided to interest groups and ask Members to share the details on their social media accounts.

Members reflected that local heritage, arts and interest groups should be contacted directly and requested to contribute.

Members welcomed the report and were keen to hear how access to arts events would be provided.

The Board was advised that the Borough had been identified as a priority for the Arts Council and advised that a number of the points in the action plan were already underway. Work was already ongoing to deliver projects in early 2022 and it was intended that there would be appropriate reviews and a drive for community engagement.

Members recognised the importance of the arts and wanted to provide opportunities within the Borough for young people to engage with them.

RESOLVED:

i) that the Board notes the contents of the 2021-36 Draft Cultural Development Strategy, Evidence Base and Action Plan.

ii) that the Board agrees to the commencement of a short external consultation involving Members, residents, local businesses, community groups and regional/sub-regional stakeholders on the basis of the agreed draft documents.

77. FAREHAM LOCAL PLAN 2037: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND BETWEEN FAREHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL AND GOSPORT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Consideration was given to a report of the Planning Policy Manager detailing the Fareham Local Plan 2037: Statement of Common Ground between Fareham Borough Council and Gosport Borough Council.

The Board was advised that Fareham Borough Council had already signed the statement and that if Gosport Borough Council agreed then there would be an examination of the evidence base undertaken in public.

The Board was advised that there was no date set as yet, but that it was anticipated to be in the New Year. It was requested that access be made available to GBC residents as it was important to continue to objecting to proposals such as those that were proposed for land off of Newgate Lane.

RESOLVED: That:

The Fareham Local Plan 2037: Statement of Common Ground between Fareham Borough Council and Gosport Borough Council (Appendix 1) be approved and that the Head of Planning and Regeneration duly signs it on behalf of the Council.

78. HIGH STREET HERITAGE ACTION ZONE PROJECT G14: HIGH STREET MARKETS DEVELOPMENT

Consideration was given to a report of the Economic Development and Regeneration Manager updating the Economic Development Board with progress on the Gosport High

Street Heritage Action Zone (HSHAZ) project to enhance and reinvigorate Gosport High Street's Saturday and Tuesday markets.

The Board was advised that an additional report would be presented in the spring. The project was now moving forward.

Members recognised that the market had suffered and that it was a shame as it had once been the largest in the South Coast.

It was felt that attendance at the market would improve if the approach to the High Street was made more appealing. The Board was advised that work was ongoing with the Police to make this happen.

A Member questioned whether the use and hire of gazebos was something that was being considered. The Board was advised that this could be explored but it would involve finding storage, but options to rent and sell gazebos.

There was a desire for the market to be a success and the plan would allow more detailed work to be considered and undertaken to improve it.

The Board noted the report.

79. ANY OTHER ITEMS

There were none.

80. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED: That in relation to the following item the public should be excluded from the meeting, as it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during this item there would be disclosure to them of exempt information within Paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, and further that in all circumstances of the cases, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, for the reasons set out in the report.

81. HSHAZ LEASE OF 51-52 HIGH STREET, GOSPORT

Consideration was given to an exempt report of the Head of Economic Development and Regeneration.

The report was exempt as the contracts are at the point of the Board were still subject to negotiations.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations be approved.

**82. EXEMPTIONS FROM CORPORATE PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS FOR
HSHAZ STRATEGIC INITIATIVES**

Consideration was given to an exempt report of the Economic Development and Regeneration Manager.

The report was exempt as negotiations with various organisations would still be ongoing at the time of the November Board and as such will be 'Commercially Confidential'. Details of these should therefore not be put into the public domain.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation in the report be approved.

CHAIRMAN

Concluded at 7.11 pm