

Royal Clarence Marina Residents Association

Mr. Mark Bridge
Senior Development Management Officer
Planning and Regeneration
Gosport Borough Council
Town Hall
Gosport
PO12 1EB

c/o Secretary
16 Granary & Bakery
Royal Clarence Marina
Weevil Lane
Gosport PO12 1FX

e-mail: info@rcmra.co.uk
www.rcmra.co.uk

31 July 2019

Dear Mr. Bridge

19/00314/VOC at Block NM7, Royal Clarence Yard, Weevil Lane Gosport for the proposed VARIATION OF CONDITION 7 (CAR PARKING) OF PLANNING PERMISSION 15/00620/FULL - ERECTION OF BUILDING (NM7) COMPRISING 55 NO. FLATS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS AND CAR PARKING (CONSERVATION AREA).

The Residents Association at Royal Clarence Yard strongly **objects** to the proposed change of wording to Condition 7 of 15/00620/FULL as it removes an essential connection with the long-delayed permanent RCY Car Parking Management Plan and thus fails to meet local Policy 23 and the 2014 Parking SPD.

The NM7 building as consented and currently under construction only has 12 car parking spaces within its footprint. Of these, two are designated as disabled parking bays and one for electric cars¹. That leaves just 9 standard car parking bays to be allocated to residents of NM7.

There are to be 55 apartments in the NM7 block. Under the approved planning permission, the vast majority of those residents' cars are to be parked in the communal RCY car park in North Meadow. Additional permits (if requested for second or third cars) may also be issued for the main RCY communal and visitor car park in Cooperage Green.

NM7 Visitor Parking: It appears from the *Transport Statement*² that the intention is that provision for NM7 visitor parking is also to be provided in Cooperage Green (0.4 miles from NM7). However, there is no explanation as to how this is to be managed effectively, other

¹ 15/00620/FULL *Ground Floor Plan S690/NM7/05 REV C*

² 15/00620/FULL *Royal Clarence Marina - NM7 Transport Assessment Addendum* p6 (Berkeley Homes October 2015)

than vague references to the RCY Car Park Management Plan nor how NM7 visitors are to be prevented from using the small adjacent (and much closer) Visitor Car Park in North Meadow.

At the time that 15/00620/FULL was approved, it was made very clear by both the applicant and the LPA that the parking provision for NM7 was inextricably connected to the RCY CPMP. This was the chief reason why reference was made in Condition 7 to the then approved CPMP (15/00154/FULL), which has never been implemented and has now expired.

While it is understandable that the applicant may wish to “tidy up” the wording for Condition 7 to remove the reference to the expired CPMP (especially since we understand that they are in the process of selling the entire block to a third party), the obligation to provide details for the parking for *all* NM7 residents and their visitors in accordance with the approved RCY CPMP cannot (and should not) be removed.

With the expiry of 15/00154/FULL and the earlier approved amendments, the active RCY CPMP appears to be that approved on appeal in **05/00217/FULL (condition 12)**.

While it might be considered to be enough to just change the reference in Condition 7 to the 2005 CPMP, we can see that there is scope for confusion in the wording which may need further amendment to reflect the fact that the 12 spaces (and attendant cycle, MC & disabled parking spaces) within the NM7 footprint were approved under 15/00620/FULL and may have already been constructed, whereas the details of the parking for all the remaining NM7 residents and their visitors are entirely dependent on the eventual permanent RCY CPMP.

Further concerns relating to Condition 7 proposed wording

1) An additional variation to the condition relating to **the approved electric car-charging space within the NM7 footprint may also need to be considered.** At the time of the 15/00620/FULL approval, that space was designated for the exclusive use of the NM7 residents. We understand now (from conversations with a senior Berkeley Homes executive) that they are proposing that the NM7 electric car charging space will be the only such facility on the whole site and it will be made available to all RCY residents. If that is the intention, it would present a significant change (and is probably unworkable) as well as not meeting national and local policies and guidelines in relation to the provision for electric car charging point. We recommend that clarification on this issue be sought as it may require a further revision to the wording of Condition 7

2) Parking journeys/access to NM7: Access and use of the narrow road between NM7 and the North range of the North Meadow workshops. We understand from conversations with Berkeley Homes that their intention is that the narrow access road to NM7 is to be one way. The November 2015 Design and Access Statement states that this is to be one-way “*in/out access from Weevil Lane*”³ – but they have not provided any clarity to us (nor can we see this in the documents available online for 15/00620/FULL) as to which way this will operate. Nor any clarity on:

- Safety issues as vehicles emerge from the access road (blind corner both ends) – particularly at night.

³ 15/00620/FULL *Building NM7 Gosport Design and Access Statement* Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd p35 (November 2015)

- How they propose to prevent drivers using the road as a short cut.
- Where residents without the privilege of a car park space within the NM7 footprint (the majority of residents) are supposed to drop off passengers and goods before they move their vehicle to the ultimate parking space (either North Meadow or Cooperage Green). Same issue applies to visitors and deliveries/removal vans.
- How they propose to prevent vehicles dropping off for NM7 using or blocking the access road to the rear of the North Meadow car park (by the gap between Unit 10 and Unit 11 North Meadow).

The applicant may be intending to address these issues when they get around to submitting a new RCY CPMP but this further underlines why Condition 7 of 15/00620/FULL cannot be decoupled from the RCY CPMP. Without that link to the RCY CPMP, there is no guarantee that the requirements of LP23 and the 2014 Parking SPD will be met before the NM7 building is occupied.

Removing the essential link between the necessity to resolve the parking provision for NM7 before the building is occupied and the permanent RCY CPMP would also effectively remove any incentive Berkeley Homes may have to finally address all the parking and related issues. They have been stalling on all these issues for many years with vague promises that it will all get sorted out with the construction of the NM7 block. Residents and commercial units here have been extremely patient. It would be extremely unfair and a very retrograde step for everyone's ambitions for the future success and prosperity of RCY if these matters are not finally resolved through a workable CPMP for the whole site. And this should happen *before* the NM7 building is occupied.

Berkeley Homes has had several years in which they could have dealt with these issues but have wasted that time. They submitted an application for a revision in 2017 (17/00290/FULL) which stalled following numerous objections. They should not now be allowed to avoid their obligations to RCY stakeholders and GBC by seeking to decouple the parking provision for NM7 from the long-overdue resolution to the RCY CPMP.

We strongly recommend that the applicant reconsiders the proposed change to the wording of Condition 7 and that a revised and updated wording to address the issues highlighted above is resubmitted for consultation.

We urge the LPA to **refuse** the proposed wording as formulated in this application.

Yours sincerely

David Whitehead
Chairman