

# 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](mailto:info@rcmra.co.uk)  
[www.rcmra.co.uk](http://www.rcmra.co.uk)

16 December 2019

Dear Mr. Bridge

**17/00290/FULL | CAR PARKING STRATEGY (AMENDMENT TO CAR PARKING STRATEGIES APPROVED 29.02.08 AND 16.10.15) (CONSERVATION AREA) (as amended by documents received 18.11.19) | Royal Clarence Marina Weevil Lane Gosport Hampshire**

Further to our Chairman's letter dated 12 December 2019, here are further comments and photos to support the Residents Association's objections to:

- Lack of Visitor Cycle Parking
- Zone 2: Car-park temporary surface treatment NM4/5 footprint: flooding & lack of drainage.

## **Lack of Visitor Cycle parking for the RCY site**

There are only two sets of publicly available visitor cycle parking areas in the whole of the RCY site east of Weevil Lane:

- 10 wall-mounted brackets hidden behind the former telephone exchange building (Sea Cadets Hall) in Cooperage Green. Not sign-posted from the entrance to Cooperage Green. Rarely used (unless by Sea Cadets two evening week).
- 12 wall-mounted brackets tucked behind Galleon Place opposite the Slaughterhouse. No signage. Now occasionally used by visitors to the gym in the Slaughterhouse.

There are no hoops or brackets available for members of the public to use anywhere else on the site – most notably none provided for visitors to either the North Meadow workshops or the Waterfront and Brewhouse Square retail units.

It has always been the stated ambition of both the developer and GBC that people should be encouraged to visit RCY as a tourist and retail destination. Also the council has policies which are intended to encourage people to cycle rather than to drive to RCY. It seems illogical, therefore, to allow this developer to avoid any requirement to provide suitable short-

term parking for members of the public's cycles. These would need to be in convenient and visible locations and marked on site maps. Locations would need to be carefully chosen to achieve the twin aims of being obvious to someone arriving on a cycle – while being sympathetic to the Conservation Area and the setting of the Listed Buildings.

We note that a new cycle-path signage has been erected in the Conservation Area at the junction of Weevil Lane and the Millennium Bridge, which is presumably an initiative encouraged by the council. Encouraging people to cycle and visit RCY is going to be important for the economic future of business setting up here. So it is extremely important that there are appropriate places for them to park their bikes while they explore the site.

**Zone 2: Car-park temporary surface treatment NM4/5 footprint: flooding & lack of drainage**

As stated in our previous letter, the temporary tarmac surface on the NM4/5 footprint is manifestly unsuitable as a long-term car park surface. It is not porous and there are no drainage channels (as there are in Cooperage Green), with the result that surface water is not directed or dealt with appropriately. The area floods in wet weather at both ends (see photos below). At the southern end of the NM4/5 footprint, the surface water eventually escapes across the road surface, but this creates a serious hazard in icy weather.



*SE corner of NM4/5 footprint flooding into the road*



*Flooding at north end of the NM4/5 footprint.*

In the now expired 2015 CPMP (15/00154/FULL), the applicant had intended to level the NM4/5 footprint to the same as the rest of the North Meadow car-park. This would have made the parking layout simpler and easier to understand/navigate around – and would also have required the substrate, surface & and drainage of the former NM4/5 footprint to be properly constructed in line with current local and national SUDS policies. Condition 7 of the approved plan required details of the hard landscaping etc to be provided.

Unfortunately, in these latest plans, the applicant appears to be trying to avoid that work, costs and requirement to abide by Condition 7 of the previous approval.

We hope this additional information is helpful.

Yours sincerely,

Philippa Dickinson  
**Secretary**  
**RCMRA**