SHLAA Proforma

Site location

| Site name | Royal Clarence Yard Retained Area | Site reference | WTSPD09 |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Site address and post code | Weevil Lane, Gosport, PO12 1AG | Ward | Christchurch |
| Last updated | May 2019 | I | |

Site details

| Site description | The site consists of a derelict MoD boat yard located to the north of the MoD oil pipeline and to the South of the redeveloped area of Royal Clarence Yard. The site has deep water access as well as good road access from Weevil Lane / Mumby Road. Part of the site is currently used informally for sailing activities and the Sea Cadets. Includes a number of vacant historic buildings relating to the former use as a Victualling Yard. |
|--|---|
| Topography | Flat with numerous warehouses associated with marine uses. |
| Existing land use | Former boat yard |
| Surrounding land use and storey heights | To the north and west the site is bordered by the redeveloped Royal Clarence Yard. This includes residential uses on the immediate western boundary and to the north. The site is currently accessed from the west through the Cooperage employment area. To the south is further residential development including the Royal Engineers site and Rope Quays. This latter proposal consists of 101 residential units an industrial unit, doctor's surgery and pharmacy, it was built from 2004. Further to the south is Gosport Town Centre. |
| Site size | 2.82 ha |
| Development status | None |

Key

| Unconstrained |
|---|
| Site may be acceptable, subject to further study, infrastructure or mitigation works, or policy requirements |
| Site is not suitable for allocation |

Suitability

| Issue | Suitability | Comments | Actions | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|---------|--|--|--|
| Local plan designations | Local plan designations | | | | | |
| Is the site within the Urban Area Boundary? | Yes | | | | | |
| Is the site allocated for development? | Yes | Gosport Waterfront and Town Centre: LP4. Mixed Use Allocation LP4 | | | | |
| Is the site in the Strategic Gap? | No | | | | | |
| Is the site Protected Open Space? | No | | | | | |
| Is the site a Protected Employment Site? | Yes | Evidence of lack of employment need is required. | | | | |
| Does the site have a community, culture or leisure use? | No | | | | | |

| Issue | Suitability | Comments | Actions |
|---|-------------|--|---|
| Is the site within a Defined Shopping Area? | No | | |
| Is the site currently tourist accommodation? | No | | |
| Flooding | <u> </u> | | |
| Is the site in Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes | Site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3. | Work has been undertaken as part of a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to |
| Is the site predicted to be in Flood Zone 2 or 3 in 2115? | Yes | Predicted to be in Flood Zones 2 and 3 by 2115. | demonstrate that this is an exception site in terms of flood risk. It will be necessary to ensure that any potential flood risk from tidal flooding is minimised through a range of measures including locating less vulnerable uses in the higher risk flood areas and ensuring more vulnerable uses are at higher ground levels. There will also be a need to some flood defence works and other associated measures. |

| Issue | Suitability | Comments | Actions | |
|--|-------------|--|---------|--|
| Ecology | | | | |
| Does the site contain any irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland or ancient and veteran trees)? | Νο | | | |
| Does the site have any TPO trees? | No | Adjacent to RCY Group TPO. | | |
| Does the site contain any protected species (bats, badgers, Great crested newts)? | Yes | Very urbanised site. Further investigations will be required (for example bats) The site contains a number of old disused buildings which may contain bird and bat roosts. Proposals will need to protect the species. | | |
| Does the site contain, or is within 400m of, a SAC or possible SAC, SPA or potential SPA, Ramsar site or proposed Ramsar site, a Brent Goose site or proposed Brent Goose site, or a biodiversity-offset site? | Yes | Adjacent to SPA at Forton Creek. (Portsmouth Harbour) (133m) Adjacent the Solent and Dorset Coast potential SPA. An ecology survey may be required. Development will not be permitted unless no adverse impact upon the habitat can be demonstrated. | | |

| Issue | Suitability | Comments | Actions |
|--|-------------|--|---------|
| Does the site contain, or is in proximity of, a SSSI or candidate SSSI? | Yes | Adjacent to SSSI at Forton Creek. (Portsmouth Harbour) (133m). An ecology survey may be required. Development will not be permitted unless no adverse impact upon the habitat can be demonstrated. | |
| Does the site contain, or is in proximity of, a SINC, candidate SINC or a Local Green Space? | Yes | Arden Park (157m). Proposals should protect the habitat. | |
| Access | | | |
| Can satisfactory vehicular access be achieved? | Yes | | |
| Can safe pedestrian and cycle access be achieved? | Yes | | |
| Can adequate emergency service and refuse truck access be provided? | Yes | | |

| Issue | Suitability | Comments | Actions | |
|--|-------------|--|---------|--|
| Heritage | | | | |
| Is the site within or is adjacent to a Conservation Area? | Yes | Within Royal Clarence Yard Conservation Area. Adjacent to the High Street Conservation Area; a Heritage Statement will be required. Proposals will need to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. | | |
| Does the site contain, or is adjacent to, any Designated Heritage Assets (listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments or registered parks and gardens)? | Yes | Tanks Store and Steam fire engine house, New South Store, Cooperage, Southern Boundary Wall to RCY. Area of parkland adjacent to the Gosport Lines as part of St Georges Barracks North; Flagstaff Green. a Heritage Statement will be required. Proposals will need to preserve or enhance the heritage assets. | | |
| Does the site contain, or is adjacent to, any locally listed buildings? | No | | | |

| Issue | Suitability | Comments | Actions |
|---|-------------|---|---------|
| Is the site likely to be of archaeological interest? | Yes | Potential for historic marine use. Potential Neolithic and Mesolithic remains on foreshore. An archaeological assessment will be required. | |
| Contamination | | | |
| Is it likely the site could be contaminated? | Yes | Contamination issues to consider- historic and current including marine uses and the pipeline. A Contaminated Land Assessment and potential mitigation will be required. | |
| Amenity | | | |
| Is development likely to have an adverse impact upon neighbouring amenity? | Yes | The relationship of proposed uses with existing and other proposed uses; most notably the residential buildings at RCY and Rope Quay. Proposal will need to minimise amenity impacts. | |
| Are neighbouring uses likely to have an adverse impact upon the amenity of future occupiers (industrial uses, major roads)? | Yes | Appropriate mitigation will be required. | |

| Issue | Suitability | Comments | Actions |
|---|-------------|----------|---------|
| Services | | | |
| Is the site likely to be serviced by utilities? | Yes | | |
| Is the site within a Safeguarded Area (other than Southampton Airport Safeguarding Zone, which covers the whole borough)? | No | | |

Availability

| Issue | Availability | Comments | Actions |
|---|--------------|---|---------|
| Does the site have multiple owners? | No | Site is owned by MOD. | |
| Is the site owned by a developer or is the owner willing to sell? | No | | |
| Is it necessary to acquire land off-site to develop this site? | No | | |
| Does the site have any legal issues (covenants, ransom strips)? | Unknown | | |
| Are there any on-site constraints (pylons, rights of way, easements)? | Yes | Oil Pipeline in close proximity. May affect site viability. | |
| Are there any existing tenancies or operations on site? | No | | |

Achievable

| Issue | Achievability | Comments | Actions |
|--|---------------|---|---------|
| Is there a realistic prospect that the site would come forward for development within the plan period? | Νο | | |
| Are there any known abnormal development costs (contamination, heritage conservation, demolition etc)? | Yes | Potential decontaminations costs. Costs associated with demolition, site clearance, ground stability and flood mitigation. Funding or planning gain may be needed to make the site viable. | |
| Does the site require significant new infrastructure investment in order to be suitable for development? | Unknown | | |

Conclusion

| Suitable | Available | Achievable |
|----------|-----------|------------|
| | | |

| Issue | Figure | Assumptions |
|------------------------|---------|---------------------|
| Developable area | 2.82 ha | Based on whole site |
| Local area density | High | 150 dph |
| Development density | - | |
| Capacity for dwellings | 0 | |

| Concluding comments | The site forms part of the wider retained area which is partly owned by the MoD and partly owned by the Crown Estate. A significant area of land will be retained by the MoD as part of the operations of the Oil and Pipeline Agency. These arrangements could affect the size and shape of the land that is ultimately disposed as well its timing. Further consideration will need to be given to the Agency's security arrangements and whether this affects how the disposed land functions. The deep water access is a key asset, the benefits of which need to be maximised through marine employment use in order to create jobs and to improve the economy of this area of the town centre. There are a number of listed buildings on the site which will need to be incorporated. In addition parts of the site are low lying and have a history of flooding when there is a high tide. Flood defences and the Millennium Promenade will need to be incorporated into the site. The MoD operations will need to be appropriately safeguarded. |
|---------------------|---|
| Concluding actions | No further action |