

Please ask for:

Chris Wrein

Direct dial:

(023) 9254 5288

Fax:

(023) 9254 5587

E-mail:

chris.wrein@gosport.gov.uk

4 November 2008

S U M M O N S

MEETING: Policy and Organisation Board
DATE: 12 November 2008
TIME: 6.00 p.m.
PLACE: Committee Room 1, Town Hall, Gosport
Democratic Services contact: Chris Wrein

LINDA EDWARDS
BOROUGH SOLICITOR

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

The Mayor (Councillor Kimber)(ex-officio)
Councillor Smith (Chairman)
Councillor Chegwyn (Vice-Chairman)

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Councillor Burgess | Councillor Langdon |
| Councillor Gill | Councillor Philpott |
| Councillor Hicks | Councillor Mrs Searle |
| Councillor Hook | Councillor Wright |

FIRE PRECAUTIONS

(To be read from the Chair if members of the public are present)

In the event of the fire alarm (single continuous sound) being activated, please leave the room immediately.

Proceed downstairs by way of the main stairs or as directed by GBC staff, follow any of the emergency exit signs. People with disability or mobility issues please identify yourself to GBC staff who will assist in your evacuation of the building.

IMPORTANT NOTICE:

- If you are in a wheelchair or have difficulty in walking and require access to the Committee Room on the First Floor of the Town Hall for this meeting, assistance can be provided by Town Hall staff on request

If you require any of the services detailed above please ring the Direct Line for the Democratic Services Officer listed on the Summons (first page).

NOTE:

- i. Members are requested to note that if any member wishes to speak at the Board meeting then the Borough Solicitor is required to receive not less than 24 hours prior notice in writing or electronically and such notice shall indicate the agenda item or items on which the member wishes to speak.
- ii. Please note that mobile phones should be switched off for the duration of the meeting.

AGENDA

PART A ITEMS

RECOMMENDED
MINUTE FORMAT

1. APOLOGIES FOR NON-ATTENDANCE

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All Members present are required to declare, at this point in the meeting or as soon as possible thereafter, any personal or personal and prejudicial interest in any item(s) being considered at this meeting.

3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD HELD ON 17 SEPTEMBER 2008

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Policy and Organisation Board held on 17 September 2008 (copy herewith).

4. DEPUTATIONS – STANDING ORDER 3.5

(NOTE: The Board is required to receive a deputation(s) on a matter which is before the meeting of the Board provided that notice of the intended deputation and its object shall have been received by the Borough Solicitor by 12 noon on Monday, 10 November 2008. The total time for deputations in favour and against a proposal shall not exceed 10 minutes).

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS – STANDING ORDER 3.6

(NOTE: The Board is required to allow a total of 15 minutes for questions from members of the public on matters within the terms of reference of the Board provided that notice of such Question(s) shall have been submitted to the Borough Solicitor by 12 noon on Monday, 10 November 2008).

6. PRESENTATION: GOSPORT SUMMER PASSPORT

PART II

To provide a presentation to Members on the Gosport Summer Passport.

Contact Officer:
Jamie O'Reilly
Ext 5501

7. GOSPORT LOCAL PLAN REVIEW - SAVED POLICES

PART II

To inform Members of the need to request the Secretary of State to save the Local Plan Review policies and to agree the list of policies to be saved.

Contact Officer:
Chris Payne
Ext 5216

Policy and Organisation Board
12 November 2008

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 8. | FORTON ROAD CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL DOCUMENT | PART II |
| | <i>To present to the Board a final version of the Forton Road Conservation Area Appraisals following public consultation on the draft appraisal.</i> | Contact Officer: Helen Green Ext 5452 |
| 9. | LAND ADJACENT TO 2 PORTSMOUTH ROAD | PART II |
| | <i>To seek Board approval for the sale of the freehold interest of the land shown cross hatched black and hatched black on the plan attached to the report.</i> | Contact Officer: Mark Pam Ext 5563 |
| 10. | REVIEW OF STOKES BAY FESTIVAL | PART II |
| | <i>To comply with the Boards request, at its last meeting, to undertake a review of the operation of the Stokes Bay Festival.</i> | Contact Officer: Ian Lycett Ext 5201 |
| 11. | ANY OTHER ITEMS which the Chairman determines should be considered, by reason of special circumstances, as a matter of urgency. | |

**A MEETING OF THE POLICY AND ORGANISATION BOARD
WAS HELD ON 17 SEPTEMBER 2008**

The Mayor (Councillor Kimber) (ex-officio); Councillors Burgess (P), Chegwyn (P), Gill (P), Hicks (P), Hook (P), Langdon (P), Philpott (P), Mrs Searle (P), Smith (Chairman) (P) and Wright (P).

24. APOLOGIES

An apology for inability to attend the meeting was received on behalf of the Mayor.

25. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Chegwyn and Hicks declared personal and prejudicial interests in agenda item 10 (Stokes Bay Festival).

Councillor Mrs Searle declared a personal and prejudicial interest in agenda item 11 (Hot Dog Stand) which was raised as a Chairman's urgent item.

26. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD HELD ON 25 JUNE 2008

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Board meeting held on 25 June 2008 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a true and correct record.

27. DEPUTATIONS

There were no deputations.

28. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no public questions.

PART I

**29. TREASURY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REVIEW 2007/08, PROGRESS
REPORT 2008/09, & PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS**

Consideration was given to a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and Borough Treasurer (a copy of which is affixed in the Minute Book as Appendix A). Members were advised that the annual treasury report was a requirement of the Council's reporting procedures and covered the treasury activity for 2007/08 together with a review of 2008/09 to date. The report also covered the actual Prudential Indicators for 2007/08 in accordance with the requirements of the Prudential Code.

The Borough Treasurer advised Members of the current volatile money market and that the Council's investment strategy would need to be critically reviewed before the next financial year.

Policy and Organisation Board
17 September 2008

With regard to paragraph 2.1.4 of the report, the Borough Treasurer clarified that the organisation the Council dealt with was the Royal Bank of Scotland and not the Bank of Scotland.

Members were advised that the maximum amount the Council would be borrowing was £12m based on the current capital programme. It was hoped that, at the next window of opportunity, the Council would be able to carry out more forward funding. However, there was no intention to borrow unless the market conditions improved.

It was anticipated that the Council would be able to borrow at about 4.5%. The money markets were monitored on a daily basis. The current long term borrowing of £8m was at an average rate of 3.89% and, in the absence of long term borrowing, short term borrowing could take place to ensure proper cash flow management.

The capital programme was improving slightly but there were still concerns about slippage.

With regard to the maturity of investments, Members were advised that money was normally placed for up to 364 days. Capital receipts had been saved for some projects and the Council had taken advantage of favourable interest rates and placed deposits for longer. Investments maturing this year would be generally lent out for short periods but some may be placed for one or two years. A certain amount of liquidity was needed for the Housing Decent Homes Standard Capital Expenditure and to finance other large projects.

Members were advised of the need for maturing invested money to meet commitments and for the investments to match up with the Council's largest payment dates, for example, when precepts were due to be paid. Income such as Council Tax, was also set aside for precept dates and, at the end of the Financial Year, the Council would be left with about £2m in working balances

RECOMMENDED: That:

- a) the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and Borough Treasurer be noted and the 2007/08 prudential indicators approved; and
- b) Approval be given to the revised 2008/09 limits at 3.3 of the report – i.e. to increase the current year limits for fixed interest rate investments from £10.5 to £15.0 million and for fixed interest rate borrowing from £8.0 to £12.0 million.

30. STOKES BAY FESTIVAL

Note: Councillors Chegwyn and Hicks declared personal and prejudicial interests in this item, left the meeting room and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

Consideration was given to the following motion which had been referred to the Board by Council at its meeting on 14 July 2008:

"That the Council reaffirm the decision taken by the Emergency Sub-Board on 18 February 2008 to allow Mr Peter Chegwyn to hold a festival at Stokes Bay and reconsider the terms of the decision."

Members debated this matter and the following views were expressed:

- The general public had been denied the opportunity to express their concerns
- The event had now taken place and lessons should be learned from it
- A full written report to the Policy and Organisation Board should be made
- The report could include comments from the police and fire services
- Many of the anticipated complaints from the public did not materialise
- The Council should consider a partnership approach on future festivals of this type
- The charging system for the hire of the land should be reviewed
- The Council should seek best value from events of this type
- Conditions laid down by the Licensing Sub-Board were superseded by the Temporary Event Notice
- Some shopkeepers reported an upturn in trade during the festival

Members agreed that a report relating to the Council's involvement with the festival should be presented to the next meeting of the Board.

RECOMMENDED: That a report relating to the Council's involvement with the Stokes Bay Festival be presented to the next meeting of the Board.

31. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC

Members agreed that Mr Richard Perry, independent Member and Chairman of the Standards and Governance Committee, should be invited to remain in the meeting room for this item.

RESOLVED: That:

- a) in relation to the following item the public 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 Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, and further that in all circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information; and
- b) Mr Richard Perry, independent Member and Chairman of the Standards and Governance Committee, be invited to remain in the meeting room for this item.

32. LAND AT FORT ROAD, GOSPORT

This report was exempt from publication as it contained financial information which could be used by prospective purchasers and thereby adversely affect the offers which may be received.

Consideration was given to an exempt report of the Chief Executive which recommended the marketing of land at Fort Road which was currently in the ownership of the Council.

Under Standing Order 6.10 (Minority Order), two Members requested that the matter be referred to full Council.

RECOMMENDED: That the Board approve:

- a) the marketing of the site for sale for residential development;
- b) access by the Public to the seafront across the site to be retained (paragraph 2.4 of the report); and
- c) any sale of the land to be the subject of a further report to the Policy & Organisation Board.

PART II

33. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ENFORCEMENT POLICY

Consideration was given to a cross reference from the Community and Environment Board at its meeting on 8 September 2008 which advised of the results of stakeholder consultation on the Environmental Health Enforcement Policy approved at the meeting of the Community and Environment Board on 3 March 2008 and confirmed by Policy and Organisation Board and Full Council on 12 March and 2 April respectively. Approval was subject to a further report if the results of the consultation made this necessary.

RESOLVED: That the amended Environmental Health Enforcement Policy be approved.

34. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT – LEE ROAD, GOSPORT

Consideration was given to a cross reference from the Housing Board at its meeting on 10 September 2008 which recommended that Gosport Borough Council lease an area of land at Lee Road to Portsmouth Housing Association who would carry out the redevelopment of that area of land to provide social rented housing.

RESOLVED: That a long lease of the land be granted to Portsmouth Housing Association at nil cost in lieu of grant and nomination rights.

35. APPOINTMENT PANEL

Consideration was given to a report of the Chief Executive which advised Members that the Personnel Sub-Board, at its meeting on 3rd September 2008, approved the creation of a new post of Director of Economic Development, Tourism and the Arts.

Members were advised that, for appointments at Director and Chief Officer level, the Board may appoint an Officer or an Appointment Sub-Board with power to act on its behalf. The Board were asked to nominate an Appointment Sub-Board to make the appointment to the newly created Director post.

Concerns were raised regarding the introduction of a post at Director level when, it was felt, additional staff resources could instead be provided within Economic Prosperity.

Members were advised that there were difficulties in attracting businesses to Gosport and that there should be more emphasis on tourism. An officer was required who would be able to negotiate at a high level.

It was agreed that any appointment panel created should be on a 2:2:2 basis. The nominations were:

Conservative Group: declined to nominate
Labour Group: Councillors Cully and Wright
Liberal Democrat Group: Councillors Chegwyn and Smith

The recommendation contained in the Chief Executive's report was put to the vote and was carried.

RESOLVED: That:

- a) the Policy and Organisation Board appoint an Appointment Sub-Board to act on its behalf in making the appointment of Director of Economic Development, Tourism and the Arts; and
- b) nominations to the Appointment Sub-Board be on a 2:2:2 basis

36. HOT DOG STAND AT BUS STATION

Note: Councillor Mrs Searle declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item, left the meeting room and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

By reason of special circumstances, the Chairman determined that this item be considered at this meeting notwithstanding the fact that it had not been available for public inspection in accordance with the provisions of Section 100B(4)(a) of the Local Government Act 1985.

The special circumstances were created due the vendor having been given 21 days notice to leave the site of the hot dog stand and for efforts to be made to identify a solution as quickly as possible.

Members were advised that the hot dog vendor currently occupied a site at the Bus Station but had been given 21 days notice to leave.

Members agreed that the Chief Executive investigate the situation and endeavour to find a solution to enable the vendor to carry on his business, following which consultation with the Leader of the Council and Group Leaders would take place.

RESOLVED: That:

- a) the Chief Executive investigate the situation with a view to finding a solution to enable the vendor to carry on his business; and

Policy and Organisation Board
17 September 2008

- b) the Leader of the Council and Group Leaders be consulted once a potential solution is found.

The meeting ended at 8.25 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Board/Committee: | POLICY AND ORGANISATION |
| Date of Meeting: | 12 th NOVEMBER 2008 |
| Title: | GOSPORT LOCAL PLAN REVIEW -SAVED POLICIES |
| Author: | DEVELOPMENT SERVICES MANAGER |
| Status: | FOR DECISION |

Purpose

To inform Members of the need to request the Secretary of State to save the Local Plan Review policies and to agree the list of policies to be saved.

Recommendation

That the Board request the Secretary of State to save the Local Plan Review policies set out in Appendix C.

1 Background

- 1.1 Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 policies in local plans are saved for 3 years from the date they were adopted. The Secretary of State may make a direction to save specified policies beyond the 3 year period. If local authorities wish to retain policies beyond this date local authorities need to seek the Secretary of State's agreement to issue a direction to save them.
- 1.2 The Secretary of State has issued a protocol describing how local authorities can apply to save policies and what considerations the Secretary of State would apply in deciding whether to agree to these requests. Local authorities are asked to submit requests to the Secretary of State six months in advance of the expiry of the 3 year period.

2 Report

- 2.1 The Gosport Borough Local Plan Review was adopted in May 2006 and consequently the policies will not be saved beyond May 2009 unless the Secretary of State has issued a direction to save them. In order to meet the Secretary of State's deadlines it is necessary for the Council to submit a request now.
- 2.2 The protocol against which local plan policies should be assessed identifies a series of tests which are set out in Appendix A. The policies in the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review have been assessed against these tests. Appendix B lists those policies that do not pass the test and the reasons why. There are very few policies

that do not meet the tests which reflects the fact that the plan was only recently adopted. Appendix C lists those policies that meet the test and should be saved by the Secretary of State.

3 Risk Assessment

- 3.1 Failure to request the Secretary of State to save policies in the Local Plan Review could lead to a planning policy vacuum in which to determine planning applications.

4 Conclusion

- 4.1 The policies in the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review have been assessed against the Secretary of State's protocol for saving policies. It is considered that the greater majority of the plan's policies are still valid and should be saved. Accordingly the Secretary of State should be requested to save these policies.

| | |
|---|---|
| Financial Services comments: | None |
| Legal Services comments: | |
| Service Improvement Plan implications: | None |
| Corporate Plan: | The list of saved policies are in accordance with the priorities of the corporate plan. |
| Risk Assessment: | This has been dealt with in section 3 of the report |
| Background papers: | Protocol for handling proposals to save Local Plan, Unitary Development and Structure Plan policies beyond the 3 year saved period. |
| Appendices/Enclosures: | |
| Appendix 'A' | Tests set out in the Protocol for handling proposals to save adopted Local Plan policies beyond the 3 year saved period. |
| Appendix 'B' | List of policies not to be saved |
| Appendix 'C' | List of Policies to be saved |
| Report author/ Lead Officer: | Chris Payne |

Tests set out in the Protocol for handling proposals to save adopted Local Plan policies beyond the 3 year saved period

The Government will take the following issues into account in considering extensions to local plan saved policies.

- (i) where appropriate, there is a clear central strategy;
- (ii) policies have regard to the Community Strategy for the area;
- (iii) policies are in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy or spatial development strategy;
- (iv) policies are in conformity with the core strategy development plan document (where the core strategy has been adopted);
- (v) there are effective policies for any parts of the authority's area where significant change in the use or development of land or conservation of the area is envisaged; and
- (vi) policies are necessary and do not merely repeat national or regional policy.

In addition, the government will also have particular regard to:

- Policies that support the delivery of housing, including unimplemented site allocations, up to date affordable housing policies, policies relating to the infrastructure necessary to support housing;
- Policies on Green Belt general extent in structure plans and detailed boundaries in local plans/UDPs
- Policies that support economic development and regeneration, including policies for retailing and town centres;
- Policies for waste management, including unimplemented site allocations;
- Policies that promote renewable energy; reduce impact on climate change; and safeguard water resources.

Appendix B

Local Plan Review Policies Gosport BC Requests Not To Be Saved

| GBLPR Policy | Policy Title | Reason for not saving policy |
|---|--|---|
| Chapter 3: Development Principles | | |
| R/DP2 | Development Briefs and Action Plans | This policy has been superseded by the need to prepare a Local Development Scheme (LDS). The LDS will identify Development Briefs in the form of SPD or Area Action Plans that are required. |
| R/DP5 | Demolition of Buildings | This policy is covered in part by policy R/DP1 and primary legislation |
| R/DP6 | Landscape Design | This is now covered by the Borough Council's check list of documents required to support the submission of a planning application. |
| R/DP7 | Additions, Extensions and Alterations | Legislation has recently changed on permitted development with regard to extensions. Those elements not covered by the new legislation are covered by policy R/DP1 and the Borough Council's check list of documents required to support the submission of a planning application. In this case the need to submit a Design and Access Statement is particularly important. |
| R/DP8 | Protection of Trees | This matter is covered by legislation (<i>Town and Country Planning (Application of Subordinate Legislation to the Crown) Order 2006</i>). |
| Chapter 5: Housing | | |
| RH/7 | Conversion and Sub-division of Properties to Provide Residential Accommodation or Residential Institutions | This matter is covered by policy R/DP1 and the Borough Council's check list of documents required to support the submission of a planning application. In this case the need to submit a Design and Access Statement is particularly important. |
| Chapter 8: Community and Built Leisure | | |
| R/CF4 | Provision of new health and community facilities | The sites identified in this policy have been implemented. Their retention in health and community use is covered by policy R/CF2 |
| | | |
| | | |

| GBLPR Policy | Policy Title | Reason for not saving policy |
|---|---|---|
| Chapter 9: Ministry of Defence and other Government Land | | |
| R/MOD1 | Development of Existing Establishments | This policy is covered by policy R/DP1 as the Crown immunity that previously applied to defence establishments has now been removed. |
| R/MOD2 | Development of Sites Declared Surplus to Requirements | This policy has been superseded by the need to prepare a Local Development Scheme (LDS). The LDS will identify Development Briefs in the form of SPD or Action Area Plans that are required. |
| Chapter 11: Open Space and Nature Conservation | | |
| R/OS10 | Protection of Areas of International Nature Conservation Importance | Paragraph 6 of PPS9 says that local policies for international sites should not be required as there is extensive legislation protecting these sites. |
| Chapter 12: Coast and Harbour | | |
| R/CH6 | Slipways | This matter is covered by policy R/DP1 and the Borough Council's check list of documents required to support the submission of a planning application. In this case the need to submit a Design and Access Statement is particularly important. |
| Chapter 13: Environmental Controls | | |
| R/ENV1 | Floodplains and Tidal Areas | This policy has been superseded by PPS25 which offer greater protection to areas liable to flood. |
| R/ENV6 | Unstable Land | This policy is covered by PPG14 Development on Unstable Land. |

Local Plan Review Policies meeting DCLG Protocol requested to be saved

| GBLPR Policy | Policy Title | CP | CS | RSS | C | N | Further Comments |
|--|--|----|----|-----|---|---|---|
| Chapter 3: Development Principles | | | | | | | |
| R/DP1 | General Standards of Development within the Urban Area | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a key policy that against which most planning applications are assessed. This policy will be replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/DP3 | Provision of Infrastructure, Services and Facilities | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a key policy that identifies the types of developer contributions the Council will be seeking to provide infrastructure to support new development. This policy will be replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/DP4 | Mixed-Use Developments | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally significant policy that identifies sites for mixed use development. Those sites not yet implemented will be replaced by a strategic sites policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/DP9 | Outdoor Advertisements | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | Although covered to some extent by national policies this policy provides a local context by linking it to a design appendix. This policy will be replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/DP10 | Marine Parade Area of Special Character | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is locally significant policy that identifies an area of special character and provides the policy context for a SPD on the design advice for the area. This policy will be replaced by a policy in the Site Allocations DPD. |
| Chapter 4: Transportation | | | | | | | |
| R/T1 | Land Use and Transport | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy sets out the Plan's overall transport strategy. This policy will be replaced by a transport strategy policy in the Core Strategy. |

Note: The policies have been tested against the DCLG criteria set out below together with supplementary information

CP – Corporate Plan

C – Area of Change or Conservation

CS – Community Strategy

N – National Policy

RSS – Conformity

| GBLPR Policy | Policy Title | CP | CS | RSS | C | N | Further Comments |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|---|
| R/T2 | New Development | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a key policy that against which many planning applications are judged. This policy will be replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/T3 | Internal Layout of Sites | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is locally important policy which provides the context for layout of development sites in the context of traffic circulation. This policy will be replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/T4 | Off-Site Transport Infrastructure | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is an important policy as it gives the policy context for obtaining relevant transport infrastructure or contributions to mitigate against the transport impact of development. This policy will be replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/T5 | South Hampshire Rapid Transit | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | Although this proposal for a light rail system has now not been supported the government, Transport for South Hampshire are proposing to use the route for a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) scheme. It is therefore important to safeguard the route in this policy. Proposals for the BRT will be reflected in the Core Strategy. |
| R/T6 | Improvements to Public Transport | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy is important as it encourages improvements to public transport. Transport congestion is major local issue for Gosport and the provision of improved public transport facilities is an important tool in addressing this issue. The improvement of public transport will be a key element of the transport strategy to be included in the Core Strategy. |

Note: The policies have been tested against the DCLG criteria set out below together with supplementary information

CP – Corporate Plan

C – Area of Change or Conservation

CS – Community Strategy

N – National Policy

RSS – Conformity

| GBLPR Policy | Policy Title | CP | CS | RSS | C | N | Further Comments |
|---------------------|---|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|---|
| R/T7 | Gosport Bus Station/Ferry Interchange | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is an important local policy. The bus station and ferry terminal are crucial elements of the transport hub for Gosport and this policy will enable a more efficient development to be implemented. |
| R/T8 | New Roads Safeguarding of Proposed Routes | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy safeguards two road alignments. The Cherque Farm link road has been implemented and will open in 2009. The B3385, Newgate Lane Improvement Scheme has not been implemented and accordingly needs to be safeguarded. The safeguarded road alignment will be included in the Site Allocations DPD. |
| R/T9 | Cycleways and Footpaths | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally important policy. The improvement of cycling and walking facilities will be a key element of the transport strategy to be included in the Core Strategy. |
| R/T10 | Traffic Management | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy provides the context to ensure development proposals take full account of traffic management issues. This issue will be considered in the development management policies in the Core Strategy. |
| R/T11 | Access and Parking | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is locally important policy. Whilst the Hampshire Parking Standards for residential development are no longer relevant Gosport has produced a supplementary advice note on parking provision that is linked to this policy. Car parking will be addressed in the Core Strategy with SPD to provide more detailed guidance. |
| R/T12 | Protection of Existing Car Parks | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally significant policy as it seeks to retain car parks that are important for the economic well being of Gosport. This matter will be considered in the Site Allocations DPD. |

Note: The policies have been tested against the DCLG criteria set out below together with supplementary information

CP – Corporate Plan

C – Area of Change or Conservation

CS – Community Strategy

N – National Policy

RSS – Conformity

| GBLPR Policy | Policy Title | CP | CS | RSS | C | N | Further Comments |
|---------------------------|--|----|----|-----|---|---|---|
| Chapter 5: Housing | | | | | | | |
| R/H1 | Allocation of Land for Housing | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy sets the Borough's housing requirement until 2016. This policy should be retained until the SE Plan is adopted. |
| R/H2 | Major Housing Proposals | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally significant policy that identifies sites for housing development. Those sites not yet implemented will be reviewed in the Site Allocations DPD. |
| R/H3 | Major Housing Proposals as Part of a Mixed-Use Development | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally significant policy that identifies sites for mixed use development. Those sites not yet implemented will be replaced by a strategic sites policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/H4 | Housing Densities Type and Size | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | PPS3 covers this policy to some extent but some elements provide local context in terms of where higher densities may be acceptable. Housing policies in the Core Strategy will address this issue. |
| R/H5 | Affordable Housing | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally important policy as it sets the target for the provision of affordable housing in Gosport. Housing policies in the Core Strategy will address this issue. |
| R/H6 | Change of use of existing dwellings | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy sets out criteria for the types of new use that would be acceptable. This matter will be reviewed in the Core Strategy. |
| R/H8 | Accommodation for the Elderly | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy provides detailed criteria for accessing proposals for elderly accommodation. Housing policies in the Core Strategy will address this issue. |
| R/H9 | Lifetime Homes | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is locally important policy. Housing policies in the Core Strategy will address this issue. |
| R/H10 | Residential Caravans and Mobile Homes | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is locally important policy. A policy in the Sites Allocations DPD will address this issue. |

Note: The policies have been tested against the DCLG criteria set out below together with supplementary information

CP – Corporate Plan

C – Area of Change or Conservation

CS – Community Strategy

N – National Policy

RSS – Conformity

| GBLPR Policy | Policy Title | CP | CS | RSS | C | N | Further Comments |
|------------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|--|
| R/H11 | Sites for Gypsies and Travellers | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is locally important policy. Housing polices in the Core Strategy will address this issue. |
| R/H12 | Site for Short Stay Travellers | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is locally important policy and will be replaced by a policy in the Sites Allocation DPD |
| Chapter 6: Employment | | | | | | | |
| R/EMP1 | Allocation of Land for Employment | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | Although these sites have been implemented it is important that they remain allocated for employment use. The draft Employment Land Review indicates that it will be necessary to retain these sites in the LDF. |
| R/EMP2 | Land Allocated for Employment Use as Part of Mixed-Use Development | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally significant policy that identifies sites for mixed use development. Those sites not yet implemented will be replaced by strategic sites policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/EMP3 | Protection of Existing Employment Sites from Inappropriate Development | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is an important policy as the draft Employment Land Review indicates that the existing employment areas are very important to creating a sustainable local economy. It will be replaced by a policy in the Sites Allocation DPD |
| R/EMP4 | Marine Related Employment | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally important policy as there a few key marine sites that provide employment opportunities within the sub region. It will be replaced by a policy in the Sites Allocation DPD. |
| R/EMP5 | Extension of Existing Employment Uses and Redevelopment of Redundant Employment Sites | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally important policy that enables further employment development. Employment polices in the Core Strategy will address this issue. |
| R/EMP6 | Development for Employment Uses within Urban Areas | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally important policy that enables further employment development. Employment polices in the Core Strategy will address this issue. |

Note: The polices have been tested against the DCLG criteria set out below together with supplementary information

CP – Corporate Plan

C – Area of Change or Conservation

CS – Community Strategy

N – National Policy

RSS – Conformity

| GBLPR Policy | Policy Title | CP | CS | RSS | C | N | Further Comments |
|---|--|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|---|
| R/EMP7 | Low Employment Generating Uses | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally important policy that seeks to maximise employment opportunities. Employment policies in the Core Strategy will address this issue. |
| Chapter 7: Retail and Town Centres | | | | | | | |
| R/S1 | Shopping and Commercial Allocations | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally significant policy that identifies sites for mixed use development. Those sites not yet implemented will be replaced by strategic sites policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/S2 | Location of Additional Shopping & Leisure Floorspace | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | Although partially covered by PPS6 this policy makes reference to need to take into account the cumulative impact of proposals and to have regard to other local plan designations. This policy will be reviewed by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/S3 | Principal and District Shopping Centres | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally important policy and provides local criteria to maintain the vitality and viability of the centres. This policy will be replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/S4 | Local and Neighbourhood Centres | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally important policy and provides local criteria to maintain the vitality and viability of the centres. This policy will be replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/S5 | Non 'Class A' Uses in Shopping Centres at Ground Floor | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally important policy and provides local criteria to maintain the vitality and viability of the centres. This policy will be replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |

Note: The policies have been tested against the DCLG criteria set out below together with supplementary information

CP – Corporate Plan

C – Area of Change or Conservation

CS – Community Strategy

N – National Policy

RSS – Conformity

| GBLPR Policy | Policy Title | CP | CS | RSS | C | N | Further Comments |
|---------------------|--|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|---|
| R/S6 | Residential Development at Ground Floor within Defined Shopping Centres | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally important policy and provides local criteria to maintain the vitality and viability of the centres but recognises that residential development has a role to play in the defined centres. This policy will be replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/S7 | Use of Upper Floors | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally important policy and provides local criteria to maintain the vitality and viability of the centres recognising that the upper floors of units have role to play in the defined areas. This policy will be replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/S8 | Local Shops Outside Defined Centres | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy recognises the value that shops outside of the defined centres can have in the local economy but acknowledges that if they are no longer commercially viable then alternative uses may be acceptable. This policy will be replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/S9 | Shopfronts and Commercial Facades | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This design policy sets the context for the design criteria in appendix I. This policy will be replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy and SPD |
| R/S10 | Protection of Commercial and Leisure Uses in the Marine Parade Area of Special Character | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is locally significant policy that identifies an area of special character and seeks to retain the commercial uses that contribute to its special character. This policy will be replaced by a policy in the Site Allocations DPD. |

Note: The policies have been tested against the DCLG criteria set out below together with supplementary information

CP – Corporate Plan

C – Area of Change or Conservation

CS – Community Strategy

N – National Policy

RSS – Conformity

| GBLPR Policy | Policy Title | CP | CS | RSS | C | N | Further Comments |
|---|---|----|----|-----|---|---|---|
| Chapter 8: Community and Built Leisure | | | | | | | |
| R/CF1 | New or Improved Community and Health Facilities | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy sets out criteria where new community facilities should be located. This policy will be replaced by a policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/CF2 | Protection of Existing Health and Community Facilities | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy which seeks to retain community facilities unless specific is met. This policy will be replaced by a policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/CF3 | Provision of Community Facilities on Major Housing Development | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy seeks to ensure that major new residential development provides the appropriate level of community facilities. This policy will be replaced by a policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/CF5 | Development of Childcare and Day Care Facilities | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy sets out criteria where childcare and day care facilities would be acceptable. This matter will be reviewed in the Core Strategy. |
| R/CF6 | Provision of Educational Facilities | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is an important local policy which enables the Local Education Authority to collect contributions for education facilities if the proposed development has an adverse impact on the existing facilities. This matter will be reviewed in the Core Strategy. |
| R/CF7 | Land for the provision of Additional Educational Establishments | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | Although neither of the sites identified in the policy are no longer required for education purposes the reasoned justification indicates the preferred alternative uses so its retention is important. The sites will be considered in the Site Allocations DPD. |
| R/CF8 | Provision of Built Leisure Facilities | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | Although partially covered by PPS6 this policy makes reference to the need to take into account the cumulative impact of proposals and to have regard to other local plan designations. This policy will be reviewed by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |

Note: The policies have been tested against the DCLG criteria set out below together with supplementary information

CP – Corporate Plan

C – Area of Change or Conservation

CS – Community Strategy

N – National Policy

RSS – Conformity

| GBLPR Policy | Policy Title | CP | CS | RSS | C | N | Further Comments |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|---|
| R/CF9 | Recreation and Leisure Allocations | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy identifies sites that have not been implemented. The sites will be considered in the Site Allocations DPD. |
| R/CF10 | Protection of Existing Built Leisure Facilities | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is an important policy which seeks to retain leisure facilities unless specific criteria are met. This policy will be replaced by a policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/CF11 | Improvement or Development of Tourist Accommodation and Conference Facilities | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | Tourism is a growing sector that is important for Gosport. This policy seeks to guide tourism facilities to appropriate locations. This policy will be replaced by a policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/CF12 | Cemetery Provision | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy identifies the particular criteria that need to be met when proposing new cemeteries. This policy will be replaced by a policy in the Core Strategy. |
| Chapter 10: Built Heritage | | | | | | | |
| R/BH1 | Development in Conservation Areas | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | Although covered in part by PPG15 para 2.4 indicates that development plans should include policies that are relevant to development control decisions. Conservation issues will be addressed in the Core Strategy. |
| R/BH2 | Demolition in Conservation Areas | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | Although covered in part by PPG15 para 2.4 indicates that development plans should include policies that are relevant to development control decisions. Conservation issues will be addressed in the Core Strategy. |
| R/BH3 | Development Affecting Listed Buildings | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | Although covered in part by PPG15 para 2.4 indicates that development plans should include policies that are relevant to development control decisions. Conservation issues will be addressed in the Core Strategy. |

Note: The policies have been tested against the DCLG criteria set out below together with supplementary information

CP – Corporate Plan

C – Area of Change or Conservation

CS – Community Strategy

N – National Policy

RSS – Conformity

| GBLPR Policy | Policy Title | CP | CS | RSS | C | N | Further Comments |
|---|--|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|---|
| R/BH4 | Demolition of a Listed Building | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | Although covered in part by PPG15 para 2.4 indicates that development plans should include policies that are relevant to development control decisions. Conservation issues will be addressed in the Core Strategy. |
| R/BH5 | The Local List | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally important policy and is in accordance with PPG15 para 6.16. Conservation issues will be addressed in the Core Strategy. |
| R/BH6 | Registered Historic Parks and Gardens | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is an important policy as Haslar Hospital is a grade II registered historic park and due to the imminent closure of Haslar Hospital is likely to be subject to development pressures. Haslar Hospital will be considered as a strategic site in the Core Strategy. |
| R/BH7 | Parks and Gardens of Local Historic Interest | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally important policy. Conservation issues will be addressed in the Core Strategy. |
| R/BH8 | Archaeology and Ancient Monuments | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | Although covered in part by PPG16 para15 indicates that development plans should include policies for the protection, enhancement and preservation of sites of archaeological interest and of their settings. Archaeological issues will be addressed in the Core Strategy. |
| Chapter 11: Open Space and Nature Conservation | | | | | | | |
| R/OS1 | Development Outside of the Urban Areas | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a key policy against which all planning applications outside of the designated urban area are assessed. This policy will be replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/OS2 | Strategic Gaps | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally significant policy. This will be reviewed in the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations DPD and it may be combined with the urban gaps policy. |

Note: The policies have been tested against the DCLG criteria set out below together with supplementary information

CP – Corporate Plan

C – Area of Change or Conservation

CS – Community Strategy

N – National Policy

RSS – Conformity

| GBLPR Policy | Policy Title | CP | CS | RSS | C | N | Further Comments |
|---------------------|--|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|--|
| R/OS3 | Urban Gaps | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally significant policy. This will be reviewed in the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations DPD and it may be combined with the strategic gaps policy. |
| R/OS4 | Protection of Existing Open Space | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is an important policy as the Open Space Audit demonstrates that there is a shortage of open space in Gosport. This will be reviewed in the Core Strategy. |
| R/OS5 | New Open Space Provision | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy sets out criteria against which new proposals for open space will be assessed. This will be reviewed in the Core Strategy. |
| R/OS6 | Recreation Allocation in the Alver Valley | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally specific policy. This will be reviewed in the Site Allocations DPD. |
| R/OS7 | Additional Open Space Allocations | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy still identifies sites that have not been implemented. This will be reviewed in the site Allocations DPD. |
| R/OS8 | Recreational Space for New Residential Developments | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy sets out the local requirement for additional open space resulting from the impact of new residential development. This policy will be replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/OS9 | Allotment Gardens | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally important policy as there is shortage of allotments and local demand demonstrates a need for this policy. This will be reviewed in the Site Allocations DPD. |
| R/OS11 | Protection of Areas of National Nature Conservation Importance | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | Para 7 of PPS9 refers to the need for local SSSI policies to provide sufficient degree of protection. This will be reviewed in the Core Strategy. |
| R/OS12 | Locally Designated Areas of Nature Conservation Importance | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is an important local policy and is in line with para 9 of PPS9. This will be reviewed in the Core Strategy. |

Note: The policies have been tested against the DCLG criteria set out below together with supplementary information

CP – Corporate Plan

C – Area of Change or Conservation

CS – Community Strategy

N – National Policy

RSS – Conformity

| GBLPR Policy | Policy Title | CP | CS | RSS | C | N | Further Comments |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|---|
| R/OS13 | Protection of Habitats Supporting Protected Species | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is an important local policy and is in line with paras 9 and 16 of PPS9. This will be reviewed in the Core Strategy. |
| R/OS14 | Biodiversity Action Plans | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is a locally important policy. This will be reviewed in the Core Strategy. |
| Chapter 12: Coast and Harbour | | | | | | | |
| R/CH1 | Development within the Coastal Zone | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | PPG20 requires the designation of a coastal zone. This policy designates a coastal zone and sets out criteria to assess to development proposals. This will be reviewed in the Site Allocations DPD. |
| R/CH2 | Pedestrian Access Along the Coast | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is an important local policy and relates to the Millennium Promenade in Gosport. This will be reviewed in the Core Strategy. |
| R/CH3 | Reclamation and Dredging | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is an important local policy as dredging could have an adverse effect on the Gosport coastline. This will be reviewed in the Core Strategy. |
| R/CH4 | Marina Development | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is important policy as Portsmouth Harbour is very congested as confirmed by evidence produced by the Queens Harbour Master on the capacity of the harbour. This will be reviewed in the Core Strategy. |
| R/CH5 | Moorings | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is an important local policy as there is considerable pressure to provide additional moorings in Gosport and the policy sets out criteria to assess proposals. This will be reviewed in the Core Strategy. |

Note: The policies have been tested against the DCLG criteria set out below together with supplementary information

CP – Corporate Plan

C – Area of Change or Conservation

CS – Community Strategy

N – National Policy

RSS – Conformity

| GBLPR Policy | Policy Title | CP | CS | RSS | C | N | Further Comments |
|---|--|----|----|-----|---|---|---|
| Chapter 13: Environmental Controls | | | | | | | |
| R/ENV2 | River and Groundwater Protection | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy does not seek to control processes that can lead to pollution but to control land uses that may have impact on water quality as advised in PPS23 para 10. This policy will be reviewed and possibly replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/ENV3 | Water Resources | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This is an important local policy to ensure that there are sufficient water resources to meet the needs of new development. This policy will be reviewed and possibly replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/ENV4 | Treatment of Foul Sewage and Disposal of Surface Water | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | PPS25 indicates in appendix F14 that policies for Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems should be included in the development plan. This policy will be reviewed and possibly replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/ENV5 | Contaminated Land | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | PPS 23 partially covers this issue but this policy provides more detail which assess the development control process. This policy will be reviewed and possibly replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/ENV7 | Hazardous Substances | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | PPS23 Appendix A indicates that development plans should consider the possible impacts of potentially polluting development. This policy will be reviewed and possibly replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |

Note: The policies have been tested against the DCLG criteria set out below together with supplementary information

CP – Corporate Plan

C – Area of Change or Conservation

CS – Community Strategy

N – National Policy

RSS – Conformity

| GBLPR Policy | Policy Title | CP | CS | RSS | C | N | Further Comments |
|---------------------|--|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|--|
| R/ENV8 | Development within the Proximity of Hazardous Substances | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | PPS23 Appendix A indicates that development plans should consider the possible impacts of potentially polluting development. This policy will be reviewed and possibly replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/ENV9 | Safeguarded Areas | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | Although addressed in Circular 01/03 this policy reflects the local context and the designations are shown on the proposals map. This issue will be addressed in Site Allocations DPD. |
| R/ENV10 | Noise Pollution | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | PPS23 Appendix A indicates that development plans should consider the possible impacts of potentially polluting development. This policy will be reviewed and possibly replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/ENV11 | Minimising Light Pollution | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | PPS23 Appendix A indicates that development plans should consider the possible impacts of potentially polluting development. This policy will be reviewed and possibly replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/ENV12 | Air Quality | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | PPS23 Appendix A indicates that development plans should consider the possible impacts of potentially polluting development. This policy will be reviewed and possibly replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |
| R/ENV13 | Telecommunications | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | PPG8 partially covers this issue but this policy provides more detail. This policy will be reviewed and possibly replaced by a development management policy in the Core Strategy. |

Note: The policies have been tested against the DCLG criteria set out below together with supplementary information

CP – Corporate Plan

C – Area of Change or Conservation

CS – Community Strategy

N – National Policy

RSS – Conformity

| GBLPR Policy | Policy Title | CP | CS | RSS | C | N | Further Comments |
|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|---|
| R/ENV14 | Energy Conservation | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | This policy encourages the provision of energy conservation measures and provides guidance on appropriate techniques. This policy will be reviewed in the Core Strategy. |
| R/ENV15 | Renewable Energy | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | PPS22 partially covers this issue but this policy as suggested in paras 15 and 19 provides criteria against which to assess proposals. This policy will be reviewed in the Core Strategy. |

Note: The policies have been tested against the DCLG criteria set out below together with supplementary information

CP – Corporate Plan

C – Area of Change or Conservation

CS – Community Strategy

N – National Policy

RSS – Conformity

Agenda item no. 8

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Board/Committee: | POLICY AND ORGANISATION BOARD |
| Date of meeting: | 12 NOVEMBER 2008 |
| Title: | FORTON ROAD CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL DOCUMENT |
| Author: | DEVELOPMENT SERVICES MANAGER |
| Status: | FOR DECISION |

Purpose

To present to the Board a final version of the Forton Road Conservation Area Appraisals following public consultation on the draft appraisal.

Recommendation

That Members approve the Forton Road Conservation Area Appraisal as a supporting document to inform Development Control decisions, and policies and proposals in the Local Development Framework.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 A Conservation Area is an area of 'special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance' (Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. S.69(1)). The designation of Forton Conservation Area was made in recognition of its historic and architectural significance.
- 1.2 The Draft Forton Road Conservation Area Appraisal was submitted to the Transportation and Planning Sub Board on 27 November 2007 where it was approved for consultation purposes.

2.0 Report

- 2.1 Following Members' approval of the draft document, a public consultation exercise has subsequently been undertaken. A letter and plan of the Conservation Area was sent to every residence and business. Residents were invited to review the Appraisal at the Town Hall. Appraisals were also sent to larger organisations and to the Gosport Society, who were invited to submit their comments.
- 2.2 A small number of responses were received during the consultation period. All were supportive of the updated Appraisal, and additional information to improve our understanding of the history of the Conservation Area was provided. A positive response was received from St Vincent College, who did not recommend any amendments. Minor additional details regarding the history of the area have been made following comments received from a local historian.

3.0 Risk Assessment

- 3.1 Completion of the Appraisal will help towards fulfilling the requirements

of a Local Performance Indicator for the current year and ensure that appropriate supporting information is available for Development Control and Planning Policy purposes.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 It is important that planning decisions are fully informed by Conservation Area Appraisals so that the area's special interest and character may be preserved whilst enabling appropriate development to take place. The public consultation exercise will enhance its status as a background document for Development Control purposes and policy formulation.

| | |
|---|--|
| Financial Services comments: | None |
| Legal Services comments: | None for the purposes of this report |
| Service Improvement Plan implications: | Meets with performance indicator 219B. |
| Corporate Plan | Preparation of the Appraisal is consistent with several key areas of the Corporate Plan. |
| Risk Assessment | See section 3 |
| Background papers: | None |
| Appendices/Enclosures: | Forton Road Conservation Area Appraisal |
| Report author/Lead Officer: | Helen Green |

AGENDA ITEM NO. 9

| | |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Board: | Policy & Organisation Board |
| Date of Meeting: | 12 November 2008 |
| Title: | Land adjacent to 2 Portsmouth Road |
| Author: | Development Services Manager |
| Status: | For decision |

Purpose

To seek Board approval for the sale of the freehold interest of the land shown cross hatched black and hatched black on the attached plan.

Recommendation

That the Board authorises the Head of Property Services to agree terms for the sale of the Freehold interest and authorises the Borough Solicitor to enter into such legal documentation as is necessary to effect the above decision.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The owner of 2 Portsmouth Road has occupied the land shown cross hatched black since 1989 through a licence from the Council.
- 1.2 The land shown hatched black has been severed from the Council's ownership by the new road currently under construction and will be included in the sale.

2.0 Report

- 2.1 Terms have been agreed for the sale of the land which has a total area of 422 square metres (504 square yards).
- 2.2 The sale price has been agreed, subject to Board approval, at £4750. The Council's Head of Property Services confirms that this sum represents the best consideration that can be reasonably obtained for the land.
- 2.3 The value of the land is restricted by reason of the lack of vehicular access or the prospect of achieving such an access owing to the level of the adjacent road and the vicinity to the new link road junction.
- 2.4 The sale is subject to the purchaser entering into a covenant to use the land only for garden purposes accepting that the existing garage and garden buildings can remain.

- 2.5 The purchaser shall be responsible for fencing the northern and southern boundaries of the land
- 2.6 Each party will be responsible for their legal and other costs.
- 2.7 There are no Human Rights issues relating to this sale.
- 2.8 There are no Race or Equal Opportunity issues.
- 2.9 There are no Sustainability or Prevention of Crime issues.

3.0 Risk Assessment

- 3.1 There are no risks associated with the sale of the land.

4.0 Conclusion

- 4.1 The Council to sell the land shown cross hatched and hatched on the attached plan for the sum of £4750 subject to the purchaser entering into a covenant.

| | |
|---|---|
| Financial Services comments: | None |
| Legal Services comments: | The Council has power to sell the land and from the report is complying with the relevant statutory requirements. |
| Service Improvement Plan implications: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None |
| Corporate Plan: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Corporate Plan implications. |
| Risk Assessment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low risk. |
| Background papers: | None |
| Appendices: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan 1 |
| Lead Officer: | Head of Property Services (Ext 5563) |

AGENDA ITEM NO. 10

| | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Board/Committee: | POLICY AND ORGANISATION BOARD |
| Date of Meeting: | 12 NOVEMBER 2008 |
| Title: | REVIEW OF STOKES BAY FESTIVAL |
| Author: | CHIEF EXECUTIVE |
| Status: | FOR DECISION |

Purpose

To comply with the Boards request, at its last meeting, to undertake a review of the operation of the Stokes Bay Festival.

Recommendation

The Board to consider the report and the recommendations contained within it.

1 Background

- 1.1 In January 2008 an application was received from Mr Peter Chegwyn for and on behalf of Hampshire Festivals for permission to hold a Folk Festival on Stokes Bay between Thursday 31 July and Sunday 3 August 2008.
- 1.2 The proposed event included:-
 - the provision of live music and entertainment between 1800 and 2300 on the Thursday 31st and between 1300 and 2300 on the Friday, Saturday and Sunday.
 - craft stalls,
 - a solar powered cinema tent,
 - children's entertainers
 - a licensed bar.
 - a campsite was also to be provided for ticket holders on land to the east of Military Road.
- 1.3 The existing Premises for Stokes Bay did not cover the land that had been requested to be used for the main event and therefore, it was necessary to apply for a Premises Licence. The land accommodating the camp site did not require a Licence.
- 1.4 Consultation was undertaken with the ward councillors for both Anglesey and Alverstoke wards as the event proposed to make use of land within both wards.
- 1.5 A report was subsequently considered by the Emergency Sub Board on Monday 18 February 2008 at which approval was given for the event to

proceed.

- 1.6 A separate application for a Premises Licence was submitted to the Licensing Sub Board. Objections were received and a hearing took place on June 3 and 24. The Licence was granted with specific conditions being applied (see Appendix A). Subsequently Mr Chegwyn also applied for a Temporary Events Notice.
- 1.7 The Stokes Bay Festival itself ran over four days and it is important to note that it was a safe event for the public and the Festival appears to have been enjoyable for those who attended. This report considers the operation of the Stokes Bay Festival by looking at the following issues:
 - Licensing and compliance with conditions
 - Requirements of the Event Management Plan
 - The role of Gosport's Safety Advisory Group
 - Use of the Council's land
 - Financial issues

2.0 Licensing and Compliance with Conditions

- 2.1 In the main the event was held in compliance with the Premises Licence issued for the site although some breaches were noted. The principal breaches of the Premises Licence are of a technical / bureaucratic nature and highlight areas of the existing Premises Licence that need to be the subject of a variation request, in order to simplify the conditions and clarify compliance. None of these breaches had an adverse impact on the safety of the public who attended the event.
- 2.2 The role of the Safety Advisory Group (SAG) in relation to the Premises Licence in particular requires further clarification given the nature of that group and its constituents. This is further considered in Section 4 of this report.
- 2.3 For many public events, an Event Management Plan (EMP) may not be available until the opening of the event due to the need to incorporate into the document a number of different requirements from the contributors. This is considered further below.
- 2.4 The campsite and car park are not directly relevant to the Premises Licence or Temporary Event Notice (TEN) however their operation had a significant impact on the overall levels of compliance.
- 2.5 Verbal undertakings given by the event organiser were not complied with e.g. details on the site letter, no amplified music under the TEN.
- 2.6 The operator of the bar area was co operative through out the event and assisted with Licence compliance.
- 2.7 The sound engineer was co-operative throughout the event. This

assistance contributed to the low number of noise related complaints received.

Premises

- 2.8 The Premises Licence permitted the site to be open from 09:00 – 23:00. Regulated Entertainment was permitted between 12:00 and 22:00 (11:00 to 22:00 Sundays), the sale of alcohol between 11:00 and 21:45. These requirements were met in the main and the event finished on time every night except for Sunday, when the regulated entertainment finished at 22:08.

Temporary Event Notice.

- 2.9 Following the granting of a Premises Licence, Mr Chegwyn applied for a Temporary Event Notice. This was considered by a Licensing Sub Board following objections from the Police on the 25th July 2008 and subsequently approved with conditions (see Appendix B).
- 2.10 Due to the nature of the audience at this particular event, the closing down of the bar and subsequent re-opening did not produce the crime and disorder issues that had been the concern of the Police. Security staff were able to undertake this operation successfully on each night. The process of closing and re-opening the bar did, however, cause some confusion on site with other stall holders who were required to close at 23:00 as the Premises Licence had not given them permission to open after this time.
- 2.11 At the Licensing Sub Board to hear the Police objections to the TEN, Mr Chegwyn gave assurances to the Sub Board that no amplification would be involved in the provision of this entertainment. In the event this entertainment was amplified and the cause of some complaints particularly as it took place after 22:00 when the normal provision of amplified music had ceased under the Premises Licence.
- 2.12 ***Recommendation***
Consideration to vary the Premises Licence should be given urgent consideration. A variation to permit alcohol sales until 22:45 and regulated entertainment until 23:00 as was originally applied for and is the case for Walpole Park where similar events are held would make sense in the light of our knowledge of this event. Such arrangements should negate the need for TENs and provide improved control over the closure of the site at the end of each day. Any attempt to circumvent the Premises Licence hours by applying for a TEN should be prevented in the agreement with the event organiser for the use of the Council's land.

Other Conditions

- 2.13 There were issues between the Police and the organiser over specific

conditions. The policing agreement for the event required agreement 28 days prior to the event taking place, in the event the agreement was reached on the 31st July (day one of the event).

- 2.14 Whilst a satisfactory CCTV system was installed, it was agreed with Police during the week of the event and not 28 days prior to the event.
- 2.15 A drugs policy for the event was required. This was agreed with the Police on the 31st July and not 28 days prior to the event.
- 2.16 There were no signs in the bar advising of the offences relating to the sale of alcohol to under 18s. This was a condition of the Licence. There were signs relating to Challenge 21 and there was no evidence of drinking by under 18s throughout the event.
- 2.17 **Recommendation**
The responsibility for meeting the timescales rests with both the event organiser and the police. Difficulties were experienced in identifying the responsible officer within the police for various requirements. A single point of contact for all statutory bodies should be identified for future events of this nature to simplify access to those bodies.
- 2.18 Many of the Premises Licence conditions relate to the provision of information prior the event. The failure to provide this information in a timely manner does place considerable pressure on Officers, although a technical breach of the conditions is not likely to result in successful legal proceedings.
- 2.19 **Recommendation**
The agreement between the Council and the event organiser for the use of the Council's land should include a clause that failure to provide documentation on time will result in cancellation of the agreement by the Council.

Stewarding

- 2.20 The schedule of stewards and security personnel was to be provided to the licensing authority 24 hours prior to the event commencing. This was not done. Site personnel were required to be issued with high visibility tabards, individually numbered and marked with their job title.
- 2.21 Tabards were provided however with only "Steward" or "Security" printed on them, however, they were individually numbered.
- 2.22 The tabards were to be further differentiated by colour, in the event all tabards were yellow.
- 2.23 Members of the security team who were not SIA registered were nevertheless issued with "Security" tabards although these officials did

not undertake front line security tasks.

- 2.24 All stewards were required to be suitably trained and briefed. The stewards were volunteers and whilst they received a briefing on the site for basic duties no information on other relevant duties or responsibilities was provided.
- 2.25 There were insufficient stewards and SIA staff on site to effectively cover all the crowd control points identified on the EMP. There were three occasions when SIA security at entrances was inadequate.
- 2.26 **Recommendation**
The specification for security / stewards should not only address training and experience but also identify minimum numbers to be provided in each of the principal site areas i.e. the arena, campsite and car park. The EMP refers to the use of experienced stewards; this was not immediately evident during the event. SIA registration does not automatically cover other stewarding tasks e.g. traffic management. For future events a cadre of professional stewards must be provided to ensure public safety and evidence of personnel qualifications etc provided to this Council in advance.

Tickets

- 2.27 Tickets for the event were to display information confirming that searching would be carried out. Ticket sales commenced prior to the grant of the Licence with the conditions relating to ticket sales. Subsequently following a complaint, documentation issued with bookings carried this information. The organiser at a later date incorporated this information on ticket confirmations. The majority of tickets were purchased in advance via the web site and a conventional printed ticket did not exist for the event.
- 2.28 The licensing authority was not informed of the number of tickets sold prior to the event opening to the general public. Once the site was opened the mechanism for counting festival attendees on-site was not accurate and it would not have been possible to ascertain whether the site capacity as specified in the Premises Licence, had been exceeded.
- 2.29 **Recommendation**
***Future conditions regarding ticketing need to take into account electronic ticketing procedures.
A condition to disclose advance ticket sales for each day of the event to the licensing authority should be included.***

Noise Limiter

- 2.30 The Premises Licence requires a noise limiter device of the type and

design approved by Environmental Services. The Licence did not however set a site maximum sound level for such a device.

- 2.31 The provision of a sound limiter for an external event is impractical. If the Licence condition is taken literally the event organiser must provide such a device but not set it as no parameters are identified. At this event the sound engineer was able to profile the sound energy to minimise nuisance to residential Premises in the area. The land agreement for the use of the land set a maximum average noise level of 100dBA Leq fast and a maximum peak level of 125dBC at the mixing desk. This standard was capable of being monitored and was more appropriate.

- 2.32 **Recommendation**
The Premises Licence should not include a noise limiter condition for this type of event.

3.0 Requirements Of The Events Management Plan

Noise Management Plan

- 3.1 *Section viii) of the Noise Management Plan* may not have been complied with as there is no evidence that the Festival Organiser monitored sound levels:
"...at the perimeter of the site at regular intervals during concert performance"
- 3.2 *Section v) of the Noise Management Plan* was not complied with as amplified music was still playing on some stalls after 22.00 on at least 2 occasions:
Thursday 31st July – music still playing at 22.10
Friday 1st August – music still playing at 22.15
- 3.3 *Section ix) of the Noise Management Plan states:*
"All residents living within half a mile of the site will be sent a written letter prior to the commencement of the Festival....."

Failure to provide the information letter led to complaints principally because the letter provided for free access onto the site for the Thursday and Friday evening performances. Failure to provide a contact number for the organiser was a breach of verbal undertakings provided to the licensing authority that such detail would in fact be provided on the letter. The letter to residents is a tried and tested way of mitigating residents concerns relating to such events.

- 3.4 **Recommendation**
Rather than relying on the organiser complying with their event management plan this should be included in the Premises Licence conditions. The letter should be agreed by the Council 14 days prior to the event and delivered by the organiser at least 7 days

before the commencement of the event.

Pedestrian Control Barriers

- 3.5 There were a number of instances where the signage provided for pedestrian and vehicle routes did not comply with the EMP. Pedestrian routes were also not lit as provided for in the plan.
- 3.6 There were no speed limit signs on the car park area, the campsite or along Military Road/GAFIRS access road as required by the Risk Assessment in the EMP.
- 3.7 Section v) of the Traffic Management Plan also specified: *“Heras fencing will be used to prevent pedestrians taking a short-cut from the raised footpath to the west of the Festival arena down a slope into the day car park and on to Gate B”.*
- 3.8 The Head of Security was asked to provide this fencing at 16.00 on Thursday 31st July, but whilst Heras fencing was fixed along the western perimeter of the site up to the promenade, no fencing was ever fixed from the promenade to denote a safe pedestrian route through the car park into Gate B.
- 3.9 In this instance the failure to provide proper safe access to the site for pedestrians and adequate warning to motorists was mitigated by relatively low attendance numbers and the fact the majority of festival clients remained onsite all day. The operator was advised on three separate occasions to provide signage in the road but failed to do so.
- 3.10 ***Recommendation***
Whilst the agreement between the Council and the event organiser for the use of the Councils land did include provisions relating to the effective pedestrian and vehicle separation and signing any future agreements will need to be more specific.

General Issues relating to the Traffic Management Plan

- 3.11 A complete temporary signing was not provided for approval. On -site Parking was generally poorly controlled with inadequate stewarding to make best use of the site.
- 3.12 ***Recommendation***
Parking areas are not included in the Premises Licence. The agreement between the Council and the event organiser for the use of the land included provisions for the organisation of car parking but any future agreements will need to be more specific.

Toilets

- 3.13 There were too few toilets as these were split between the licensed site and the campsite. 6 more units had to be delivered on Friday 1st August. The servicing of toilets was not effective and they were not cleansed and serviced at the start of each day as required by the EMP. There were occasions when they were either no water or no hot water.
- 3.14 No toilets were illuminated during the hours of darkness, either on the festival arena or on the campsite, so were difficult and unsafe to use in the night-time as it was not possible to see once a person was inside with the door shut.
- 3.15 ***Recommendation***
Specific requirements for numbers and cleansing of toilets should be included in the agreement between the Council and the event organiser for the use of the land. This provision must be separate from the Premises Licence.

Risk Assessment including Campsite

- 3.16 Risk assessments were provided in the EMP but not all were complied with, as indicated below.

Big Top

- 3.17 The Fire Safety Officer had to carry out a practical test to determine the fire resistance of the Big Top material as the relevant certificate was only provided in Italian.
- 3.18 No technical details were initially available for the design and construction of the Big Top in order that the Council's Structural Engineer could check its safety and integrity, having regard to the ground conditions of the site. These details were partially provided on 31st July immediately prior to opening the site but with no chance for Council officers to interpret the information.
- 3.19 Due to high winds overnight on Friday 31st July and during Saturday 1st August it became necessary to consult with Carlinden Events (the Big Top suppliers) on the safety of the Big Top and any need to evacuate the public from the big top area.
- 3.20 No provision was made in the Big Top for disabled patrons.
- 3.21 There were very few public complaints regarding the Festival. Some concern was expressed regarding car parking in adjacent residential roads.
- 3.22 The Friends of Stokes Bay have produced a review of the Festival. In summary, the report acknowledges that the Festival was enjoyed and

passed off without serious incident, but raises questions of the non-compliance with the Licence conditions and the use of the Temporary Event Notice. These issues are dealt with in this report.

3.23 **Recommendation**

The Premises conditions should include a condition requiring technical details of any big tops, marquees, tents or similar temporary structures open to the public to be provided to the Council at least 14 days prior to the commencement of the event and that these details be provided in English. Where any of the foregoing temporary structures have a wind speed restriction on use the Premises conditions should include a condition relating to:

- i. the provision of a calibrated anemometer to effectively measure wind speed on the licensed arena site during times that the site is open to the public.***
- ii. the provision of a competent representative from the company supplying the relevant temporary structures to advise on the safety of those temporary structures whilst the site is open to the public having regard to the prevailing conditions.***

4.0 The Role of Gosport's Safety Advisory Group (SAG)

- 4.1 The Gosport SAG was formed 18 months ago to help ensure acceptable standards of safety at all public events in the Gosport Borough area. It is co-coordinated by GBC and the Corporate Services Manager chairs meetings of the group. The Emergency Services, the Police, the Borough Council and County Council are all represented on this group.
- 4.2 It is important to note that SAG acts in a purely advisory capacity, has no legal entity and has no legal powers and therefore cannot itself dictate whether or not any particular event takes place or impose any conditions on event organisers.
- 4.3 SAG's role is to provide advice and support to assist event organisers in considering safety matters when planning their event. Advice and guidance is provided via the GBC web site where there is also an Event Notification Form which organisers can *voluntarily* complete and return. This is then automatically circulated to all SAG members, enabling the organiser to easily make contact with all agencies in the Borough about their event. It is then the responsibility of each individual agency to contact the event organiser if they have any questions or concerns about the proposed safety arrangements.
- 4.4 SAG meets at quarterly intervals to review events which have taken place and consider forthcoming events. This enables co-ordination between the individual agencies regarding events and helps ensure that everyone is properly informed. For larger events (HMS Sultan

Show, Waterfront Festival, Stokes Bay Festival) it is normal to invite the Event Organiser to a “special” SAG meeting to discuss the event, any Event Management Plan produced for the event and any other issues and concerns of the individual agency.

- 4.5 There is no legal obligation on any organisation to notify SAG of an event. As mentioned above for a particularly large event the organiser might be invited to attend a special SAG meeting to enable safety issues to be considered well in advance of the event. However, there is no compulsion to attend although organisers do find it very helpful when planning their event. The organisers of smaller scale events are not normally invited to SAG as issues can generally be dealt with directly by the individual agencies.
- 4.6 The Corporate Services Manager has provided details of the involvement of Gosport’s SAG with the Stokes Bay Festival. This is attached to this report for information (see Appendix D).
- 4.7 The Licensing Sub-Board imposed a number of conditions on the Premises Licence which required SAG to approve certain matters for example the event management plan, stewarding arrangements, tabards. Given the nature of SAG, for any future event, the conditions in any Premises Licence should ensure that it is the appropriate body that approves any proposals and not this advisory group.
- 4.8 The condition on the Premises for the Stokes Bay Festival which required SAG to provide written approval of the Event Management Plan 28 days prior to the event, was not achieved as each individual of public bodies had varying requirements that were the subject of negotiations with the organiser right up to the commencement of the event.
- 4.9 ***Recommendation***
It is sensible to require any event taking place under the Premises Licence to be considered by the SAG but final approval of the details of the event has to be obtained from each relevant public body and the Premises Licence should reflect this.

5.0 Use Of The Land

- 5.1 The event organiser entered into a separate agreement for the use of the Council’s land. This agreement covered the use of the land for 12 days of which 8 days involved set up and take down. The agreement set out the conditions upon which the Council permitted its land to be used and covered the camping and car parking areas.

Campsite

- 5.2 The agreement for the use of the Council’s land covered the provision of the campsite. At some point on Thursday 31 July the Campsite

expanded from its original planned size and without the Council's permission additional areas of Council land were used. A consequence of the expansion was that cars and vehicles were not adequately separated from the tents as set out in the EMP.

- 5.3 There was no control over the number of tents, caravans, mobile homes and camper vans allowed on the site and the total number of campers on the site is not known.
- 5.4 Despite it being known that the approved campsite was full, tickets were still being sold for people to use the campsite up until the following afternoon (Friday 1st August).
- 5.5 Once the campsite was full, additional toilets (see separate comments) and additional fire points were provided, but no additional drinking water points or waste water disposal points to cater for the additional numbers.
- 5.6 Caravans, mobile homes and camper vans were directed by the event organiser to park on the Council Pay and Display Car Park (at GAFIRS) when the campsite was full. Officers have been advised that people parking on the Pay and Display Car Park in order to visit the Festival were told that they would have to pay the daily parking fees (which would be reimbursed by the Event Organiser) but that they should ignore the "No Overnight Parking" rule, in contravention of the Car Parking Order.
- 5.7 At 16.10 on Friday 1st August there was 1 caravan and 6 mobile homes/camper vans on this Pay and Display Car Park and one large, partially erected trailer tent. At 11.25 on Saturday 2nd August there were 2 caravans and 14 mobile homes/camper vans parked on the Pay and Display Car Park (including those which had been noted at 16.10 the previous day). At 13.25 on Saturday 2nd August there were an additional 2 camping vehicles parked on the Pay and Display Car Park, making the total up to 16 mobile homes/camper vans and 2 caravans.

5.8 ***Recommendation***

Many of the above issues were due to the poor standard of stewarding and organisation of the site. Specific requirements for layout and organisation of any campsite should be included in the agreement between the Council and the event organiser for the use of the Council's land.

The Event Organiser should identify in the EMP and have available an overflow campsite with car parking facilities for campers in excess of the numbers allowed by the agreement with the Council.

6.0 **Financial Matters**

- 6.1 The event organiser did not request any funding from the Council and it was confirmed that all costs associated with the event would be met by the

organiser. Staff costs were met by this Council i.e. Environmental Health Officers time.

- 6.2 In setting a charge for use of the land for such an event, consideration was given to the Council's approved Fees & Charges. In the relevant section of the 2008/09 Fees & Charges, the following charges apply to the use of Walpole Park and Sea Front Land:

| Category | Unit Cost | Charge £ |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| Commercial Fairs etc | Per day | 485 |
| Overnight Parking | Setting up | 84 |
| Charitable Organisation Functions | See note 2 below | 75 |
| Caravan Rallies | Per caravan per night | 7 |

NOTES

1. *Price includes water, fencing and reinstatement*
2. *Fees for certain charitable Organisations may be waived at the Committee's discretion*
3. *Other relevant sites by negotiation with the Leisure and Cultural Services Manager*

- 6.3 Where no specific charges were available, the Council's existing charges were used for guidance as to calculating a fee for the various aspects of the event. This was broken down to take account of:

- Use of the main event field
- Use of the adjacent field for camping (the organiser advised up to 500 tents / camping units may use the site)
- Car parking on the main event field (up to 100 spaces were estimated, although the Council does not charge in its car parks after 6.00pm)

The total Hire Fee was set at £5000 and was paid in full before the event set up began.

In addition, a deposit of £5000 was paid to the Council to cover any costs to address reinstatement or dealing with other extra costs that the Council may have incurred. In the outcome, this deposit was returned in full as any ground repairs were arranged directly between the organiser and a local contractor.

7.0 Risk Assessment

- 7.1 Risks to this Council in connection with any future similar events will be reduced by the adoption of the recommendations contained within this

report.

8.0 Conclusion

- 8.1 There were 11 complaints from the public over the four days mainly concerned with noise. There were no public order issues and no health and safety incidents.
- 8.2 The event commenced on the 31st July but due to circumstances, the Premises Licence was not granted until the 24th June. The Licence required that information be provided in a number of instances within 28 days of the event. This timescale was perhaps in retrospect, too tight and unlikely to be met in all cases.
- 8.3 Although there were a number of breaches of Licence conditions, these were of a technical nature and did not materially affect the safety of people attending the event. Therefore, in accordance with the Council's Enforcement Policy, no formal legal proceedings are proposed.

| | |
|---|---|
| Financial Services comments: | Contained within Section 6 of this report |
| Legal Services comments: | Contained within this report |
| Service Improvement Plan implications: | Nil |
| Corporate Plan: | N/A |
| Risk Assessment: | See Section 7.0 |
| Background papers: | Nil |
| Appendices/Enclosures: | |
| Appendix A | Premises Licence |
| Appendix B | Temporary Event Notice |
| Appendix C | Gosport's Safety Advisory Group |
| Report author/ Lead Officer: | Ian Lycett |

APPENDIX C**SAG - INVOLVEMENT WITH STOKES BAY FESTIVAL**9 January 2008 SAG Meeting

SAG considered a briefing note that had been submitted by the Event Organiser (EO). It was agreed that a Special SAG be arranged to discuss the event with the EO.

4 February 2008 – Special SAG Meeting

The EO attended the Meeting, having previously submitted the standard Event Notification Form. At the conclusion of the debate it was agreed that there would be further consideration at the Group's next meeting in April. In the meantime the EO would submit to SAG the EMP, including the Site Layout Plan, Traffic Management Plan and Risk Assessments.

14 April 2008 SAG Meeting

EO had submitted a draft EMP just prior to the Meeting, incorporating Noise Management Plan, Crowd Management Plan, Traffic Management Plan, Emergency Plan and Risk Assessment. Concerns about various aspects were raised by some agencies but a full discussion was not possible as the group had not had sufficient time to properly review the documents prior to the Meeting. It was therefore agreed that, having read the document, individual agencies would contact the EO directly with their concerns/issues and responses would be sought prior to the next Meeting.

30 June 2008 SAG Meeting

It was noted that the Licensing Sub-Board had approved the Council's Application for a Premises Licence on 24 June 2008, but concern was expressed that the Conditions of the Licence imposed a number of responsibilities on SAG which it was not in a position to fulfill, due to its lack of legal status.

The EO was invited to join the Meeting and circulated a revised EMP. Again the Group felt they needed time to read the document before making any formal comment. Nevertheless during the debate a number of issues were raised by the various agencies, as noted in the Minutes of the Meeting. It was agreed that the EO submit by email a revised Site Layout Plan and an amended EMP by 2 July 2008 to enable consideration at a Special SAG on 10 July 2008.

10 July 2008 Special SAG Meeting

The EO had circulated on the morning of the Meeting an updated version (3) of the EMP. Following initial discussions the EO was invited to join the Meeting. Again a whole range of issues were discussed and in order to

enable SAG to try to fulfill some of the Conditions imposed by the Licensing Sub-Board, and in view of the short amount of time before the event was due to take place, it was agreed that each agency provide a status report by 17 July 2008. This would state whether their agency was satisfied with the safety arrangements for the event, although it was noted that this might be subject to site inspection before the start of the event.

The EO was also reminded of the need to comply with all of the Licence Conditions if the event were to proceed.

In the final lead-in to the event all agencies then communicated directly with the EO to discuss outstanding issues and agree a way forward to enable the event to take place.

9 September 2008 SAG Meeting

It was agreed that if the event were to be repeated in 2009 the EO would be requested to submit an EMP by the end of March 2009 at the latest with a view to arranging a Special SAG in April 2009.