

Please ask for:

Vicki Stone

Direct dial:

(023) 9254 5651

E-mail:

vicki.stone@gosport.gov.uk

12 September 2016

S U M M O N S

MEETING: Regulatory Board
DATE: 20 September 2016
TIME: 6.00 pm
PLACE: Council Chamber, Town Hall, Gosport
Democratic Services contact: Vicki Stone

LINDA EDWARDS
BOROUGH SOLICITOR

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

The Mayor (Councillor Mrs Hook) (ex-officio)
Chairman of the Policy and Organisation Board (Councillor Hook) (ex-officio)

Councillor Jessop (Chairman)
Councillor Allen (Vice Chairman)

Councillor Mrs Batty	Councillor Foster-Reed
Councillor Beavis	Councillor Hicks
Councillor Carter	Councillor Raffaelli
Councillor Ms Diffey	Councillor Ronayne
Councillor Earle	Councillor Scard
Councillor Farr	Councillor Wright

INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

(To be read by the Chairman if members of the public are present)

In the event of the fire alarm sounding, 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.

Please note that mobile phones should be switched off or on silent for the duration of the meeting.

This meeting may be filmed or otherwise recorded. By attending this meeting, you are consenting to any broadcast of your image and being recorded.

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).

Regulatory Board
20 September 2016

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES FOR NON-ATTENDANCE
2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
All Members are required to disclose, at this point in the meeting or as soon as possible thereafter, any disclosable pecuniary interest or personal interest in any item(s) being considered at this meeting.
3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD HELD ON 27 JULY 2016
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 Friday 16th September 2016. 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 Friday 16th September 2016).
6. REPORTS OF THE BOROUGH SOLICITOR AND DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE
*Schedule of planning applications with recommendations.
(grey sheets 1 – 28/1 pages)*
7. ANY OTHER ITEMS
Which the Chairman determines should be considered, by reason of special circumstances, as a matter of urgency.

PART II
Contact Officer:
Debbie Gore
Ext: 5455

**A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD
WAS HELD ON 27 JULY 2016 AT 6PM**

The Mayor (Councillor Mrs Hook)(ex-officio); Councillors Hook (ex-officio) Allen (P), Mrs Batty, Beavis (P), Carter (P), Diffey (P), Earle (P), Farr (P), Foster-Reed (P), Hicks (P), Jessop (P), Raffaelli (P), Ronayne (P), Scard (P), Wright (P)

23. APOLOGIES

An apology was received from Councillor Mrs Batty.

24. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- Councillors Allen, Beavis, Carter, Jessop, Councillor Raffaelli and Scard advised that in respect of Item 7 of the agenda they had each written a letter of objection to Fareham Borough Council.
- Councillor Carter declared a personal interest in respect of Item 4 of the grey pages as his property was shown on the map.
- Councillor Beavis declared a personal interest in respect of item 2 and 3 of the grey pages of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive as he was a Member of the Sailing Club.

26. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Regulatory Board meeting held on 27 June 2016, be approved and signed by the Chairman as a true and correct record subject to the following two changes:

Councillor Raffaelli be added to the list of attendees.

In the final paragraph of the discussion prior to the Resolution for application 16/00059/FULL the word 'serious' be changed to 'some'.

25. DEPUTATIONS

Deputations had been received on the following items:

- Item 1 of the grey pages 16/00015/FULL – Land rear of 363 Fareham Road, Gosport
- Item 2 of the grey pages 16/00189/FULL – 46 Marine Parade East, Lee-on-the-Solent
- Item 3 of the grey pages 16/00156/DETS – 47 Marine Parade East, Lee-on-the-Solent
- Item 4 of the grey pages 16/00246/FULL – Drake Road, Lee-on-the-Solent
- Item 6 of the grey pages 16/00223/FULL – 92 The Avenue, Gosport
- Item 7 of the grey pages 16/00226/ADVT – Beechcroft Manor, 1 Beechcroft Road, Gosport

26. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no public questions.

27. LAND AT THE FORMER HMS DAEDALUS

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive to advise the Board of a request from the Homes and Community Agency to vary the Section 106 Agreement dated 28 January 2016 (the 'Agreement') relating to the redevelopment of land at the Former HMS Daedalus.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Members welcomed the additional investment to the waterfront area and the proposal to support Starter Homes for local people.

RESOLVED: that the Board agree to vary:-

1. The planning obligations relating to the provision of Affordable Housing contained in the Agreement as set out in paragraphs 2.4 and 2.6 of the report; and
2. The definition of the Value of the Manor Way Open Land contained in the Agreement as set out in paragraph 2.7 of the report.

28. FAREHAM BOROUGH CONSULTATION D.11/004/16 ELECTRICAL INTERCONNECTOR WITH AN APPROXIMATE CAPACITY OF 1000 MEGAWATTS EXTENDING FROM TOURBE, NORMANDY TO CHILLING, HAMPSHIRE FORMER HMS DAEDALUS, STUBBINGTON, HAMPSHIRE

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive which advised the Board that a planning application had been received by Fareham Borough Council from National Grid IFA 2 Limited (National Grid) for the installation of an electrical interconnector with an approximate capacity of 100 megawatts (MW) extending from Tourbe, Normandy (France) to Chilling, Hampshire.

The Planning Officer referred Members to paragraph 2.8 of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive where it was clarified that the approved building height measurements were to the eaves of the buildings.

Members raised concerns about locating the cabling equipment at Daedalus and the impact that this would have on the local amenities and aircraft operations. It was further felt that alternative and possibly more suitable sites, such as Chilling, had not been investigated.

A Member queried whether it would be more appropriate for the Secretary of State to determine the application rather than a local planning authority. In response, the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive advised that the Secretary of State has the power to determine any planning application he or she chooses and the local planning authority only has to refer to the Secretary of State those applications which are departure applications as set out in the relevant Regulations, otherwise local planning authorities retain the power to determine their own applications.

RESOLVED: That Gosport Borough Council:

Raise objection on the following grounds:

- a) Harmful impact on the Strategic Gap; and

Raise concern on the following grounds:

- a) Noise

- b) Failure to deliver employment opportunities.
- c) Impact on specialist employers for whom the site is allocated.
- d) The impact on the quality and attractiveness of the proposed open space and the planned Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG)
- e) Suitable alternative sites have not been fully evaluated.

PART II

29. **REPORTS OF THE BOROUGH SOLICITOR AND DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

The Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report on applications received for planning consent setting out the recommendation.

RESOLVED: That a decision be taken on each application for planning consent as detailed below:

30. **16/00015/FULL - ERECTION OF 1 NO. TWO BEDROOM DETACHED BUNGALOW AND DETACHED SINGLE GARAGE WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND TURNING (as amplified by plan and ecological assessment received 05.04.16 and letter dated 04.04.16)
Land Rear of 363 Fareham Road Gosport Hampshire PO13 0AD**

Councillor Wright advised that although the estate where he lives is mentioned in the report after taking advice he was not declaring an interest as the application did not affect his property.

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00015/FULL.

Mr Trevor Ayles was invited to address the Board.

The Board was advised by the Head of Development Management that Members had attended a site visit at 2pm earlier that day at the property whereby Members had the opportunity to gain access to the site and also view the property from Wych Lane and at the junction of Wych Lane and Fareham Road to look at access proposals.

Mr Ayles thanked Members who had attended the site visit. Mr Ayles reiterated to Members the positive points of the proposal and felt that the design and mass was acceptable and would not have a harmful impact on the existing dwelling or surrounding area.

Mr Ayles added that access via the side of the existing building would not generate any noise disturbances and that the amenity space was of an sufficient size to accommodate the proposal.

Mr Ayles advised Members that the capacity of the highway could accommodate both the existing dwelling and the proposal and that no increase of traffic would be generated. He further added that Hampshire County Council had raised no objection to the proposals and had highlighted the improvements to the access as a consequence of this proposal.

Mr Ayles advised that the proposal would not be out of keeping with the residential area due to there being substantial outbuildings in the rear of other dwellings in Fareham Road, further adding that the commercial development across the road from the site had a far greater impact than the proposal being considered.

Following discussion Members felt that the number of vehicles coming out of the property would not be increased and that the site was large enough to accommodate the proposed building.

Members recognised that this site was a unique on Fareham Road in that it was the only one to have sufficient width to allow access for this type of development, and a sufficiently long garden to accommodate an additional dwelling in this way. It was further felt that the outbuildings already in place along Fareham Road were consistent with the proposal.

It was proposed and seconded that the proposal be approved and that delegated authority be given to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive to impose appropriate conditions.

RESOLVED: That planning application 16/00015/FULL be approved and that authority be delegated to the Head of Development Management, in consultation with the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive to impose appropriate planning conditions.

31. **16/00189/FULL - DEMOLITION OF SAILING CLUB (AND ASSOCIATED FLAT) AND ERECTION OF DETACHED BUILDING TO FORM SAILING CLUB AND 9 NO. TWO BEDROOM FLATS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, CAR PARKING, CYCLE AND REFUSE STORES (as amplified by additional ecological information received 2.6.16 and additional information received 7.7.16) 46 Marine Parade East Lee-On-The-Solent Hampshire PO13 9BW**

Councillor Beavis declared a personal interest in this item; he left the meeting room and took no part in the discussion or the voting thereon.

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor & Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00189/FULL.

Mr Temperton was invited to address the Board.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Mr Temperton advised Members that residents had concerns regarding the information relating to the access of the site and the associated responsibilities of Hampshire County Council's Highway Department and Gosport Borough Council's Planning Department.

Mr Temperton went on to say that the original case officer had advised that the decision to allow access to the site from the rear access way was a Hampshire Highways Department decision and not a matter that Gosport Borough Council could rule on. However, Mr Temperton added that a Senior Transport Planner at the Hampshire Highways Department had advised that they were purely a consultee and that any decision rested with the Local Planning Authority. Mr Temperton further advised that Hampshire County Council had based their response to this application on their response to the original application; they have "no objection".

Mr Temperton felt that it should therefore be requested that the application was deferred until such time as Gosport Borough Council and Hampshire County Council Highways Department produced a more considered response than "no objection."

Mr Temperton advised Members that the residential population of the proposed development would generate noise, light pollution (from both internal and external lighting) and an increase in traffic movements in the immediate area, specifically in the rear access way.

Mr Temperton advised Members that there was not anything in the proposal that suggested a positive environmental dimension and that addressed the effect that the development might have on the amenities of the neighbouring properties such as the overlooking and loss of privacy; incompatible location, design or mass.

Mr Temperton advised Members that the design was inappropriate in terms of both scale and massing and was therefore inconsistent with Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Council Local Plan.

Mr Temperton advised Members that it could be seen from the elevation plans submitted that the mass of the proposal was considered greater than that of both the existing building and the extant proposal. He further felt that the proposal sought to add more than the equivalent of a floor to the mass of the existing building and added that the present club house had a roof line roughly level with the 3rd floor of Seaview Court.

Mr Temperton advised Members that there was nothing in the application that in any way protected the amenities of the residential properties in Cambridge Road and the proposals were therefore contrary to Policy LP14 of the Gosport Borough Council Local Plan.

Mr Temperton advised Members that the proposal did not meet the criteria of LP24 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan because the proposal was based on the presumption that the height and ridge line was taken from the highest point of Seaview Court, the only structure on that stretch of Marine Parade East to be of such a height.

Mr Temperton also noted that the 8 residential properties and the Old Ship Inn, extending to the south-east of the Sailing Club, were generally of a similar height to the current club house, with one being a bungalow.

Mr Temperton advised Members that the proposed parking provision for the site for 26 vehicles reflected a significant increase in the current usage of the rear access way.

In conclusion, Mr Temperton advised Members that the plan for the rear elevation showed 18 separate windows on the first and second floor levels and a very large glazed section on the second floor committee room of the Sailing Club providing panoramic views of Cambridge Road and beyond. The combined effect of these glazed areas would be to provide a level of overlooking and loss of privacy not seen on any other block of flats on Marine Parade East or West.

Following a Member's question as to whether the correct process was followed to advertise and notify residents affected by the proposals, the Head of Development Management advised the Board that a press notice would have been published and site notices erected. It was also confirmed that residents within 5 metres of the development site should have received a letter advising that an application had been received.

Mr Warburton was invited to address the Board. He advised Members that he was the Commodore of the Sailing Club and speaking in support of the proposal.

Mr Warburton provided Members with background details of the Sailing Club and advised that the proposal incorporated changes and adaptations needed to meet current demands and promote health for the whole community.

Mr Warburton advised Members that the Sailing Club was a thriving volunteer-run club and supported community events such as the Gosport Marine Festival; providing local people with access to sailing facilities.

Mr Warburton advised that presently the club house was an iconic building on the seafront but was in a state of disrepair and of little visual benefit. He felt that the new design would be more neighbourly and energy efficient and would make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

Mr Warburton further clarified that 4 windows proposed on the south-eastern side elevation of the new building would be obscure glazed to protect privacy.

RESOLVED: That planning application 16/00189/FULL be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**32. 16/00156/DETS – DETAILS PURSUANT TO APPLICATION 15/00316/OUT – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND ERECTION OF BUILDING TO FORM 5 NO. FLATS WITH CAR PARKING, REFUSE AND CYCLE STORAGE (DETAILS OF ACCESS, LAYOUT, SCALE, APPEARANCE AND LANDSCAPING) (as amended by plans received 15.05.2016)
47 Marine Parade East Lee-on-the-Solent Hampshire PO12 9BW**

Councillor Beavis declared a personal interest in this item; he left the meeting room and took no part in the discussion or the voting thereon.

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00156/DETS.

Mr Temperton was invited to address the Board.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Mr Temperton advised the Board that he was speaking on behalf of a group of neighbouring properties to the application site that had raised concerns that neither the outline application nor the full application had been correctly processed and that nobody was formally aware of the submission of either application.

Mr Temperton advised Members that should the development go ahead it was clear that there would be an effect on the local environment. The increased residential population of the proposed development would generate noise, light pollution (from both internal and external lighting) and an increase in traffic movements in the immediate area, specifically in the rear access way. Mr Temperton added that there was not anything in the proposal that suggested a positive environmental dimension.

Mr Temperton reminded Members of Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan that is permissive of development within the defined urban areas subject to the development being of appropriate design, scale and massing for its setting. Mr Temperton advised that in relation to its setting, the design was inappropriate in terms of both scale and massing.

Mr Temperton further advised Members that it could be seen from the plans submitted that the mass of the proposal was greater than that of the existing building and that the proposal sought to add another floor to the mass of the existing building.

Mr Temperton added that a particular concern was the inclusion of a lift tower on the north-west side of the proposed development and that the planning document provided had only seemed to consider the impact of the structure in relation to it being viewed from the front of the proposed building. Mr Temperton also noted that the lift tower had a flat roof, whereas the Marine Parade Area of Special Character SPD “encourages roof forms that are hipped, pitched or gabled”. Mr Temperton concluded that the proposals did not follow the SPD.

Mr Temperton advised Members of Policy LP14 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan which – sets out special criteria for development proposals on Marine Parade including the protection of amenities of neighbouring residential properties. Mr Temperton advised that there was nothing in the application that protected the amenities of the residential properties in Cambridge Road.

Mr Temperton advised Members that the proposal did not meet the criteria of LP24 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan. The height of the proposed development was based on an arc drawn from the top of the south-east corner of Seaview Court over the roof of the proposed Sailing Club development to the roof of 48 Marine Parade East.

Mr Temperton advised Members that it should be noted that the 6 residential properties extending to the south-east of the application site were generally of a similar height to the present house at No.47. Mr Temperton felt that in terms of visual consistency the deciding factor on height should be based on the majority of properties along the stretch of Marine Parade East not Seaview Court

or the proposed Sailing Club development. Mr Temperton further advised that it should also be noted that No.47 was comparable in height to the present Sailing Club and No.46.

Mr Temperton advised Members that the planning document stated that the distance between the proposed development and the Cambridge Road properties is sufficient and complies” with the Design SPD, noting that these distances are general guidance not regulations and should be considered in the context of the setting to which they relate.

Mr Temperton advised that the garage at the rear of the application site was not referred to in the planning application. This omission meant that a separate application would be required to approve its demolition. Mr Temperton added that the garage, over 5 metres in height, was what provided significant privacy between No.47 and the Cambridge Road properties. It had been suggested that plantings would quickly attain a similar height to the garage and mitigate the issue of overlooking and add an environmental dimension to the proposal.

Mr Temperton advised Members that no consideration had been given to the strength of the surface of the rear access way adding that, should the application be approved, this brings into question the ability of the surface of the rear access way to withstand use by construction traffic and the long term significant increase in traffic.

Mr Temperton advised Members that the proposed parking provision for the site was for 8 vehicles, a significant increase in relation to the current level of use.

In conclusion Mr Temperton advised Members that there were numerous important issues relating to the application that required more thought to ensure that the application was correctly processed and considered.

Mr Tony Allies was invited to address the Board whereby he thanked Members for the opportunity to speak on the application. Mr Allies explained that he was the architect speaking in support of the proposal and on behalf of the Applicant.

Mr Allies advised Members that the Planning Officer’s report was comprehensive and that the applicant had worked with Planning Officers to comply with all applicable planning policies and frameworks to ensure that the proposed design was responsive to the local environment.

Mr Allies advised Members that the proposal was to replace a large detached house which had some damp issues, was difficult to heat and no longer met the requirements of the occupants who love the locality and plan to live in the replacement building should it receive planning consent.

Mr Allies advised Members that the proposal was of a similar scale to the existing property on the site and would therefore have a similar impact on neighbouring properties.

Mr Allies advised Members that the previously approved plans for the adjacent sailing club were larger in scale than the existing building on this site and justified a modest increase in size adjacent to the boundary.

Mr Allies advised Members that the issues that had been raised in respect of the application were the same as those that had been raised at the outline stage and concluded that these were responded to in detail at the time of the outline application and the outline application had been subsequently approved with appropriate conditions.

Mr Allies advised Members that the Planning Officer’s report confirmed that the distances between windows were considered acceptable and that all practical arrangements were acceptable with no objections having been raised by Council Departments, Hampshire Highways or any other statutory consultees.

Mr Allies felt that there was no planning policy basis to refuse this application, which had been carefully designed to respect the local environment and to comply with all reasonable requirements for a proposal in the location.

In conclusion, Mr Allies requested that Members approve the application on the basis of the current planning policy framework which would apply to any application for the site, the outline consent already approved which had been supported by full and essentially identical details to this proposal and the Planning Officer's detailed and considered recommendation.

RESOLVED: That planning application 16/00156/DETS be approved subject to the conditions in the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**33. 16/00246/FULL - ERECTION OF 2NO. MODULAR BUILDINGS (TO PROVIDE 3NO. SHOW HOMES) AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AND PARKING (as amended by plans received 21.06.2016)
Drake Road Lee-On-The-Solent Hampshire**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00246/FULL.

Mr Stephenson was invited to address the Board. He advised Members that he was speaking on behalf of several residents in Drake Road who have been resigned to the fact that further residential development was certain. However, he felt that the proposal should take into account the interests of other Drake Road residents that had been in residence for more than 62 years.

Mr Stephenson advised the Board that concerns had been raised with regards to vehicle parking. He advised that Drake Road was a narrow cul-de-sac and was the only refuge off Marine Parade West for some distance in both directions and was effectively an overspill car park for Marine Parade West residents. Mr Stephen concluded that current parking provisions were inadequate and that further congestion would be experienced from people viewing the show homes.

Mr Stephenson advised Members that the majority of dwellings fronting Marine Parade West to the west of Richmond Road were either rendered or all plain brick and added that concerns had been raised by residents that the proposal would look out of keeping with the surrounding area.

Mr Stephenson advised Members that dwellings in Drake Road were all of some age; Wharfedale, for example was almost 100 years old and had never been overlooked at the front nor the back. Mr Stephenson believed that this proposal would cause a loss of privacy with views directly into the private front garden of Wharfedale.

Mr Stephenson advised Members that residents felt that any new homes being built in Drake Road should be orientated, such that back gardens, with no access, were presented to Drake Road, with frontage facing west or into the development area. Mr Stephenson felt that there was ample space available to site show homes away from Drake Road, which would avoid congestion and loss of privacy for existing residents.

Mr Stephenson concluded that residents were concerned by the lack of plan for the derelict site between Drake Road and the Ross House boundary.

Mr Jonathan Moore was invited to address the Board. He advised Members that he was the Architect speaking on behalf of the Applicant, Offsite Homes Limited, who are a locally-based company that developed prototypes for a new model of housing utilising modular technologies.

Mr Moore advised Members that the new homes were intended to be built to maximise quality of construction, minimising waste, impact on the environment and lengthy build times and to deliver cost effective housing.

Mr Moore further advised Members that the proposed show homes would showcase the modular housing system developed by a local company.

Mr Moore advised Members that concerns regarding parking provisions were being addressed and that visitors to the show home would be limited to business customers and by appointment only. It would not be open to members of the public.

Following a question from a Member Mr Moore advised that Offsite Homes had looked at other areas in Daedalus to accommodate the proposal but had concluded that the site proposed was a strong preference because it was within a residential area and would set the buildings into context.

Following a question, Mr Moore advised Members that the modular show homes on the site were temporary and could be moved. It was also indicated that the proposed units were 'proto-types' and likely to be replaced by new models in the future.

Members were further advised by the Planning Officer that if the buildings were to become permanent dwellings for occupancy, a further planning permission would need to be sought.

Following discussions Members felt that the proposal would create employment opportunities and generate interest in the Daedalus site.

RESOLVED: That planning application 16/00246/FULL be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**34. 16/00186/FULL – CHANGE OF USE OF PREMISES FROM FINANCIAL AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES (CLASS A2) TO CLINIC (CLASS D1)
5-6 The Precinct South Street Gosport Hampshire PO12 1HA**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00186/FULL.

Members were advised that an additional letter of representation from a local business had been received. This letter was read out by the Planning Officer as follows:

"Firstly I would like to touch on the comment from the applicant in their additional information document that 'it is not known where the assumption that hazardous substances will be brought on site has arisen from. Within the application form it was not stated'. Section 7 states clearly that 'Hazardous waste to be stored internally and disposed of via private contractors'. If this is an oversight on their part then you would hope that their attention to details like this does not extend to the rest of their Application form, if this was a deliberate omission and an attempt to discredit those raising concerns then I would like to suggest that they are not an organisation that the Council might like to support.

This directly leads to one of my concerns that has effectively been ignored and that is a simple question of how do these 'hazardous materials' get on-site. It's easy to dispose of them afterwards securely but the only possible way for them to get onsite is for clients to bringing them with them through an open precinct where children do play and families pass through regularly. As to the type of potential hazardous waste then I will also refer the applicant to their application where it clearly states that they will operate a needle exchange.

The danger of any hazardous materials is that they can be dropped by clients either passing through, or congregating in, the shopping precinct prior or after therapy.

I can only imagine what the outcry would be if a needle happened to be dropped and picked up by a child. This type of impact on the public needs to be considered properly and not swept under the carpet as I feel the applicant's response, and the note to councillors for this meeting, has attempted to do.

Surely this is a public health risk. This is a designated shopping precinct and the proposed clinic must be considered incompatible with the Precinct location, even though it might conform to the Gosport Borough Local plan 2029. There are other more appropriate areas with less public access within scope of the Local plan 2029. To justify the location as appropriate, just because of the plan,

does not take into account local knowledge and the variations in suitability of certain locations covered by that plan.

I also note with interest that in the guidance for the public on raising a concern there were strict guidelines on what can, and can't be considered as a valid grounds for comment. Whilst not allowed as a valid concern I do notice that in the application form it talks about bringing a new business into a vacant unit in the Precinct thereby improving its utilisation. It all sounds very positive but the alternative view was not an area that would have been recognised as a formal concern. However, now that it has been raised by the Applicant, I would suggest that the impact will be that other vacant units are now less likely to be filled and that those units that are filled are more likely to find locations more suitable to their businesses. As a co-owner of one of the recent businesses in the Precinct I can state that it is very unlikely that we would have taken the unit had the proposed clinic been present. The impact on the Public through the variety of shops and shopping experience available to them, will in the mid to long term be detrimental. By accepting this application the Council will be making it far less attractive for businesses to operate out of the Precinct and in future there could well be more vacant units than now.

In summary I don't believe all the considerations have been addressed by the applicant and the Council in taking this decision to base a rehabilitation clinic in a local shopping precinct. Not being a planning officer or in any way aware of the procedures/processes of the Council, I am deeply concerned that this has not been more openly discussed within the Council and that no wider debate has been held by all Councillors on the issues of public health and the longer term future of one of Gosport's shopping areas."

The response from the Applicant was read out as follows:

"The hazardous waste confusion was the result of the planning application team, and nothing to do with SSSFT NHS. It was believed this comment was referring to drugs (i.e. methodone) being dispensed, which is not the case for the service.

All pharmacies in the local area are required to do needle exchange, and it is not planned that SSSFT's service would replace these. The service provided is simply an obligatory emergency exchange service and not something that is anticipated to become a regular service.

The service offers vaccinations against blood borne diseases and as such is required to safely dispose of this type of hazardous waste.

SSSFT currently have a local service in Fareham and are expecting to open another in Rowner. Therefore the people that will utilise this service are from Gosport and are already localised in the area.

There will be a dedicated smoking area away from the central precinct area.

As stated in the management plan, should anything be considered anti-social it will be dealt with by the staff.

The police station neighbouring the precinct is considered to be a powerful deterrent of any negative behaviour.

The service is in place to improve public health and improve the lives of a vulnerable section of the local population.

It is understood that MIND (already in the precinct) offer a weekly alcohol and drug public group on a weekly basis."

Following a Member's question regarding the location of the smoking area, the Planning Officer advised that the Applicant would manage the site and that staff and customers at the facility would not be provided with a smoking shelter to allow them to smoke outside the facility.

Following discussions Members recognised that this proposal would provide a facility in the community and that this facility was ideally placed for accessibility to public transport routes and parking.

RESOLVED That planning application 16/00186/FULL be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**35. 16/00223/FULL – ERECTION OF TWO STOREY FRONT/SIDE EXTENSION
92 The Avenue Gosport Hampshire PO12 2JU**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00223/FULL.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Mr Forshaw was invited to address the Board and advised Members that whilst he understood the Applicants wished to extend their home, he objected to the effects that the proposal would have on his residential amenity due to overshadowing and overlooking.

Mr Forshaw advised Members that two of his lounge windows and two bedroom windows faced south, with a separation of 20ft to the north wall of No.92. Mr Forshaw added that, should the proposal be allowed, the visual impact of the extension would be oppressive and overbearing and that they would suffer an unacceptable loss of light and outlook from the lounge windows.

Mr Forshaw advised Members that the views of St Mary's Church and Alverstoke Village that used to be enjoyed had largely disappeared over time due to the trees in the garden of no.92 growing taller and wider. However, Mr Forshaw advised that the sunlight still flooded through the south facing windows throughout the day. In conclusion Mr Forshaw stated that if the proposal was approved, his residence would suffer a huge loss of natural light making his lounge become colder and darker.

Mr Forshaw also expressed concerns with the potential risk of structural damage to his property as the footings under his house were very shallow and major construction work being carried out so close could cause damage.

In conclusion, Mr Forshaw advised Members that The Avenue was characterised by large detached houses, set in spacious gardens with wide gaps between properties. Mr Forshaw felt that the proposed extension would reduce the gap between the two properties to 9ft which was not in keeping with the area.

The Applicant Mr Collins was invited to address the Board.

Mr Collins advised Members that he believed the reason for their application was irrelevant, however it was being sought to provide accommodation for his son and, to a limited extent his children, for the foreseeable future.

Mr Collins advised that currently they had a total of 4 fully opening windows facing the south wall of No 90 The Avenue, these being the ground floor garage, plus the bathroom, lavatory and landing on the first floor. Until all the windows were replaced, the landing window was clear glass and looked directly into the south-facing window of one of the bedrooms at No. 90. Mr Collins further advised that the proposal would reduce these to a side door into the garage and a single, non-opening and obscured glass window on the first floor, thereby improving the privacy of No. 90 The Avenue..

Mr Collins felt that there were a number of contradictions in the concerns raised regard to outlook and visual impact since, on the one hand No. 90 The Avenue mentioned the impact of trees at No 92 blocking views of the church, whilst ignoring the fact that such a view has largely disappeared over many years due to the growth of trees and buildings far beyond the boundary. Mr Collins also noted that the residents at No 90 say that "during the circa 25 years we have lived at No 90 my

wife and I have enjoyed a pleasant outlook on the south side”, but then concluding that this outlook had always been dominated by sheds and the caravan in the carport at No 92, which had abutted the boundary since 1986.

Mr Collins further advised that, in addition, two very large bay trees, which were particularly high and still shown on the “Google Earth” website, were also on the shared boundary adjacent to No. 90 The Avenue’s south-facing windows until early 2015 when he had cut them down. Mr Collins added that there was also a large “Bird Cherry” tree close to the shared boundary which he had also cut down. Mr Collins stated that these trees had always dominated any view from No. 90 The Avenue’s small, south facing windows and added that there had been trees along the shared boundary since before they had bought their house in 1986.

Mr Collins advised Members that No. 90 had also raised concerns about a “two storey solid brick wall circa 9 feet from the house”, with further concerns that the extension would project several feet forward from the present building line. Mr Collins advised that the proposed extension would be, at its closest, 3.08 metres or a little over 10 feet from the boundary wall, and would project forward by just 1.2 metres or a little less than 4 feet, meaning that the proposed new wall would be just 0.8 metres or just over 2 and a half feet closer to No.90 The Avenue than the footprint of the existing car port, and certainly beyond the 3 metre limit required by the Party Wall Act for the foundations required.

Mr Collins concluded that the footprint of the proposed extension was therefore not much greater than the existing car port; therefore, any loss of light to No 90 would be minimal. The main windows serving No. 90 The Avenue’s ground floor room face east and west, and the extension would have no impact on these, therefore, Mr Collins believed that the statements regarding “a huge loss of natural light” and “our lounge would become colder and darker” are fanciful. Meanwhile, no 90’s bedrooms are similarly served with large windows on the east and west sides, so the same argument applies.

Mr Collins advised that the concern of structural damage to a neighbouring property was completely unfounded, given that the separation between the walls would exceed 10 feet. Furthermore Mr Collins added that the excavation of the deep and much closer footings required for the recently built orangery at No.90 clearly had had no impact on No.90 The Avenue’s foundations, and neither had the second floor extension which No 90 had built on the north-west corner of their house some years ago.

Mr Collins advised that anyone familiar with the area would recognise that the proposed extension was entirely in keeping with the area, being not dissimilar to a number of others along The Avenue. The proposal was developed by a qualified architect familiar with the area, but not before notifying Mr. Forshaw of their intentions.

In conclusion, Mr Collins asked Members to consider the similarities with the recently completed extension at No. 66 The Avenue, approved by the planning board on 2 June 2015 under Planning Application 15/00081/FULL. Mr Collins advised Members that this project had been much more ambitious than the one proposed, and had resulted in the extensive development of both north and south aspects, with the northerly aspect being very similar to his proposal.

A Member asked for clarification on how the impact of the proposal and the consideration of loss of light to neighbouring properties was assessed. The Planning Officer advised that the height, proximity and orientation of the existing building and the proposed development were taken into account when considering the impact of the application.

Following Members’ discussions, it was proposed and subsequently agreed that the application be deferred for a site visit.

RESOLVED: That planning application 16/00223/FULL be deferred for a site visit.

**36. 16/00226/ADVT – RETENTION AND CONTINUED DISPLAY OF 2 NO. NON ILLUMINATED SIGNS
Beechcroft Manor 1 Beechcroft Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 2EP**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00226/ADVT.

Mr Lazenbury was invited to address the Board.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Mr Lazenbury advised Members that he lived and worked in Gosport, employing some 15 staff, and had lived at 32 Anglesey Road for a number of years.

Mr Lazenbury advised Members that the two signs at Beechcroft Manor were out of keeping with the residential area Mr Lazenbury referred Members to photographs that he had circulated to the Board and advised that the two signs were differing heights and far too big and high.

In conclusion Mr Lazenbury advised that the signs and the height of the wall above which they stand, and due to their new positioning, could cause a distraction to drivers turning into and out of Beechcroft Road. Therefore, Mr Lazenbury asked Members to refuse the retrospective planning application.

RESOLVED: That the application for advertisement consent 16/00226/ADVT be approved.

**37. 16/00215/FULL – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING OFFICES AND TEMPORARY WAREHOUSE AND ERECTION OF EXTENSIONS TO NORTH AND EAST ELEVATIONS TO FORM PRODUCTION AREA, WAREHOUSE AND OFFICES, PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL CAR PARKING AREA, RECONFIGURATION OF INTERNAL LAYOUT, RELOCATION OF EXISTING CYCLE AND PALLET STORE, PROVISION OF SMOKING SHELTER AND REPLACEMENT SPRINKLER TANK (as amplified by supporting documents received 04.07.16 and 12.07.16 and 18.07.16)
Huhtamaki (UK) Ltd Rowner Road Gosport Hampshire PO13 0PR**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00215/FULL.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Following discussions Members felt that this application proposed an increase to the number of employment opportunities within Gosport and as a consequence they welcomed the application.

RESOLVED: That planning application 16/00215/FULL, be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

38. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business

The meeting concluded at 20:10

CHAIRMAN

GOSPORT BOROUGH COUNCIL – REGULATORY BOARD

20th September 2016

ITEMS WITH RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Copies of drawings and accompanying planning applications referred to in this schedule will be made available for inspection by Members from 5.00 pm immediately prior to the meeting. Unless otherwise advised, these plans will be displayed in the room in which the Regulatory Board is to be held.
2. The number of objections and representations indicated in the schedule are correct at the time the recommendations were formulated. Should any representations be made after this date, these will be notified to the Regulatory Board during the officer presentation.
3. Copies of all representations received from the public will be made available for inspection by Members in the same way as drawings will be made available, referred to in Note 1 above.
4. An index of planning applications within this schedule can be found overleaf, together with a summary of each recommendation.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Page No</u>	<u>Appl. No.</u>	<u>INDEX Address</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
01.	3-5/1	16/00223/FULL	92 The Avenue Gosport Hampshire PO12 2JU	Grant Permission subject to Conditions
02.	7-9/1	16/00248/FULL	1 Shell Pier Cottages Hayling Close Gosport Hampshire PO12 4JS	Grant Permission subject to Conditions
03.	11- 14/1	15/00633/FULL	45 Woodstock Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 1RS	Grant Permission subject to Conditions
04.	15- 19/1	16/00387/FULL	6 Compton Close Lee-On- The-Solent Hampshire PO13 8JP	Grant Permission
05.	21- 25/1	16/00027/FULL	St Vincent College Mill Lane Gosport Hampshire PO12 4QA	Grant Permission subject to Conditions
06.	27- 28/1	16/00298/FULL	3 Village Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 2LD	Grant Permission subject to Conditions

ITEM NUMBER: 01.
APPLICATION NUMBER: 16/00223/FULL
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Collins
DATE REGISTERED: 29.04.2016

ERECTION OF TWO STOREY FRONT/SIDE EXTENSION
92 The Avenue Gosport Hampshire PO12 2JU

The Site and the proposal

1. This application was considered by the Regulatory Board on 27 June 2016 when Members resolved to defer it for a site visit.
2. The application property is a detached two storey house, located on a corner plot at the junction of The Avenue and Beatty Drive. The house is set back 20m from the road frontage and well screened by mature landscaping, although partial glimpses of the front elevation are available particularly along the gated driveway. The area is characterised by good sized, detached family houses set within well maintained grounds offering off-road parking and attractive landscaping.
3. The house is constructed of white painted brickwork under a red/brown concrete pantile roof. Its curtilage is bounded on the southern Beatty Road frontage by a well maintained hedgerow in excess of two metres height. Within the curtilage, and particularly along The Avenue frontage are mature trees with an understorey shrub layer. Boundary treatment within the site, along the shared boundaries with the neighbouring properties, comprise two metre high timber fencing. There are a number of small outbuildings incidental to the enjoyment of the house within the space where the extension is proposed on the north side of the site adjacent to 90 The Avenue. These, a carport and two sheds would be removed to make way for the extension.
4. The proposal is for a two storey front and side extension to provide an additional double length garage at ground floor level and an additional bedroom, shower room and extended (existing) bathroom at first floor level. It would be set off the shared boundary with 90 The Avenue by 1.1m to allow for a gated walkway to the rear garden and access to a side door proposed in the garage. The extension dimensions are: a 1.2m forward projection from existing forward most point of the house, 3.7m additional width, 8.9m depth and 5.3m height to eaves level. The front elevation is designed to 'cantilever' the extension to the existing bathroom over the existing garage giving an overhang of 1.2m and altering the existing hipped roof of that element of the elevation to a vertical wall. This gives a slightly awkward roof junction with a cat-slide roof formation being used to link into the main eaves.
5. Number 90 The Avenue, to the north west, is positioned approximately 1m behind and in the same alignment to the application site. Given the proposed forward projection of the proposed extension the house as extended would sit 2.3m forward of the front corner of 90 The Avenue. 90 The Avenue has ground and first floor habitable room windows facing the extension (a lounge on the ground floor and two separate bedrooms at first floor). There is also a 1.9m wide walkway between the house and the side boundary giving total separation between the properties of 3.1m compared to 6.8m at the moment (not taking into account the car port and sheds).

Relevant Planning History

Nil

Relevant Policies

Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011 – 2029:
LP10
Design
LP23

Layout of Sites and Parking

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Gosport Borough Council Design Guidance: Supplementary Planning Document: February 2014

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012

Consultations

Nil

Response to Public Advertisement

1 letter of objection

Issues raised:-

- overshadowing due to height and proximity to the boundary immediately south of habitable room windows.
- loss of light and outlook due to forward projection, two storey height and proximity to boundary.
- internal layout means habitable room windows face onto extension.
- loss of gap between building would be out of character with the area.
- possible structural damage due to age of properties.

Principal Issues

1. Potential structural damage during construction is not a material planning consideration. The main issues in this case are therefore the acceptability of the design of the proposed extension and the impact on the character of the existing dwelling, the character of and visual impact on the street scene and the amenities of the adjacent occupiers.

2. The scale, height and massing of the extension is proportionately sympathetic to the existing dwelling. The ridge and eaves are continuous and the roof pitches and materials are to match the existing. The windows to the first floor front elevation differ from those on the existing house in that they are of horizontal rather than vertical profile. This is due to the height of the proposed garage door which is designed to allow access for a larger motorhome type vehicle. This is not considered to be a significant design issue which would detract from the character of the house or the streetscene.

3. The significant set back of the house, reinforced by the mature landscape screening, means that the impact on the wider street scene will not be significant. The existing gap between the houses is not readily discerned and there is not a uniform spatial pattern established within the street. The gaps between houses vary, and whilst each application is considered on its merits, it is worth noting that other plots within the street, such as at 66 The Avenue, (15/00081) have been similarly extended in the recent past. The forward projection would similarly not have a significant impact on the character of the area where there is no clearly established building line. The proposal is therefore considered to have an acceptable impact upon the streetscene and the wider character of the area in accordance with Policy LP10 (Design) of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

4. The adopted policies of the Development Plan support new development and Policy LP1.3 (Sustainable Development) identifies that the Council will grant planning permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is acknowledged that the proposed extension would have an impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the property at 90 The Avenue. The combination of the projection forward beyond the existing front elevation, the two storey height and the proximity to the boundary would affect the outlook from and light into habitable room windows at number 90, in particular, the ground floor lounge and a first floor bedroom and there would be a greater sense of enclosure within these rooms which would decrease the level of amenity currently enjoyed by the occupier's. Being immediately north of the extension, some direct light would also be lost from these rooms up to around midday when the alignment of the houses means the sun would then pass

behind the existing house from midday onwards. There would also be an increased sense of enclosure when viewed from the existing area at the side of the house.

5. The applicant has referred to a similar application nearby at 66 The Avenue which has recently been completed. The judgement regarding the impact on neighbouring amenity is, however, unique to the characteristics of each site. Whilst there are similarities in terms of design, orientation of properties, forward projection, proximity to boundary, windows and internal rooms impacted upon each site must be dealt with on its own merits.

6. In this instance, the lounge and front bedroom of the neighbouring property at number 90 do benefit from a large front facing window which would not be affected by the proposals and which provide the rooms with natural light and outlook. The area to the side of the dwelling is also not used as 'sitting out' garden space from which the neighbour would currently enjoy a high level of amenity. The neighbours newly constructed garden room and rear garden will be unaffected by the proposals. For these reasons, whilst it is acknowledged that the proposals will have an impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property at number 90, the impacts are not considered to be significant enough to warrant refusal of the application in this instance.

7. The site currently benefits from an integral garage and the car port to be replaced by the new extended garage facility. The on-site parking and turning complies with adopted standards and is designed to meet the dimensions of the applicants own private vehicle(s).

8. For the above reasons it is therefore considered that the proposal is in compliance with Policies LP1 and LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011-2029.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant Permission

Subject to the following condition(s):-

1. The development hereby permitted must be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.

Reason - To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended).

2. The materials to be used for the extensions, alterations and garage shall match in type, colour and texture, those on the existing dwelling unless otherwise agreed, in writing, with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To ensure satisfactory visual relationship of the new development to the existing, and to comply with Policy LP10 of Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011-2029

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

A4 Location Plan 1:1250, A4 Site Plan 1:500, collins-16-02 proposed elevations and floor plans ,collins 16-04 proposed ground floor layout,collins 16-03 proposed first floor layout.

Reason - To ensure that the development is completed satisfactorily in all respects and to comply with Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

ITEM NUMBER: 02.
APPLICATION NUMBER: 16/00248/FULL
APPLICANT: Ms Annette Thorne
DATE REGISTERED: 13.05.2016

RETENTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION (AMENDMENT TO 15/00149/FULL) (CONSERVATION AREA)
1 Shell Pier Cottages Hayling Close Gosport Hampshire PO12 4JS

The Site and the proposal

1. The application property comprises an end-terrace 19th Century Cottage, with outbuildings at the rear within the Urban Area Boundary and Priddy's Hard Conservation Area. The application site has a 15m long and 5m wide rear garden. There is a single storey garage and parking area to the side of the property. The property is constructed from brick walls, with white framed double glazed windows, under a plain clay tile and blue/grey slated roof. The dwelling fronts onto Priory Road and benefits from views over Portsmouth Harbour beyond. The rear garden benefits from landscaping which results in little being able to be seen from outside of the site. To the north-west, west and south of the site there are a mixture of three and four storey, recently built, apartment blocks, interspersed with modern two storey terrace housing. There is also a network of access roads and formally laid out parking areas to serve these apartment buildings.

2. The proposal is retrospective and follows the granting of planning permission for a smaller rear extension (15/00149/FULL) in June 2015. The current proposal is therefore, for the retention of the single storey extension erected on the site. The approved single storey extension was 3.5m in height along the shared boundary with No 2 (which was 0.2m higher than the original extension it replaced). However, the as built scheme raises the angle and height of the mono-pitch roof, (to ensure that the roof slates have sufficient slope for water run-off and head room in the room below) , making the roof a maximum of 3.9m in height. This is 0.6m higher than the original single storey extension and 0.4m higher than what was permitted in 2015. The eaves level on the north-west side elevation (away from neighbours) of the extension is also raised by 0.2m, to a height of 2.5m. No other changes have taken place on this development. The extension has been constructed using dark red brick walls, white framed windows and doors under a blue/grey slated roof.

Relevant Planning History

15/00149/FULL - part demolition of existing rear extension and construction of new extension (Conservation Area) - permitted 18.06.15
K15653/1 - erection of two storey rear extension (Conservation Area) - permitted 14.07.03
K15653 - erection of single garage and driveway (as amended by plan received 23.11.00) (Conservation Area) - permitted 04.12.00

Relevant Policies

Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011 – 2029:

LP10

Design

LP12

Designated Heritage Assets: Conservation Areas

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Gosport Borough Council Design Guidance: Supplementary Planning Document: February 2014

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012

Consultations

Environmental Health	No objection, subject to condition and informative regarding possible land contamination.
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	No objection.
The Gosport Society	No response received.

Response to Public Advertisement

1 letter of objection,

Issues raised:-

- the original approval was a maximum of 3.5m in height, although they were concerned but they did not object to the proposal;
- the extension now is 4m in height more than originally agreed, which restricts natural daylight by over 50% more;
- the development is visually prominent, it is not in keeping and does not preserve the look of the historic dwelling within the Conservation Area;

Principal Issues

1. The site is located within an area of potentially contaminated ground. Environmental Health have recommended attaching a condition and informative relating to encountering potential contamination during the construction phase, however, it is inappropriate to attach this condition and informative, as the development has already been carried out and works have concluded on site. Therefore, the main issues in this case are the acceptability of the design of the amended height of the extension, the impact on the visual amenity of the locality and the impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties. Also whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the Conservation Area.

2. The completed extension is located on the south-western rear elevation and replaces a smaller single storey wing on the rear elevation. The extension introduces a taller structure to the simple form of the rear elevation, however, the simple elements are retained and the extension is similar in design to the attached neighbouring dwellings to the south-east. The extension is still subservient in size to the existing dwelling and is of a compatible and acceptable design. Given the size of the site, the extended dwelling does sit comfortably within the plot, still allowing for significant amenity space in the rear garden. The front of the house and terrace can be clearly seen from the shore line, however, the rear elevation is partially obscured by walls and fences surrounding the rear gardens. Whilst this is a taller extension, it is not considered to have a detrimental impact upon the streetscene. The extension has been constructed using matching and suitable materials. The extension as constructed does preserve the special historic and architectural character of the Conservation Area and does not have a harmful impact on the appearance of the dwelling, in compliance with Policies LP10 and LP12 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011 - 2029.

3. Concerns have been raised regarding the height of the extension and the impact this has on the neighbouring property. The amended extension does not introduce any more windows, therefore, the scheme does not increase overlooking or loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties. The house sits in line with other neighbouring houses to the south-east. The roof and parapet has been raised by a maximum of 0.4m from the approved scheme and this is located directly on the neighbouring boundary which has had an impact on daylight received at No.2. However, as the amended extension is to the north-west of this neighbour it has not considered that the loss of light is significant enough to warrant refusal of the application in this instance. The extension is a distance from other dwellings within Hayling Close, there being over 25m of separation to neighbouring apartment buildings to the south-west and 20m to the apartment building to the north-west. Therefore, it is not considered that the amended extension has any impact on the amenities

of other residential occupiers in the locality. This would be in compliance with Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011 - 2029.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant Permission

Subject to the following condition(s):-

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing No. 1232/02.

Reason - To ensure that the development is completed satisfactorily in all respects and to comply with Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011 - 2029.

ITEM NUMBER: 03.
APPLICATION NUMBER: 15/00633/FULL
APPLICANT: Mr S Murphy
DATE REGISTERED: 22.12.2015

**ERECTION OF PART TWO STOREY AND PART SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY FRONT BAY WINDOW (as amended by plans received 29.04.16)
45 Woodstock Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 1RS**

The Site and the proposal

1. The application site is a rectangular plot located on the western side of Woodstock Road, close to the corner/junction with Woodley Road, within the Urban Area Boundary. The plot contains a Victorian two storey terrace house, with a detached outbuilding on the rear boundary. This is located within an established residential area of similar sized houses on the western side of the road, many of which have been altered and extended on the rear elevation by means of single storey extensions. Dwellings on the eastern side of Woodstock Road are 1920's semi-detached two storey houses, on larger rectangular plots and are constructed of yellow brick walls with red brick banding and detailing. The house on site was originally constructed from red brick work, matching the attached neighbouring terrace houses to the north and south. However, the front and rear elevations have been rendered over and covered in masonry paint, with the alteration of the window sizes and the insertion of a small bay window on the front elevation. The house also contains white uPVC double glazed windows and doors, under a concrete interlocking tiled pitched roof.

2. It is proposed to remove an existing rear single storey projection containing the kitchen, scullery and shower rooms and to erect a part two storey and part single storey extension to the rear, western elevation of the existing house. The proposal also includes a single storey bay window with mono-pitched roof, which would be inserted into the front, eastern elevation. The original design of these rear extensions has been amended and reduced in size in order to try and address concerns raised by neighbouring occupiers. The two storey part of the proposal when originally submitted measured 5.97m deep by 3.3m wide, to a height of 6.5m. As amended it measures approximately 3.3m deep by 3.3m wide, to maximum height over ridge of 6.5 metres. The single storey part of the proposal when originally submitted measured 9m deep by 4.28m wide, to a height of 2.895m. As amended, it measures 8.97m deep by 4.28m wide, to a height of 2.5m to the flat roof. The extension would contain bi-fold glazed doors on the rear elevation, with two roof lanterns and a glazed mono-pitched roof section on the ground floor. The first floor section would have two windows inserted in to the rear elevation. The extensions would allow for the re-modelling of the interior and the inclusion of a new kitchen, utility, shower, lounge/dining room on the ground floor and a new bathroom and linen cupboard on the first floor. The proposed rear extensions would be constructed using rendered and painted walls, with white uPVC double glazed windows and doors, under either a concrete tiled roof or under a flat roof.

Relevant Planning History

Nil

Relevant Policies

Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011 – 2029:

LP10

Design

LP47

Contamination and Unstable Land

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Gosport Borough Council Design Guidance: Supplementary Planning Document: February 2014

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012

Consultations

Environmental Health

No objection, subject to an attachment of a condition and informative regarding potential contamination of the site.

Response to Public Advertisement

1 letter of objection to original plans and 2 further letters of objection from each of the neighbours in respect to the amended plans,

Issues raised:-

- reduction/amendment of 2storey part of proposal will still reduce natural day light into their dwelling and rear garden, reduce the view out of their rear bedroom window;
- the amended ground floor extension would still cause visual impact of the proposal in rear garden;
- cause access from garden to house and patio area to be dark, enclosed and create damp problems;
- impact from building works as proposal on the boundaries of the site, which would cause noise, disruption and inconvenience to occupier.

Principal Issues

1. Possible damp problems and rights to a view are not material planning considerations and any disruption during building works would be dealt with by Environmental Health if a statutory nuisance was caused. The main issues in this case are, therefore, the acceptability of the design of the rear two and single storey extensions and front bay window extension, the impact on the visual amenity of the locality and the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings in terms of loss of light, outlook and privacy and if there is any impact from potential contaminated land on site.

2. The proposed two and single storey extensions would be located on the rear elevation and would form a western facing projection. Other neighbouring dwellings within the residential estate have only been altered with a single storey rear extension. Although this would be the first dwelling to be extended in this way in the locality, the proposal would be simple in form, the roof would be set down from the main ridge by 1.5m and is of a compatible and acceptable design to that of the original Victorian terrace house. The single storey part would be considered significant in size, as it would extend beyond the rear elevation of the property by a maximum of 8.97m but would only be 2.5m in height. The two storey part has been reduced in size and would be only 3.3m in depth by 6.5m in height. Up to a 3m deep two storey rear extension and a maximum of a 6m deep single storey extension (under a Prior Notification Application) would be allowed under Permitted Development rights. Given the scale and design of the extension, and that the two storey part would be set back from the side southern boundary by 1m and be of matching design, it would not be considered to have a significant visual impact upon the surrounding area. The proposed front bay window would be of a similar design to other bay windows on the neighbouring terrace houses to the south and north of the site. The proposed extensions would not have a harmful impact on the appearance of the dwelling or the visual amenity of the locality, in compliance with the NPPF and Policies LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011 - 2029.

3. Concerns have been raised regarding the size of the extensions and the resulting impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining properties. The proposal would be located on the rear elevation and would be clearly seen from the neighbouring properties to the north and south. The two storey part of the proposal would be set back from the attached southern neighbouring boundary at No.43 by 1m, but the side wall on the northern elevation would be located directly on the boundary with the attached northern neighbour's single storey rear projection at No.47. This northern side first floor elevation would project vertically upwards by 2.5m from the ridge of No.47's rear projection. However, this two storey proposal would only be 3.3m in depth and would have a pitched roof that would slope away from the northern boundary. The single storey part of the

proposal would project out from the original rear elevation by a maximum of 8.97m but would only be a maximum of 2.5m in height. This would only project outwards by 3m from the rear elevation of No.47's existing single storey projection. The proposal would have some impact on the daylight received at No.47 in the morning but not in the afternoon or evening due to the positioning of the sun from the south, setting in the evening to the west. This would ensure that the proposals would not be overbearing and would not significantly reduce natural daylight or cause a tunneling effect to No.47. The southern neighbour at No.43 would receive daylight from the south in late morning moving to the west in the evening. As the proposal would be to the north of this neighbour and set back from the boundary by 1m, it would not significantly reduce natural daylight or cause a tunneling effect to No.43. There would be no windows inserted into the side elevations and only two smaller window inserted at first floor level on the western rear elevation. This would not overlook any private rear amenity spaces/gardens and would not allow views into neighbouring windows and house, due to the rear location. The rear bi-fold doors and first floor windows would only allow direct views down the rear garden of the site and will not increase levels of overlooking above those which already exist. There is over a 30m separation between neighbouring dwellings to the west and the proposal's rear elevation. The proposed front bay window would be similar to other bay windows on attached neighbouring properties to the north and south and would only allow views of the streetscene which is within public view. No neighbouring properties would therefore be harmfully overlooked by this part of the development. For the above reasons and in the context of the level of works that could be undertaken without the need for planning permission, it is considered that the proposals would not have a harmful impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent properties. This would be in compliance with Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011 - 2029.

4. Environmental Health were consulted due to the site being located within a Buffer area for potentially contaminated land, as the site is close to an historic landfill site. They commented that although they had no objection to this proposal, this was however subject to the attachment of a condition and informative regarding the potential of finding any potential contamination on the site during construction of the proposal and to ensure that there is mitigation for any potential contamination and that the development can be carried out safely without any unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and off site receptors. This would be in compliance with Policy LP47 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011 - 2029.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant Permission

Subject to the following condition(s):-

1. The development hereby permitted must be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.

Reason - To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing No.s 1409-111 A, 1409-411 D and 1409-511 C.

Reason - To ensure that the development is completed satisfactory in all respects and to comply with NPPF and Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011 - 2029.

3. The materials to be used in the extensions shall match in type, colour and texture, those on the existing dwelling unless otherwise agreed in writing, with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To ensure satisfactory visual relationship of the new development to the existing, and to comply with Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011 - 2029.

4. If contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development or site clearance shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination is to be dealt with has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall proceed in accordance with the approved remediation strategy.

Reason - To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future uses of the land, neighbouring land, surface water, groundwater and wider environment are mitigated to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without any unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and off site receptors and to comply with Policies LP10 and LP47 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

ITEM NUMBER: 04.
APPLICATION NUMBER: 16/00387/FULL
APPLICANT: Mr Scott Wootton
DATE REGISTERED: 08.08.2016

**ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION WITH ACCOMMODATION IN THE ROOF, FRONT AND REAR DORMER WINDOWS, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND CHANGE OF USE OF LAND TO PRIVATE RESIDENTIAL GARDEN (as amplified by the plan received 26.08.16 and information received 05.09.2016)
6 Compton Close Lee-On-The-Solent Hampshire PO13 8JP**

The Site and the proposal

1. The application property is a three bedroomed semi-detached chalet bungalow with first floor accommodation in the roof space using dormers both to the front and rear; it is located on the west side of Compton Avenue. It is broadly mirrored by the attached property, 4 Compton Close, and both are built of brick with tiled dormers, however, there are variations between the front elevations and attached garages. The properties are part of a mid/late 1970s housing estate and are of a less common housing type within the scheme, being the only such pair on Compton Close. The other properties within the vicinity are terraced and semi-detached traditionally shaped two-storey properties in brick with various hung tile detailing. The application site is set back by approximately 4.8metres from the road and there are two off road parking spaces, one in front of the attached garage (the garage falls below the size requirements set out within the Parking SPD) and one in front of the front door, both using the existing dropped kerb. The application property is the whole width of the plot, approximately 7.9metres, and has a rear garden with an uneven rear boundary so its approximate length varies from 10 to 16.5metres. The rear garden boundaries are brick walls with sections of solid fence panels approximately 2.0metres in height. The application site also includes a 3.0metre wide strip which runs parallel to the southern boundary wall of the property which is owned by the applicant but is currently part of an open grassed area as laid out within the original planning permission for the housing estate. This grassed area has two trees on it, one of which, a Lime, is within the application site boundary. It has public access footpaths along the south-east and south-west edges which are outside of the application site.

2. To the north is the attached property 4 Compton Close with the rear gardens separated by the boundary wall. To the east there is a row of terraced properties which are separated by Compton Close itself, parking bays and grass verges; the front elevation of the row is over 23metres away from that of the application property. To the south, across the open grassed space is the rear boundary wall approximately 2.0metres in height of another row of terraces. At its closest this boundary wall is approximately 10metres away from the side elevation of the application property. To the west of the application site is the rear elevation of 11 Chilcomb Close and the side elevation of 9 Chilcomb Close. Both are separated by the gardens of the properties, boundary walls and a public right of way. The approximate minimum distance between the rear elevation of the application property and the rear elevation of 11 Chilcomb Close, which is at an oblique angle, is 20.5metres. The minimum distance between the side elevation of 9 Chilcomb Close and the rear elevation of the application property is approximately 23.5metres. The application property has existing windows within the roof dormers to the east and west elevations and one window within the gable of the south elevation.

3. The proposal is to change the use of the 3.0metres strip grassed area so that it can be into the residential curtilage of the application property, and to build a side and rear extension. The proposed rear extension would be 0.15metres from the northern boundary and measure 5.07metres wide by 4.00metres deep; it would be 2.8metres tall with a flat roof and would facilitate the modernisation of the ground floor living space. The side extension would convert the existing garage into internal living space and extend above and to the side of it creating an additional, fourth, bedroom. This would move the south elevation of the application property 2.0metres to the south of the existing garage and include extensions to both the front and rear dormers. Two new windows would be installed; one in each dormer extension in line with the existing dormer windows and of

similar proportions; and the garage door would be converted into a third ground floor window. The roof pitch and ridge height would be maintained.

4. The plan submitted on the 26.08.2016 showed how an additional third off road parking space could be created to the front of the application property; and the written details submitted on the 05.09.2016 clarified the lack of potential for bats to roost in the hanging tiles on the existing dormers.

Relevant Planning History

K111136 - single storey side extension - permitted 29.06.82

K8683/2 CLA4 - er. 67 no. dwellings together with garage/parking and playareas - permitted 07.10.76

Relevant Policies

Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011 – 2029:

LP10

Design

LP23

Layout of Sites and Parking

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Gosport Borough Council Design Guidance: Supplementary Planning Document: February 2014

Gosport Borough Council Parking: Supplementary Planning Document: February 2014

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012

Consultations

HCC Ecology

No objection with advisory note concerning bats

Local Highway Authority

No objection subject to a condition retaining the off road parking spaces.
The land identified for the change of use to private garden is neither highway land nor are there any specific access rights over this land. The footpath which runs parallel to the property between Compton Close and Chilcomb Close is however adopted highway but it is not expected that this footpath will be impacted by the proposals.
It is understood from the material submitted with the planning application that the applicant is proposing to construct an additional parking space adjacent to the existing parking spaces at the front of the property. With respect to the parking arrangements, the length of the additional parking space does not meet the Gosport Borough Council Parking SPD requirements. However, given that the additional space will be the same length as the existing spaces currently at the property, it would not be appropriate to recommend refusal on this basis.

Response to Public Advertisement

8 letters of objection

Issues raised:-

- Block the view from the rear elevation of 11 Chilcomb Close and would overlook the garden of that property
- The land as part of the change of use is currently available for public use and should be protected from encroachment of urban sprawl
- No mention of removing the trees on the land which would affect the wildlife and have been there for over 35 years
- The size of the extension is almost as large as the original house, it would extend into public recreational land and is not in keeping with the local area
- The proposal would overlook houses to the front and rear
- The open space has always been a public right of way and is maintained/owned by Gosport Borough Council
- Green spaces and trees should be preserved and this relatively small and enclosed space in an area where small children can play safely
- The loss of a garage combined with the likely increase of residents will cause difficulties in parking vehicles in an already crowded close.

Principal Issues

1. The proposal does not incorporate the whole of the grassed area but a 3.0 metre wide strip along the northern boundary. No part of this amenity land is owned by Gosport Borough Council and the strip which forms part of the application site is owned by the applicant. The larger lime tree is towards the rear of the 3.0metre strip which forms part of the application site whilst the other tree falls outside of the application site. Neither of the trees are protected by Tree Protection Orders and are not considered to be worthy of this level of protection. As such no notification or permission would be required from the Council to undertake works or to remove them. The County Ecologist has confirmed that there is little to no risk to protected flora or fauna and as such an appropriate informative has been recommended. Therefore the main issues within this case are the appropriateness of the change of use of the 3.0metre wide strip and extensions; and their impact on the appearance of the surrounding neighbourhood, the amenity of the occupiers of adjacent properties and the safety of road users.

2. The proposed change of use of the strip of land would reduce the overall area of the grassed space by approximately 20%, it would not impact on the designated public rights of way around it and is not classified as designated open space within the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 Proposal Maps. On visiting the site it is apparent that the proposed 3.0metres strip includes an approximately 0.5metres wide area along the boundary wall of the application site which is overgrown and not useable. Due to the broadly triangular shape of the amenity space and the enclosed nature of it, it is considered that proportionally the removal of the strip of land in question would not significantly alter the visual character of it and would retain a suitably sized space for continued informal use by the local residents. The proposed extensions would replicate the chalet bungalow style of the application property and would use matching materials. The continuation of the roof ridge and dormers ensure that the semi-detached pair do not look unbalanced and would continue to be read as a complete building, this is assisted by the lack of formal divide to the front of the properties with informal planting and parking being the main uses of this space. The rear extension would be single storey in height and would therefore be subservient to the main building. By using a flat roof for the rear extension it does not create any awkward roof angles and maintains the simple linear form of the existing properties' eaves and roof line. Compton Close is characterised by set-back terraced properties with the application property being an anomaly in terms of its form. It is considered that this would not be altered by the proposal and the visual relationships and street scene hierarchy between the application property, the informal amenity land and the surrounding buildings would not change. As such the proposed change of use and extensions would be in compliance with this aspect of Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

3. The proposal will include an additional window within the dormer to the front and rear but will remove a first floor level window from the side, south, elevation. The window to the front would overlook the road and associated publically accessible parking and verges, and due to orientation would be further away from the terraced properties opposite then the existing dormer windows. As such it is not considered that this proposed window would have any impact on the privacy of surrounding neighbours. The proposed window in the rear dormer would look towards the rear of 11 and 13 Chilcomb Close at an angle but the separation distance between the rear elevations would not be any less than that already in existence which is 20.5metres. The Design Supplementary Planning Document recommends a separation distance of 21.0metres between properties with parallel rear elevations. As such it is considered that the separation distance and angle between the proposed new windows in the rear dormer and the properties to the west is acceptable. The additional ground floor windows in the proposed rear extension would not allow views over the existing boundary wall which is to be retained. Due to the orientation and location of the proposed rear and side extensions, and the existing boundary wall, it is considered that the proposal would have no impact on the access to light for any of the neighbouring properties. A comment was made that the proposed extension would block the outlook from the upper windows of 11 Chilcomb Close, however, taking into consideration the distance and angles between the properties, the outlook from the upper windows of 11 Chilcomb Close would not be reduced to such an extent that it would be harmful to the amenity of the occupants of no. 11. It is therefore considered that the proposed change of use and extension would be in compliance with this aspect of Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

4. There is existing on street parking within Compton Close which is predominantly from an increase in private car ownership since the wider housing estate was approved in the mid / late 1970s. The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms of the application property from three to four and as such an additional parking space is required. Of the two spaces in existence one, in front of the current garage, does not meet the parking size requirement as set out in the Parking SPD but was approved when the garage was originally approved and built. As such it would not be appropriate to require this parking space to be made larger as part of the consideration for this application. The existing space in front of the application property's front door is compliant with the Parking SPD. The proposed new off road parking space would be of an acceptable width and would have a maximum length of 5.2metres which reduces following the curve of the boundary with a minimum length the same as that of the existing adjoining parking space. The provision of the three off road parking spaces complies with the Parking SPD. Given the demand for on-street parking in Compton Close, it is considered necessary to ensure the parking spaces are retained for parking at all times and so an appropriate condition has been recommended. As such it is considered that the proposal is in compliance with Policy LP23 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant Permission

Subject to the following condition(s):-

1. The development hereby permitted must be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.

Reason - To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

P001,P002, P003, P004, P005, P008, P010 and P013.

Reason - To ensure that the development is completed satisfactorily in all respects and to comply with Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

3. The materials to be used shall match in type, colour and texture, those on the existing dwelling unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To ensure satisfactory visual relationship of the new development to the existing, and to comply with Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

4. The off road parking spaces shall be laid out as shown on the approved plan P013 and retained for the parking of vehicles at all times. At no time shall they be used for the storage of boats, caravans and trailers.

Reason - To ensure adequate on-site parking provision for the approved scheme, and to comply with Policy LP23 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

ITEM NUMBER: 05.
APPLICATION NUMBER: 16/00027/FULL
APPLICANT: Mrs Lee Hockaday St Vincent College
DATE REGISTERED: 13.04.2016

CHANGE OF USE OF BUILDING FROM EDUCATION (CLASS D1) TO A MIXED USE FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING AND EXHIBITION HALL (CLASS D1) AND ASSEMBLY AND LEISURE (CLASS D2) AND WEDDING CEREMONIES (SUI GENERIS)
St Vincent College Mill Lane Gosport Hampshire PO12 4QA

The Site and the proposal

1. The application site, the Jervis Gallery, is identified as a building located within St Vincent College. Access is provided through the college site with vehicular access from Mill Lane to the college car parking area. The site contains an existing red brick building which currently is used for a mix of educational uses (examination hall / classrooms), college admin (estate office / stores) and community purposes (external event hire for the public). The building has a limited number of fairly small windows to the southern elevation which serve the classrooms and a number of personnel doorways to all elevations. The building is surrounded by a tarmac surface between it and the other cluster of buildings that surround it.

2. The application building is surrounded by other structures around the rest of the college grounds. To the north is a red brick building, two-storey in the centre with two single-storey wings either side, this building is used for performing arts. Adjacent to this to the west is a flat roof white walled building that operates as a crèche / nursery on the college site. To the east is the college sports centre, a large two-storey red brick building with mainly solid walls and a sports hall to the southern end. Directly south of the application site is a single storey red brick ridged roof building and to the west of this a modern single-storey mono-pitch glass wall student common room / Fitness suite building. The site is fairly open to the west with car parking and tennis courts.

3. Beyond the cluster of buildings which encircle the application site is Forton Lake (part of Portsmouth Harbour) to the north, with a small jetty and moorings to the north-east. The jetty is accessed from the northern end of Ferrol Road to the east which has housing of mixed styles off it and bordering the college site. South of the sports centre is a fenced and floodlit AstroTurf multi-purpose playing surface, with grass amenity circulation space to the west and between the building cluster and the main college building a little further south. Car parks to the college lie to the west with Mill Lane beyond.

4. The proposal is to use the existing hall and ancillary rooms within the educational building for a mixed use to include educational uses, training uses, use as an exhibition hall, assembly and leisure uses as well as use for wedding ceremonies. The hours of use sought are Monday to Friday 9.00am to 11.30pm, Saturday 9.00am to 1.00am and Sunday 9.00am to 11.00pm.

Relevant Planning History

05/00394/GREG - REGULATION 3 APPLICATION - construction of flood protection embankment and installation of floodgates - permitted 23.08.2005

03/10300/FULL - erection of single storey detached student building - permitted 10.07.2003

02/00340/GREG - erection of single storey changing facility - permitted 10.02.2003

71/11798/HC - outline - use of land and buildings for educational purposes - permitted 1971

Relevant Policies

Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011 – 2029:

LP3

Spatial Strategy

LP10
Design
LP32
Community, Cultural and Built Leisure Facilities
LP39
Water Resources
LP45
Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion
LP46
Pollution Control

Supplementary Planning Documents:
Gosport Borough Council Parking: Supplementary Planning Document: February 2014

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012

Consultations

HCC Ecology	No comments to make on this proposal.
Southern Water	A formal application for any new connection to the public foul and surface water sewer would be required. An informative to achieve this should be added if planning permission is given.
Economic Prosperity	No response received.
Environment Agency (Hants & IOW)	No response received.
Environmental Health	<p>Land Contamination - no objection to approval without any conditions relating to land contamination.</p> <p>I have read the noise report (St Vincent Sixth Form College Noise Impact Assessment, July 2016, 2042W-SEC-00001-02) prepared by Southdowns Environmental Consultants.</p> <p>I would accept the findings and agree with the recommended noise management and control measures as set out in Section 7 of the report, in particular paragraphs 7.1.4, 7.1.6, and 7.1.7.</p> <p>An electronic noise limiter, that is capable of controlling sound levels in all the 1/3-Octave frequency bands, shall be installed in the venue and used during any event where amplified music is played. Setting of the noise limiter shall be done in consultation with the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>All windows and doors of the venue shall remain closed (except for access) during any event where amplified music is played.</p>
Local Highway Authority	The applicant has undertaken a parking

survey for the current car parks at the college in order to gauge if potential future vehicles visiting the site for the proposed use could be accommodated. Surveys were undertaken during the morning, afternoon evening and night for a 1 week period during May 2016. The survey results show that during evenings an average of 129 spaces were available, equating to 84% of the total 154 spaces. By 21.00 hours all spaces were available on all but 1 day where there was 1 car still present.

The majority of functions proposed would occur outside the standard college hours of 09.00-16.00 hours. On this basis and regarding the survey results the LHA consider the existing on-site parking provision adequate to serve the proposed use of the hall.

Response to Public Advertisement

8 letters of objection

Issues raised:-

- noise disturbance from evening functions for commercial purposes late into the night
- noise disturbance from amplified party music from the Jervis Gallery at the centre of a building amphitheatre
- noise disturbance from users leaving the event late at night
- noise disturbance from events running to 1am in the morning on Saturdays
- lack of accountability from the college who are indifferent to neighbours concerns of noise
- potential anti-social behaviour from event users
- noise disturbance from activities with little or no noise absorption screening
- noise disturbance from south west wind and buildings echoing noise generated

Principal Issues

1. The principle of a mixed educational and community use on the site is recognised and established, including the sports centre which lies immediately to the east of the application site. The additional use of the hall and ancillary rooms within the existing Jervis Gallery building for celebratory functions would have no impact on the nature conservation interests of Forton Lake to the north, the building being screened by other college buildings which cluster around the site. The main issues in this case are therefore the impacts of the proposal on the visual amenities of the locality, impact of the use on residential amenity of nearby residential properties, user parking requirements and the existing floodplain.

2. There is no proposed external alteration or physical change to the building for the proposed uses. The Jervis Gallery building is screened by existing college buildings which significantly obscure the view of the building from the periphery of the college boundary to the north, the east and the south. The large and high sports centre building to the east screens the majority of residential properties along Ferrol Road bordering the college site from the application building. The closest residential property along Ferrol Road is over 78.5m distanced from the application site, and has the sports centre hall in between, screening the site. The closest property without any building screening in between is further south on Ferrol Road and is over 91.5m distanced, backing on to the astroturf all weather sports ground.

3. A noise report has been submitted on behalf of the applicant which details the likely noise impacts and methodology to mitigate the issue of noise disturbance from the proposed use of the

building. The report's findings have been considered and accepted by the Councils Environmental Health Team. Control of the noise mitigation arrangements are subject to conditions to be applied should permission be approved. The measures will comply with Policy LP46 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

4. The applicants have submitted a parking use survey of the existing car parking available on the site. This has been considered, and subject to planning conditions, the proposal is viewed as not having an impact on existing parking or traffic conditions in the locality. In this regard the proposal would comply with Policies LP22 and LP23 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011-2029 and the Gosport Borough Parking Supplementary Planning Document (February 2014).

5. Flood protection works have previously been approved for St Vincent College under planning permission reference 05/00394/GREG (K16925/1) and given the small size of the building, it is considered that the mixed use proposal would not impede the flow of flood water or reduce the capacity of the floodplain to store flood waters or increase the number of people or properties at risk of flooding, in accordance with Policy LP39 and LP45 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

6. Concerns of anti-social behaviour from visitors leaving the venue are not matters for control through the planning process. The view expressed as to the responsiveness of the college is similarly not a planning matter.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant Permission

Subject to the following condition(s):-

1. The development hereby permitted must be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.

Reason - To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents :

location plan 1

annotated site plan 2

block plan 3

internal plan 4

supplementary information - highways

Reason - To ensure that the development is completed satisfactorily in all respects and to comply with Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

3. The use of the development shall not be commenced until provision for parking is made available within the site in accordance with the information provided by the applicant and in accordance with annotated site plan 2, hereby approved, and such provision shall be retained for that use thereafter. The parking spaces identified for use at the site shall only be used for parking and at no time shall be used for the storage of boats, caravans and / or trailers.

Reason - To ensure adequate on-site car parking provision for the approved development and to comply with the NPPF and Policies LP22 and LP23 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011-2029 and of the Gosport Borough Parking Supplementary Planning Document (February 2014).

4. An electronic noise limiter, that is capable of controlling sound levels in all the 1/3-Octave frequency bands, shall be installed in the venue and shall be operated and used during any event where amplified music is played, as confirmed by the applicants email dated 4 August 2016. Setting of the noise limiter shall be done in consultation with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To ensure adequate noise control for the approved development and to comply with the NPPF and Policy LP46 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011-2029.

5. All windows and doors of the venue shall remain closed during any event where amplified music is played, except for access and when utilising the external smoking areas within the enclosed quad yard area to the north of the building (ensuring that the doors into the venue are not left open) in line with the applicants email dated 4 August 2016.

Reason: To ensure adequate noise control for the approved development and to comply with the NPPF and Policies LP46 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011-2029 (October 2015).

ITEM NUMBER: 06.
APPLICATION NUMBER: 16/00298/FULL
APPLICANT: Mr Andrew Barfield
DATE REGISTERED: 07.07.2016

ERECTION OF OUTBUILDING (LISTED BUILDING IN A CONSERVATION AREA) (as amplified by email received 02.09.16)
3 Village Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 2LD

The Site and the proposal

1. This application requires consideration by the Regulatory Board as the applicant is related to a member of staff.
2. The application site is located on the southern side of Village Road within the Alverstoke Conservation Area. The property is a two storey Grade II Listed Building dating from the early 19th century with a white rendered and painted brick finish under a concrete tiled roof. There is a parapet at the front of the property and the windows are white painted timber sliding sashes. There is a large, raised garden at the rear bounded by a brick wall to the east rising from 2m to 4m in height and a hedge to the west approximately 4m high. The grounds to Alverstoke Infants School are located to the rear of the property. There are dwellings to either side of the rear garden, set further back within their respective plots than the application property.
3. The proposal is for the erection of a detached, timber outbuilding within the rear garden to replace an outbuilding that was recently demolished. The proposed outbuilding will be located at the southern end of the garden, set 2m from the boundary and approximately 20m from the rear elevation of the property. It will be 3.6m wide and 4.1m deep with a 3m high pitched roof with the northern elevation being set back under the roof to create a veranda. It will have windows and doors in the northern elevation and a window in each of the side facing elevations.
4. Additional information has been received to confirm the proposed external materials of the outbuilding, which consist of exterior treated softwood cladding finished in a stained varnish. The windows will be Georgian style casement, double glazed windows in treated softwood, painted white. The roof is proposed to be either cedar tiles or asphalt tiles.

Relevant Planning History

Nil

Relevant Policies

Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011 – 2029:

LP10

Design

LP11

Designated Heritage Assets including Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Registered Historic Parks & Gardens

LP12

Designated Heritage Assets: Conservation Areas

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012

Consultations

The Gosport Society

No objection.

Response to Public Advertisement

Nil

Principal Issues

1. The main issues in this case are the acceptability of the design of the outbuilding, the impact on the Listed Building having special regard to the desirability of preserving the building and its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses the impact on the visual amenity of the locality, whether the development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Alverstoke Conservation Area and the impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings.

2. Given its siting, low overall height and the height of the intervening boundary treatments, the outbuilding would not have a harmful impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings. The design of the proposed outbuilding is appropriate for its context and it would be discreetly located within the enclosed rear garden of the property and would not be readily visible from public vantage points. The external finish of the outbuilding, including the alternative roof materials proposed, is appropriate and will be controlled by condition. Taking the above into account, therefore, together with the siting of the outbuilding relative the main property, it is considered that the development would not harm the historic and architectural character of the Listed Building, or its setting. The development would not have a harmful impact on the visual amenity of the area and would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and is, therefore, in compliance with Policies LP10, LP11 and LP12 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011-2029.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant Permission

Subject to the following condition(s):-

1. The development hereby permitted must be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.

Reason - To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Plan A, Plan B and Plan C

Reason - To ensure that the development is completed satisfactorily in all respects and to comply with Policies LP10, LP11 and LP12 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

3. No development shall be carried out other than in accordance with the details of external materials contained within the email dated 02.09.16 unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and to comply with Policies LP10, LP11 and LP12 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.