

A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD

WAS HELD ON 15 JULY 2008

The Mayor (Councillor Kimber) (ex-officio), Chairman of the Policy and Organisation Board (Councillor Smith) (ex-officio) (P), Councillors Allen (P), Mrs Bailey (P), Carr (P), Carter (P), Dickson (P), Forder, Geddes (P), Hicks (P), Mrs Searle and Miss West (P).

It was reported that, in accordance with Standing Order 2.3.6., notice had been received that Councillors Mrs Cully and Gill would replace Councillors Mrs Searle and Forder respectively for the duration of this meeting.

39 APOLOGIES

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting were received on behalf of the Mayor, Councillor Mrs Searle and Councillor Forder.

40 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- Councillor Carter declared a Personal and Prejudicial interest in item 8/03 (53 Leamington Crescent, Gosport)

41 MINUTES

RESOLVED: That subject to it being noted that Councillor Dickson and not Councillor Allen had declared an interest on item 6/02 - (14 Elmhurst Road, Gosport), the Minutes of the Regulatory Board meeting held on 17 June 2008 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a true and correct record.

42 DEPUTATIONS

It was reported that deputations had been received on the following applications:-

- Item 8/01 – K17571 – Land at Cherque Way, Gosport
- Item 8/02 – K17518/1 – Bridgemary School, Wych Lane

43 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been received.

PART II

44 HISTORIC BUILDINGS GRANT OFFER – 3 CRESCENT ROAD

Consideration was given to a report of the Development Services Manager (a copy of which is attached in the Minute Book as Appendix 'A') requesting approval for the offer of an Historic Buildings Grant towards the replacement of six timber windows to the front elevation of 3 Crescent Road, Gosport.

RESOLVED: That the offer of an historic buildings grant of £1029.60 or 15% of the final cost of works, whichever is the lowest, be approved.

45 HISTORIC BUILDINGS GRANT OFFER – 9 PEEL ROAD

Consideration was given to a report of the Development Services Manager (a copy of which is attached in the Minute Book as Appendix 'B') requesting approval for the offer of an Historic Buildings Grant towards the replacement of three timber windows to the front elevation of 9 Peel Road, Gosport.

RESOLVED: That the offer of an historic buildings grant of £321.00 or 10% of the final cost of works, whichever is the lesser sum, be approved.

46 REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES MANAGER

The Development Services Manager submitted a report on applications received for planning consent setting out the recommendation in each case (a copy of which is affixed in the Minute Book as Appendix 'C').

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

47 K17571 - ERECTION OF TRAINING FACILITIES AND CONSTRUCTION OF 14 OUTDOOR PITCHES (7 FULL SIZE) AND ANCILLARY FACILITIES INCLUDING PARKING AND ACCESS FOR PORTSMOUTH FOOTBALL CLUB AND CONSTRUCTION OF 2 COMMUNITY PITCHES AND ASSOCIATED CHANGING FACILITIES.

Land At Cherque Way Gosport Hampshire

Members were advised that three additional letters of representation had been received. Two from residents of Shoot Lane had requested car parking on Shoot Lane was restricted. Officers advised that this could not be justified on highway safety grounds as there was no access to the site at this point. The golf Club had requested an eight foot fence be erected to stop footballs drifting onto the Golf Course. Officers confirmed this could be addressed by a minor change in the wording of the condition requiring details of the fencing. In addition formal responses had been received from all consultees confirming they had no objections. The Environment Agency had suggested some minor changes to the planning conditions attached to the report. Copies of the conditions as amended were accordingly distributed and considered by Members. The Applicant had also submitted amended plans on 11 July 2008 showing a minor alteration to the coach parking and a preliminary landscaping scheme.

Mr Herridge, 27 Fitzroy Drive, was invited to address the Board in objection to the proposal. Mr Herridge raised the following issues: Hazard from stray footballs bouncing across the highway and cars parking to watch practice sessions through the fence; increase in activity, contrary to the proposed land use within the legal agreement between GBC and Persimmon; there was not enough being done by the club to help the community; the potential negative noise impact from the facility and finally that the application seemed to be

pre-determined by some Members.

Peter Storrie, Portsmouth Football Club (PFC) Chief Executive, was invited to address the Board in support of the application. Mr Storrie spoke of the long history between Gosport and PFC and clarified the benefits of the application for the town. He explained that 14 new permanent jobs would be created, and believed that the proposal would help to attract business to the Borough. Mr Storrie informed Members of consultation undertaken with local residents and confirmed PFC's commitment to protect wildlife. He said that 24-hour security and CCTV would be put in place and there would be far more noise from the road than from the training ground. The level of traffic would not be affected by the proposal.

Councillor Burgess was invited to address the Board as Ward Councillor. Councillor Burgess advised members that he fully supported the application and was delighted with the way in which PFC had engaged with local residents and tried to satisfy the wishes and concerns of those that expressed an opinion during the consultation process.

Councillors were unanimous in their support for the proposal and saw a great many benefits for the Borough, from both a community and business perspective. They also felt that the consultation process had been conducted in an ideal manner and were delighted that local schools and children would also benefit from such modern facilities. The commitments made by PFC to the future of the Alver Valley Country Park were much appreciated and would help the Borough to achieve targets that it had been long been planning for the Alver Valley.

RESOLVED: That planning application K17571 – Land at Cherque Way, Gosport be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Development Services Manager, for the following reason:

- i. That having regard to the provisions of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and all other material planning considerations, the proposal is acceptable in this location in principle. It will not have a detrimental impact on the highway network, the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties or the visual amenity of the Alver Valley. Measures will be undertaken to ensure there is no risk of contamination and to encourage biodiversity. As such, the development complies with Policies R/DP1, R/T2, R/T3, R/T11, R/DP6, R/DP8, R/CF7, R/OS1, R/OS2, R/OS6, R/OS11, R/OS12, R/OS13, R/OS14, R/ENV1, R/ENV2, R/ENV4, R/ENV5, R/ENV14, R/ENV15 and R/BH8 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

48 K17518/1 - ERECTION OF FURTHER EDUCATION COLLEGE WITH NEW ACCESSES, PARKING AND RECREATION SPACE (AMENDED SCHEME) (as amended by Design and Access Statement received 24.6.08, Education Supporting Statement and plans received 26.06.08 and additional car parking data received 27.6.08 and 30.6.08)
Bridgemary School Wych Lane Gosport Hampshire PO13 0JN

Members were informed that in paragraph four of the report of the Development Services Manager, rather than 'eastern' in line 6, the report should read 'western' and rather than 'western' in line 13 the report should read 'eastern'. Environmental Health had now

responded and had no objection to the proposal. It was also proposed to amend condition 2 and create a new addition to deal with the submission and details of the measures to secure access to the site and the timing of these works. Officers also requested that authority be delegated to the Borough Solicitor to agree the final wording of the conditions in the event that Members resolved to grant planning permission.

Mr Burton, 53 Brewers Lane, was invited to address the Board in objection to the proposal. Mr Burton said that although he appreciated the need for an educational facility he had the following concerns: that open space would be lost for local residents; that residents weren't adequately informed of the proposal; that there would be a lot of noise as a result of the nature of the educational work and that the lack of car parking space would lead to an influx of on-street parking in the area.

Mr Cox, Highbury College, was invited to address the Board in support of the application. Mr Cox spoke of the need for the facility in the area and explained the reasoning behind the siting of the building. The additional college was intended to be set away from the main secondary school so that pupils would not feel that they were working in an extension of the school. He advised Members that a thorough search of viable alternative sites had been undertaken but concluded that the best option was at the proposed location. Mr Cox confirmed that pupils would be between the ages of 14-19, that there would be 136 in total and that no loud mechanical work, such as panel beating, would take place in the workshops. Finally, Mr Cox stated that he believed 18 car parking spaces to be sufficient given the numbers of staff and students that would be on site and given that it would be unnecessary for pupils to travel by car.

Mr Hole, the architect for the proposed scheme, was invited to address the Board in support of the application. Mr Hole stated that the workshop would operate with the doors closed when the weather was not too hot and believed that there would be no negative noise impact from the proposal. He explained that the site had been chosen as there were a number of constraining issues with the field, such as a large network of water mains, which would make any other siting extremely difficult.

Councillor Wright was invited to address the Board as Ward Councillor. Councillor Wright began by explaining to Members that he personally posted letters about the application to all residents in Brewers Lane and that all were aware a long time in advance of the Board meeting. He agreed that there was a great need for the facility in the area, but felt that the building was proposed in the wrong location. He believed there were a number of other possibilities that should be investigated and was concerned about the impact that the increased number of cars would have on the site, especially considering the lack of designated car parking space. Councillor Wright was concerned that classes would continue on occasion until 9pm, which would be unacceptable to local residents given the level of noise that could be generated in the workshops.

Some Councillors were of the opinion that the building should be re-positioned and were minded to refuse the application so that the applicant could reconsider the siting of the building, the number of car parking spaces to be provided and the impact on the surrounding highways. It was therefore moved that the application be refused due to the negative impact on the open space, character of the area and general street scene, contrary

to policies R/DP1 and R/OS4 of the Local Plan Review; as well as the impact on the surrounding highways, particularly the insufficient provision for car parking, contrary to policies R/T2, R/T10 AND R/T11 and also due to the negative impact on the amenities of local residents, contrary to policies R/DP1 and R/ENV10.

RESOLVED: That planning application K17518/1 – Bridgemary School, Wych Lane, Gosport be refused for the following reasons:

- i. The proposal, by reason of its mass and siting, would have a harmful effect on the character of the existing open space and the street scene contrary to Policies R/DP1 and R/OS4 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.
- ii. The proposal, by reason of inadequate car parking provision, is likely to result in overspill parking on Brewers Lane which, in turn, would interrupt the free flow of traffic to the detriment of highway safety, contrary to Policies R/DP1, R/T2 and R/T11 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.
- iii. The proposal is likely to result in unacceptable levels of noise disturbance which will be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential properties, contrary to Policies R/DP1 and R/ENV10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**49 K17503 – RETENTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING ROOF INCLUDING SIDE DORMER
53 Leamington Crescent Lee-On-The-Solent Hampshire PO13 9HL**

Note: Councillor Carter declared a Personal and Prejudicial interest in this item, left the meeting room and took no part in the discussion or voting.

Councillor Burgess was invited to address the Board as Ward Councillor. Councillor Burgess spoke about the design of the surrounding properties and drew Members' attention to an extension that had been erected nearby that he believed to be in keeping with the character of the area. In contrast to this, however, he believed the proposal in question to be of a bland design and explained that he had been contacted by residents who were of the same opinion.

Officers clarified the difference between the extension that it was proposed to retain and the nearby extension that Councillor Burgess had referred to.

RESOLVED: That planning application K17503 – 53 Leamington Crescent, Lee-on-the-Solent be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Development Services Manager, for the following reason:

- i. That having regard to the provisions of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and all other material considerations, the development constitutes an appropriate addition to the roof in form, scale, height and external appearance which is acceptable in the street scene and will not significantly affect the amenities of occupiers of adjacent residential properties. As such the proposal complies with Policies R/DP1 and R/DP7 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**50 K13143/2 - DEMOLITION OF GARAGE AND ERECTION OF TWO STOREY 3 BEDROOMED DETACHED DWELLING WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND AMENITY SPACE (as amended by plan received 17.06.08)
26 Bracklesham Road Gosport Hampshire PO13 0EN**

Members were advised that the legal agreement had now been completed.

RESOLVED: That planning application K13143/1 – 26 Bracklesham Road, Gosport be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Development Services Manager, for the following reason:

- i. That having regard to the provisions of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and all other material considerations, the development is acceptable in this location. Due to its appropriate design, density and layout, the development will not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area or the amenities of neighbouring or prospective occupiers. Adequate provision is made for open space, cycle and refuse storage. As such, the development complies with Policies R/DP1, R/H4, R/DP3, R/OS8, R/T4 and R/T11 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**51 K17574 - REGULATION 3 - ERECTION OF 1.8M HIGH BOW TOP FENCING AND 2NO.PEDESTRIAN ACCESS GATES
1 -15 Skipper Way Lee-On-The-Solent Hampshire PO13 9EU**

RESOLVED: That planning application K17574 – 1-15 Skipper Way, Lee-on-the-Solent be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Development Services Manager, for the following reason:

- i. That having regard to the provisions of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and all other material considerations, the development as proposed will not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the locality, the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining properties or highway and pedestrian safety. As such, the proposal complies with Policies R/DP1, R/DP7 and R/T11 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

52 ANY OTHER ITEMS

Tesco Application – Quay Street Roundabout, Fareham

Members were informed that an application to build a Tesco superstore on the Quay Street roundabout would be shortly heard by an extraordinary meeting of the Fareham Borough Council (FBC) Development Control Committee on Friday, 25 July 2008. Officers spoke of the likely adverse strategic transport impact the proposal would have on the Gosport peninsula and explained how, although concerns had been expressed to FBC, there had been no attempt to mitigate these concerns or consult with Gosport Council.

Regulatory Board
15 July 2008

Members were advised of the impact that the proposal would have on the future of Gosport, particularly the traffic flow in and out of the peninsula. The Board supported the contents of a letter sent earlier by the Chief Executive to GOSE, requesting the Secretary of State to consider 'calling-in' the application for determination. A draft response to Fareham BC had also been prepared and was circulated to Members for consideration. Members were also advised of a forthcoming presentation of a traffic model for the Quay Street junction to GBC members by Tesco on 22 July. The contents of the draft response were supported, and it was noted that a formal response would not be sent until members had heard and commented upon the Tesco presentation.

The costs implications should the Secretary of State decide to call a Local Inquiry were discussed.

The meeting commenced at 6pm and concluded at 8.05pm

CHAIRMAN