

**A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD
WAS HELD ON 21 APRIL 2009**

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

It was reported that, in accordance with Standing Orders, notice had been received that Councillors Burgess and Wright would replace Councillors Allen and Mrs Searle respectively for this meeting.

168 APOLOGIES

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting were received from the Mayor and Councillors Allen and Mrs Searle.

169 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- Councillor West declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 6 – K17671 Rowner Redevelopment, Gosport
- Councillor Hicks declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 7 – K17540 Bay House School, Gosport
- Councillor Carter declared a personal interest in item 7 – K17540 Bay House School, Gosport
- Councillor Carter declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 8/2 – K9913/66 Hornet Sailing Club

170 MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Regulatory Board meeting held on 17 March 2009 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a true and correct record.

171 DEPUTATIONS

It was reported that deputations had been received on application:

- K17540 – Bay House School, Gosport
- K3113/1 – 68A Brewers Lane, Gosport
- K2229/7 – 165 Portsmouth Road, Lee on the Solent

172 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been received.

PART II

173 K17671 - PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF ROWNER Land incorporating Grange Road, Howe Road and Nimrod Drive, Rowner, Gosport

Note: Councillor Miss West declared a Personal and Prejudicial Interest in this item, left the meeting room and took no part in the discussion and voting thereon.

Consideration was given to a report of the Development Services Manager which requested the Board to consider application K.17671 for Outline Consent for the demolition of existing buildings and removal of existing earth bunds and redevelopment to provide new residential accommodation of up to 700 units and a new neighbourhood centre, incorporating a food store (Use Class A1), a café (Use Class A3), and up to 3 retail units (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A5) and provision of open space and landscaping, and access junctions and associated roads including the re-alignment of Howe Road and new north-south road and car parking. All matters were reserved except for access.

Members were advised that since the report was published, an additional letter of representation had been received relating to the retail element of the proposal. Whilst the letter was broadly supportive of the development as a whole, it raised issues about the size of the food store which the retail assessment demonstrated would draw trade from outside the Rowner Area. The letter considered that, whilst the principle of “clawing back” trade which was currently travelling to major out of centre food stores in Fareham and Gosport was a good thing, a store in a more strategic location on the Fareham Road was to be preferred as it would not draw trade through a predominantly residential area. However, officers considered that, given Gosport was a densely settled urban borough, this was not a significant issue and there were benefits in diverting trade from stores accessed along more congested routes such as the A32 and Newgate Lane. Moreover, the Rowner Centre was allocated as a retail centre within the Local Plan.

The letter also expressed the view that the store should be sufficient only to meet the needs of day to day convenience shopping needs of Rowner residents. However, officers advised that a smaller store would not achieve any “claw back” and would therefore be less sustainable.

Comment was also made on the fact the proposed occupier was not identified but from a planning perspective it was not uncommon for this to be the case and it was not the role of the planning system to restrict competition.

The letter also referred to the discrepancy between the gross floor space (3,516 sq metres) and net floor space (1,858 sq metres). However, as a condition was proposed to restrict the net floor space, this was not an issue.

Inconsistencies were also noted between the Transport Impact Assessment and the Retail Assessment but this had been addressed by a Technical Note submitted by the applicant which demonstrated that there were minor discrepancies which derived principally from the fact that the two assessments were prepared for a different purpose and assumptions had

been made by the author of the letter in how the two assessments related to each other.

The letter contained a table reproducing calculations on impacts on existing stores but the figures reproduced related to the impact of the largest store considered by G V A Grimley (2,787 sq metres), not the store proposed which was 1,858 sq metres and was restricted to that size by condition.

Finally, the letter expressed concern about the adequacy of the quantitative need for the retail but suggested that these concerns could be overcome by condition.

Officers confirmed that under the provisions of Policy R/S2 the store was to be located in an existing centre and, as such, there was no policy requirement for a Retail Assessment. Nevertheless, the Retail Assessment did demonstrate that the expansion of the retail floor space in Rowner would not adversely affect other centres, including Principal and District Centres in the Borough and, moreover, a condition had been proposed to restrict the net floor space and the proportion of comparison goods floor space.

In answer to a Member's question concerning the 10 storey building within the proposed new development, officers advised that it was not the height of the existing tower block that had given rise to social problems on the existing estate but the design and layout of the buildings, whereas the new proposal was better designed and had a more open layout.

Members were in agreement that the proposal represented a major opportunity for the regeneration of Rowner and the chance to turn the area into somewhere people would want to live. It was the result of many years of hard work by all political groups and officers, to whom Members expressed their thanks.

RESOLVED: That having regard to the particulars of application K17671, comprising the submitted plans and documents and the Environmental Statement, that the Secretary of State be advised that the Borough Council is minded to grant Outline Consent subject to the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement relating to the provision of sports pitches within the Borough and implementation of a management plan for Browndown SSSI and the conditions set out in Appendix 1 of this report, 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 secure the social and economic regeneration of Rowner and provide an enhanced physical environment that will benefit existing and future occupiers of the Estate without adversely impacting on the environment of the site itself and the wider area. Although there is a minor intrusion into the Strategic Gap this does not adversely impact on the overall integrity of the Gap. As such the development broadly complies with national and regional planning policy and the policies of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review set out in Appendix 2 of this report.

174 K17540 - PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF EXISTING SPORTS FACILITIES AND ADJOINING LAND AT BAY HOUSE SCHOOL AND SIXTH FORM

Bay House School and Sixth Form Playing Field, Browndown Road, Gosport.

Note: Councillor Hicks declared a Personal and Prejudicial Interest in this item, left the meeting room and took no part in the discussion and voting thereon.

Councillor Carter declared a Personal Interest in this item and remained in the meeting room and took part in the voting thereon.

Councillor Forder declared a Personal and Prejudicial Interest in this item before addressing the Board.

Consideration was given to a report of the Development Services Manager which requested the Board to consider planning application K.17540 for the redevelopment of existing sports facilities and adjoining land to provide new school sports facilities, health and fitness centre, nursery and children's play facilities with amended access from Browndown Road.

Members were advised of additional consultation responses as detailed below.

Natural England had requested details of the direction of the floodlighting and the times/level of use during the bird over-wintering period. To address Natural England's concerns, it was proposed to amend proposed condition 23 to include details of the proposed hours and frequency of use of the floodlighting. This amended wording meant that condition 24 became unnecessary and was therefore proposed to be deleted.

Hampshire Wildlife Trust supported the proposed mitigation measures for Brent Geese but objected to the proposed translocation of the Green-Winged Orchids due to concerns over likely success rate. A detailed methodology for the translocation and future management of the Orchids was required to be submitted by the developer and approved under proposed condition 9.

The Environment Agency required the provision of a 12 metre wide ecological buffer zone for wildlife along the eastern bank of the river. The details and implementation of this feature were covered under condition 9.

Hampshire County Council Lighting Section had no objection as the proposed floodlighting fell within acceptable levels.

Mr Stevens was invited to address the Board. He advised Members that the points he would put forward reflected the views of many of his neighbours as well as his own. The points he raised included: lack of public consultation; the protection of the Strategic Gap and the need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances; parking provision; the lack of open space within the Borough; failure to identify an alternative location; use of Brownfield rather than Greenfield site; affordability of facilities provided to local residents; risk of contamination and building on floodplain; and the imposition of conditions to reflect local concerns.

Mr Potter, Headmaster of Bay House School, was invited to address the Board. He advised that he was accompanied by 3 members of the Board of Governors, the Managing Director of Oak Development, the Site Manager and the Head of Physical Education. Mr Potter stated that the proposed development would enable the school to deliver the national curriculum to pupils whilst, at the same time, also serving the wider community. The lack of suitable physical education facilities had been noted in recent OFSTED reports and had also caused problems in organising the school timetable. The school aimed to provide an all round education to pupils, enabling them to grow into fit and healthy adults. Bay House School would work in partnership with other schools in the Borough to promote health and fitness amongst pupils and their families, helping to tackle issues such as obesity in children. The partnership with Oak Development had been entered into in order to make it possible to raise the necessary funds to provide adequate sports facilities.

In answer to a Member's question concerning the time taken to develop the proposals, Mr Potter advised that they had taken 4½ years to produce, although he had been aware for 8 years of the need to improve the school sporting facilities. In reply to Mr Stevens' concerns as to the affordability of facilities for local residents, Mr Potter confirmed that there would be a membership fee, based on that for Fareham Leisure Centre. In the present economic climate, he challenged the way Gosport saw itself and stated that people needed to raise their aspirations.

Councillor Forder was invited to address the Board. He stated that he needed to declare a personal and prejudicial interest in this item as he had a long and continuing association with the school, having been Deputy Headmaster from 1990 – 1995. The school had a successful OFSTED and exam record and wished to give added value to the service provided. Councillor Forder advised that one of his duties had been to organise the timetable and no-one knew better than he did the constraints imposed by the state of the current buildings. The number of pupils at the school had increased from 1,500 to 2,300 and the sports facilities were no longer adequate. The number of exams sat by pupils had increased in recent years and for almost a third of the school year the current sports hall and gymnasium were used as exam rooms, making them unavailable for physical education. The proposed facilities would be of great benefit to the school in delivering a wider curriculum and of benefit to the community, as well as providing 85 jobs. Councillor Forder urged support for the proposals. Councillor Forder left the room at the end of his representation and before any discussion of the item.

In answer to a Member's question, it was confirmed that a traffic assessment had been carried out which concluded that the proposed car parking provision was acceptable. It was also concluded that the local roads could cope with the traffic generated which it was anticipated would mainly be from within the Borough.

A Member expressed concern at the proposal to develop within the Strategic Gap. He considered that the sports facilities would create noise and disturb local residents, particularly if floodlit pitches were used up to 10pm. He felt that consideration should be given to other sites within the Borough for the provision of sports facilities.

Officers clarified that given the very exceptional circumstances of this case and that the proposal was located at the southern end of the Strategic Gap, it was not considered that the proposal would affect the principal function of the Gap in terms of maintaining physical separation of the urban areas of Gosport and Lee-on-the-Solent, or prevent the Council from protecting other areas of open space of more localised importance.

Whilst some Members felt that there was a fine line to be drawn in consideration of the exceptional circumstances required to justify development in the Strategic Gap, they were supportive of the proposals and the benefit that they would bring to the school and the community of Gosport as a whole.

RESOLVED: That having regard to the particulars of application K17540, comprising the submitted plans and documents, the Secretary of State be advised that the Borough Council is minded to grant permission subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the report and amended condition 23 below, 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 secure the provision of enhanced sports facilities for Bay House School and sports and leisure facilities for the wider community without adversely impacting on the environment of the site or the wider area. Although there is a minor intrusion outside of the urban area into the Strategic Gap this does not adversely impact on the overall integrity of the Gap. As such, the development broadly complies with the national policies, regional policies and the policies of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review as set out in Section 4 of the report.

Amended Condition 23

Details of the floodlighting to be installed, including cowls, or other attenuation measures to ensure that the lux levels accord with levels shown on the approved plan, and the proposed hours and frequency of operation, shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority before installation is carried out. The floodlighting shall thereafter be installed, operated and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - In the interests of nature conservation and to protect the amenities of the area, and to comply with Policies R/DP1, R/ENV11, R/OS10, R/OS11, R/OS12 and R/OS13 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

175 REPORTS 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 attached in the Minute Book as Appendix 'C').

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

**176 K3113/1 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE STOREY SHOP UNIT AND ERECTION OF AN ENLARGED GROUND FLOOR SHOP UNIT (CLASS A1) WITH 2NO.2 BEDROOMED FLATS AT FIRST FLOOR (as amended by email dated 27.02.09)
68A Brewers Lane Gosport Hampshire PO13 0LA**

Mr Tutton was invited to address the Board. He advised that he was representing Mr Cheung who ran a hot food take-away business at 68 Brewers Lane. He stated that his client's property would be overshadowed by the proposed development which would also prevent him having access to his garage and the refuse storage area. Whilst the proposed new security gates were welcomed by his client, he considered the third parking space proposed to be a danger to vehicles. Mr Tutton did not feel that the matter of access to the garage was merely a private legal matter but was a symptom of poor design.

Mrs Hope was invited to address the Board. She did not consider that the proposed development would overshadow the next door property. The garage had weeds a foot high growing in front of it, indicating that it was not used. The back garden was also overgrown with weeds and the tarmac on the driveway had weeds growing through it. The position of the new gates would make the entrance closer for residents with an improved angle of access. Mrs Hope wished to enlarge the premises as the present shop was too small. The business would provide Saturday jobs for young people, giving them an income as well as keeping them off the streets. The rejuvenated business would benefit local residents who would not have to travel to other shops and the proposed accommodation would help the local housing situation. She stated that there were few shops within the local residential area and it was proposed that the shop would sell local produce and have a delicatessen.

Clarification was sought on the question of garage access and Members were advised that this was a private matter between parties and not a planning consideration.

Members also expressed concern that adequate parking provision had not been made for the development. Whilst acknowledging that this was a difficult issue, officers advised that, in the past, planning inspectors had overturned decisions to refuse an application on the grounds of lack of parking provision.

RESOLVED: That planning application K3113/1 – 68A Brewers Lane, Gosport be approved subject to Section 106 agreement relating to the payment of a commuted sum towards the provision and/or improvement of outdoor playing space and a commuted sum towards infrastructure, services and facilities and subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Development Services Manager, for the following reasons:

- 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 and will help to strengthen the role of this Neighbourhood Shopping Centre. The detailed design of the proposed building within the overall street scene is appropriate and acceptable. The proposal will improve the appearance of the area and will not have a detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents or prospective occupiers. Adequate provision is made for open space, transport infrastructure, car and cycle parking and refuse storage. As such the development complies with Policies R/DP1, R/DP3, R/S4, R/S7, R/H4, R/T4, R/T11, R/OS8 and R/OS13 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**177 K9913/66 - EXTENSION TO MOORING PONTOONS (10 IN NUMBER) AND PILING INCLUDING REPOSITIONING OF 1 PILE AND 4 NEW PILES WITHIN THE EXISTING FOOTPRINT OF THE MARINA AREA
Hornet Sailing Club Haslar Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 2AQ**

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

Members were concerned at the possible noise nuisance created by pile driving at night and proposed an additional condition limiting pile driving to between the hours of 8am and 8pm.

RESOLVED: That planning application K9913/66 – Hornet Sailing Club, Haslar Road, Gosport be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Development Services Manager and an additional condition limiting the times that pile driving could take place, for the following reasons:

- 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 proposal is related to the existing recreational use of the site and therefore acceptable outside the Urban Area Boundary and will not be detrimental to landward or seaward views, or the visual amenities of the area, or the wider character and appearance of the coast, or the interests of nature conservation. As such, the development complies with Policies R/OS1, R/DP1, R/MOD1, R/CH1, R/CH5, R/CF8, R/OS10 and R/OS11 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

Additional condition

No piling shall be carried out between the hours of 8pm and 8am.

Reason – In the interests of the amenity of the area and to comply with Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**178 K12345/73 - ERECTION OF TWO STOREY INDUSTRIAL UNIT (CLASS B2 & B8) WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND ACCESS (as amended by plans received 18.03.09 and revised Transport Assessment received 16.03.09)
Plot 2B, Regent Trade Park Barwell Lane Gosport Hampshire**

Members were advised of the following updates:

Line 7 of paragraph 4 on page 14 - the word 'non' should be deleted to reflect the mix of industrial uses permitted on the site under a previous condition.

Natural England had requested that a condition be attached to control the method of piling foundations on the site so that birds using the adjacent protected waters in Portsmouth Harbour were not unduly disturbed.

The required legal agreement had not yet been signed, therefore it was requested that the recommendation be amended to request that authority be delegated to the Head of Development Control to refuse the application on the grounds of non-compliance with Policies R/DP3 and R/T4 relating to the provision of a commuted sum towards highway infrastructure improvements if the completed document was not received by 12 June 2009.

RESOLVED: That planning application K12345/73 – Plot 2B, Regent Trade Park, Barwell Lane, Gosport, Hampshire be approved subject to 106 Agreement relating to the payment of a commuted sum towards the transport infrastructure, services and facilities, and subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Development Services Manager and an additional condition relating to the method of piling foundations, for the following reasons below. In the event that the completed Unilateral Undertaking is not received by 12 June 2009, authority is delegated to the Head of Development Control to refuse the application.

- 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 proposed development is acceptable in this location, will provide additional employment opportunities and will not have an adverse impact on nature conservation interests, controlled waters, biodiversity, the character and appearance of the area or highway and pedestrian safety. Appropriate facilities are available for vehicular and bicycle parking and refuse storage. Provisions have been made for highway and infrastructure improvements and the proposal therefore complies with Policies R/DP1, R/DP6, R/DP3, R/EMP1, R/EMP3, R/EMP7, R/CH1, R/T2, R/T3, R/T4, R/T11, R/OS10, R/OS11, R/OS12, R/OS13, R/ENV2, R/ENV3, R/ENV4, R/ENV5, R/ENV14 and R/ENV15 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

Additional Condition 14

The method of piling foundations for the development shall be carried out in accordance with a scheme to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the construction of the building is commenced.

Reason - To avoid disturbance to over wintering migratory waterfowl along the Portsmouth Harbour SPA/SSSI and to comply with Policies R/OS10 and R/OS11 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**179 K2229/7 - ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, REAR BALCONY AND PITCHED ROOFS TO EXISTING PORCH AND SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION (as amended by plans received 17.02.09)
165 Portsmouth Road Lee-On-The-Solent Hampshire PO13 9AD**

Members were advised that amended plans had been received showing the balcony balustrade set in 30 cm from the edge of the balcony. It was believed that this amendment overcame the neighbour's objection to the proposed development.

Mr Millard was invited to address the Board. He advised that, since making his request for a deputation, he had consulted with his neighbour. He now understood that his neighbour's objections had been resolved by the amended plans.

RESOLVED: That planning application K2229/7 – 165 Portsmouth Road, Lee-on-the-Solent, Hampshire be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Development Services Manager, for the following reasons:

- 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 is acceptable in this location and as such complies with Policies R/DP1, R/DP7 and R/T11 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**180 K17662 - REGULATION 3 - INSTALLATION OF EXTERNAL WALL CLADDING/INSULATED RENDER SYSTEM
1,3,5,7 Southway Gosport Hampshire PO13 0XB**

Members welcomed the following proposals for the installation of external wall cladding/insulated render systems on buildings throughout the Borough. The works would improve the carbon footprint of the buildings and enhance their appearance.

- 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 improve the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the locality and reduce energy use. As such, the proposal complies with Policies R/DP1, R/DP7 and R/ENV14 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**181 K17664 - REGULATION 3 - INSTALLATION OF EXTERNAL WALL CLADDING/INSULATED RENDER SYSTEM
63 To 93 (odd No.s) Skipper Way Lee-On-The-Solent Hampshire PO13 9EX**

RESOLVED: That Regulation 3 application K17664 – 63 to 93 (odd No.s) Skipper Way, Lee-on-the-Solent, Hampshire be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Development Services Manager, for the following reasons:

- 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 improve the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the locality and reduce energy use. As such, the proposal complies with Policies R/DP1, R/DP7 and R/ENV14 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**182 K17665 - REGULATION 3 - INSTALLATION OF EXTERNAL WALL CLADDING/INSULATED RENDER SYSTEM
1 To 15 (odd No's) Skipper Way & 57 To 63 (odd No's) Elmore Avenue Lee-On-The-Solent Hampshire PO13 9EU**

RESOLVED: That Regulation 3 application K17665 – 1 to 15 (odd No.s) Skipper Way and 57 to 63 (odd No's) Elmore Avenue, Lee-on-the-Solent, Hampshire be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Development Services Manager, for the following reasons:

- 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 improve the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the locality and reduce energy use. As such, the proposal complies with Policies R/DP1, R/DP7 and R/ENV14 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**183 K17666 - REGULATION 3 - INSTALLATION OF EXTERNAL WALL CLADDING/INSULATED RENDER SYSTEM
53 And 57 Southway Gosport Hampshire PO13 0XB**

RESOLVED: That Regulation 3 application K17666 – 53 and 57 Southway, Gosport, Hampshire be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Development Services Manager, for the following reasons:

- 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 improve the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the locality and reduce energy use. As such, the proposal complies with Policies R/DP1, R/DP7 and R/ENV14 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**184 K17667 - REGULATION 3 - INSTALLATION OF EXTERNAL WALL CLADDING/INSULATED RENDER SYSTEM
18 To 32 And 46 To 52 (even No's) Southway Gosport Hampshire PO13 0XD**

RESOLVED: That Regulation 3 application K17667 – 18 to 32 and 46 to 52 (even No's) Southway, Gosport, Hampshire be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Development Services Manager, for the following reasons:

- 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 improve the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the locality and reduce energy use. As such, the proposal complies with Policies R/DP1, R/DP7 and R/ENV14 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**185 K17668 - REGULATION 3 - INSTALLATION OF EXTERNAL WALL
CLADDING/INSULATED RENDER SYSTEM
31 To 37 (odd No's) Southway Gosport Hampshire PO13 0XB**

RESOLVED: That Regulation 3 application K17667 – 31 to 37 (odd No's) Southway, Gosport, Hampshire be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Development Services Manager, for the following reasons:

- 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 improve the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the locality and reduce energy use. As such, the proposal complies with Policies R/DP1, R/DP7 and R/ENV14 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

A vote of thanks was proposed to the Chairman and Officers for their work during the past Municipal Year which was unanimously endorsed by members.

The meeting commenced at 6.00pm and concluded at 7.34 pm

CHAIRMAN