

**A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD  
WAS HELD ON 15 MARCH 2011**

The Mayor (Councillor Allen) (ex-officio), Chairman of the P & O Board (Councillor Hook) (ex-officio); Councillors Ms Ballard, Carter CR (Chairman) (P), Edwards, Geddes (P) Henshaw (P), Hylands (P), Langdon (P), Ronayne (P), Scard (P), and Wright (P).

**163 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting were received from the Mayor, Councillor Edwards and Councillor Ms Ballard.

**164 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

**165 MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Regulatory Board meeting held on 15 February 2011 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a true and correct record.

**166 DEPUTATIONS**

Deputations had been received on application K17914 – 14 Monroe Close.

**167 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

No public questions had been received.

**PART II**

**168 REPORT OF THE BOROUGH SOLICITOR**

The Borough Solicitor 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 'A').

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

- 169 K17880 - ERECTION OF 20 BED CARE HOME AND ASSOCIATED ACCESS, CAR PARKING, CYCLE STORAGE AND LANDSCAPING (as amplified by additional information received 24.11.10, 03.12.10 and 17.12.10)  
Land At Rear Of 90a - 92 Fareham Road Gosport Hampshire PO13 0AG**

Members were advised that additional information had been provided by the applicant the day before the Regulatory Board and Planning Officers had not yet had the opportunity to consider this additional information and it was therefore proposed that the application be deferred until a future meeting of the Regulatory Board so that Officers could respond.

RESOLVED: That application K17880 – Land at the rear of 90a-92 Fareham Road be deferred until a future meeting of the Regulatory Board.

**170 K17914 - ERECTION OF SINGLE/TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY FRONT & REAR ADDITIONS (as amended by plan received 25.02.11)  
14 Monroe Close Gosport Hampshire PO12 2RT**

Members were advised of a correction to the report in that the second line of paragraph two on page ten should read that the two storey extension is hipped at the rear - deleting the word 'gabled'.

Mrs Horne was invited to address the Board. She advised that she resided at 16 Monroe Close and was concerned, along with other householders in Monroe Close, at the proposal to erect single/two storey side extensions.

She advised that she had resided in the property for 34 years and had no desire to leave and that the proposed application would disrupt her enjoyment of her property.

Mrs Horne expressed concern that the report did not mention her sitting room which would, should the proposal be built, look directly onto a brick wall. The proposal would result in a loss of light to the property and restrict the view of the Close. The Board were advised that the loss of light would be replicated in the first floor bedroom and bathroom.

The Board were advised that the property was a three bedroom property, not two as described in the report, and would therefore become a five bedroom property. Also that the new rear bedroom at 14 Monroe Close would overlook the garden of 16 Monroe Close.

Mrs Horne also expressed concern that the proposal would lead to additional parking problems within the Close and that in the event that the property was sold, more than likely a larger family would move in. She felt that should they have additional cars, the parking problems would be escalated.

Mrs Horne advised that as part of her deputation, she would be reading a letter from the owner of number 18 Monroe Close, who was unable to attend the meeting to address the Board himself.

The letter advised that the owner of number 18 Monroe Close had undertaken a traffic survey of the Close. He advised that the lay-by with 6 parking spaces was used by the residents of the neighbouring Heston Walk and Waverly Path and that only 20% of the residents in Monroe Close used their garages for the

storage of their cars.

Currently only 3 properties were occupied by families, the rest by retired people or working couples. Concern was expressed that should more families move in to the Close car ownership would increase even further. The letter accepted that there had been amendments to the proposal, but was disappointed that consultation had not been undertaken with local residents.

The letter advised that there were already confrontations between neighbours over parking issues and that footways and grassed areas were often damaged as a result of people parking on verges.

Mrs Barrett was invited to address the Board. She advised that she was the owner of 14 Monroe Close.

She advised that she was surprised that her neighbours had contacted Councillors and were addressing the Regulatory Board and she was upset that they had not felt that they could approach her directly.

She advised that the plans had been amended to ensure that the driveway would still accommodate a car and that their solicitor had confirmed that the boundary line shown on the application drawings was correct.

The Board were advised that the main drain would not be affected by the proposal and that on completion of the work, the trailer currently on the driveway would be stored in the garage. In addition, the Board were advised that she was aware of the Party Wall Act requirements and had instructed her solicitor to act accordingly.

Mrs Barrett advised that number 16 Monroe Close had itself been extended three times and that the design of the estate meant that all windows overlooked gardens of other properties.

In conclusion, Mrs Barrett acknowledged that the main objection to the proposal was parking issues and advised that compromises had been made to address concerns. Mrs Barrett once again expressed disappointment that her neighbours did not contact her directly with any concerns they may have had.

In answer to a Member's question, officers confirmed that the plans submitted indicated that number 14 Monroe Close had two bedrooms and a study. It was noted that the study could be used as a third bedroom.

It was proposed and agreed that the application be deferred to a future meeting of the Regulatory Board pending a site visit by Members of the Regulatory Board.

**RESOLVED:** That application K17914 –14 Monroe Close, be deferred to a future meeting of the Regulatory Board, pending a site visit.

**171 K8152/1 - REGULATION 3 - RETENTION OF 23no. REPLACEMENT GARAGE**  
**Land North Of Montgomery Road And West Of Harris Road Gosport Hampshire**

Members questioned why the application was being submitted retrospectively and were advised that there was provision within the legislation for planning applications to be submitted retrospectively and to commence works without first obtaining the necessary planning permission was not unlawful, however, the Borough Solicitor was currently in discussions with the Housing Services Manager regarding the matter.

RESOLVED: That Regulation 3 application K8152/1 – Land to the North of Montgomery Road and West of Harris Road, Gosport be approved for the reasons below:

- 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. It is acceptable in design terms, has enhanced the appearance of the area, and has not had a harmful impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties or highway and pedestrian safety, or protected species and, as such, complies with Policies R/DP1, R/T11 and R/OS13 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**172 K17903 - REGULATION 3 - RETENTION OF 25no. REPLACEMENT GARAGES**  
**Land East Of Harris Road Gosport Hampshire**

RESOLVED: That Regulation 3 application K17903 –Land to the East of Harris Road, Gosport, be approved for the reasons below:

- 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. It is acceptable in design terms, has enhanced the appearance of the area, and has not had a harmful impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties or highway and pedestrian safety or protected species and, as such, complies with Policies R/DP1, R/T11 and R/OS13 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**173 K18152/1 - REGULATION 3 - RETENTION OF 12no. REPLACEMENT GARAGES**  
**Land West Of Layton Road And East Of Nobes Avenue Gosport Hampshire**

Members were advised that the publicity period had now expired and that no letters of representation had been received.

RESOLVED: That Regulation 3 application K17895 – Land West Of Layton

Road And East Of Nobes Avenue, Gosport be approved for the reasons below:

- 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. It is acceptable in design terms, has enhanced the appearance of the area, and has not had a harmful impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties or highway and pedestrian safety or protected species and, as such, complies with Policies R/DP1, R/T11 and R/OS13 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**174 K1947/1 – REGULATION 3 - DEMOLITION AND REPLACEMENT OF  
13no. GARAGES  
Land To The West Of Prideaux Brune Avenue Gosport Hampshire**

Members were advised that a correction needed to be made to the report so that the third line of the second paragraph on page 20 should read 'boundary walls and fences'.

Members were also advised that no response had been received from Southern Electric and that the publicity period for the application had now expired and that no letters of representation had been received.

RESOLVED: That Regulation 3 application K1947/1 - Land to the West of Prideaux Brune Avenue, Gosport, be approved subject to the conditions in the report of the Borough Solicitor for the reasons below:

- 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. It is acceptable in design terms and will enhance the appearance of the area, and will not have a harmful impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties or highway and pedestrian safety and, as such, complies with Policies R/DP1 and R/T11 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**175 ANY OTHER ITEMS**

There were none.

The meeting commenced at 6.00pm and concluded at 6.20pm.

CHAIRMAN