

***Subject to Approval***  
**A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD  
WAS HELD ON 10 July 2012**

The Mayor (Councillor Dickson) (ex-officio), Chairman of the P & O Board (Councillor Hook) (P); Councillors Ms Ballard (P), Beavis (P), Carter CR (P), Ms Diffey (P), Farr (P), Gill (P), Henshaw (P), Mrs Hook (P), Jessop (P), Langdon (P), Ronayne and Wright (P).

It was reported that, in accordance with Standing Orders, Councillor Hook had been nominated to replace Councillor Ronayne for this meeting.

**16 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting were received from the Mayor and Councillor Ronayne.

**17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- Councillor Farr declared a personal and prejudicial interest in K16424/4 – 11A Brockhurst Road
- Councillor Henshaw declared a personal and prejudicial interest in K18098 – 32 Kingston Road

**18 MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Regulatory Board meeting held on 18 June 2012 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a true and correct record.

**19 DEPUTATIONS**

Deputations had been received on the following applications:

- K16424/4 – 11A Brockhurst Road
- K18098 – 32 Kingston Road

**20 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

No public questions had been received.

**PART II**

**21 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:

**22 K16424/4 - CHANGE OF USE FROM 5 NO. BEDROOM RESIDENTIAL DWELLING (USE CLASS C3) TO 8 NO. BEDROOM PROJECT HOUSE (USE CLASS SUI GENERIS)  
11A Brockhurst Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 3AJ**

Mr Pickup was invited to address the Board. He advised that he was the Chief Executive of the Society of St James.

He advised the Board that the Society had been established for 30 years and worked in the South Hampshire Area with people that were homeless and had substance abuse problems. They provided accommodation for up to 330 people a night in hostels and flats and employed 120 staff.

The Board was advised that the Society worked with Hampshire and Isle of Wight Offender Management Teams, along with the Police and the Probation Service to help drug users turn their lives around and that the facility would provide additional accommodation for Gosport residents. The Board was advised that residents were admitted voluntarily and were provided with a programme of activities to aid rehabilitation.

The Board was advised that funding had been secured for a member of staff to work on site 37 hours a week, not 18.5 as previously indicated. It was confirmed that funding had been secured for this member of staff for at least two years. In addition to this residents would have key workers and operational support from Police and other Society staff. Local neighbours would be given a contact number for emergencies.

The Society would redecorate the building externally and improve the overall appearance of the site and the facility would benefit in preventing homelessness.

It was confirmed that residents would reside there on licence, they would agree to abide by the rules of the facility and breach of them would result in removal from this facility.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that the turn around in a similar facility in Southampton had been 30 people a year, with the average stay of 3-6 months.

The Board was advised that CCTV would be installed in the facility and it was requested that this be operational before the facility was used.

Activities for residents included sport at offsite facilities.

The Board was advised that residents sometimes had multiple stays with the Society as they would often be facing further prison sentences; it was not uncommon for them to require more than one period in the facility for rehabilitation to be successful.

The scheme had the support of the Police and the Probation Service and aided

Regulatory Board  
10 July 2012

crime reduction as those released from prison were not left to fend for themselves.

Councillor Hylands, Ward Councillor for the Brockhurst Ward, was invited to address the Board. He advised that he was not against the facility, but would like Board Members to be fully aware of the concerns of local residents before considering the application.

Councillor Hylands acknowledged that the residents of the facility were there voluntarily and that it was well run and that drug screening would take place.

Councillor Hylands provided to Board Members and the applicant a screenshot of a mobile phone application that highlighted reported crime in a 4 week timescale. He advised that the proposed location had already been subject to incidences of anti-social behaviour. He advised that while he did not believe the proposed location to be the worst possible choice for the facility it was located at a potential flash point of a public house, convenience store and road junction.

Councillor Hylands reiterated his support for such a facility, but sought assurances that only residents would be allowed to enter it.

Members felt that the siting of the proposed facility close to shops and public transport would be beneficial.

Members were advised that the facility would be monitored by the Society and the Police. It was requested that the installation and maintenance of the CCTV be controlled by a planning condition should the application be approved.

Members welcomed the management plan for the facility, the increase in staffing levels and the work the Society undertook within the community. They also welcomed it as it would improve the site's appearance.

Members agreed to approve the application, subject to the amendment of the condition relating to the management plan to include the increase in staffing hours and subject to an additional condition four relating to the installation of CCTV.

RESOLVED: That application K16424/4 –11A Brockhurst Road be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report of Borough Solicitor, including an amendment to the condition relating to the management plan and an additional condition 4 as detailed below, for the following reasons :-

1. That having regard to Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and all other material considerations the proposal is acceptable in principle and will not impact detrimentally on the surrounding residential properties or highway safety and the proposal therefore complies with Policies R/DP1, R/CF1, R/T11 and R/ENV10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

And that Condition 3 as recommended be amended to read as follows:

The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until a

Regulatory Board  
10 July 2012

Management Plan including details of supervision on site has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The measures set out in the approved Management Plan shall thereafter be adhered to at all times.

Reason - In the interests of the amenities of the surrounding residential properties and to comply with Policies R/DP1 and R/ENV10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

And that an additional Condition 4 be included to read as follows:

The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until CCTV has been installed in accordance with a scheme ( such scheme to include details of the location and number of cameras and how they will be operated ) which has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The CCTV shall be retained and operated in accordance with the scheme approved under this condition.

Reason - In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of the property and the neighbouring properties and to comply with Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**23 K18098- ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH 1NO. ROOF LANTERN  
32 Kingston Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 3LL**

RESOLVED: That application K18098 – 32 Kingston Road, Gosport, be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Borough Solicitor, 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, is acceptable in this location. It is acceptable in design terms and will not have a harmful impact on the amenities of the area or the occupiers of the neighbouring properties and, as such, complies with Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

The meeting commenced at 6.00pm and concluded at 6.40pm.

CHAIRMAN