

**A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD  
WAS HELD ON 27 JUNE 2016 AT 6PM  
*Subject to approval***

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

**It was reported that in accordance with Standing Order 2.3.6, Councillors Hook and Mrs Cully had been nominated to replace Councillors Ronayne and Wright for this meeting.**

**7. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting were received by the Mayor, Councillor Ronayne and Councillor Wright.

**8. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- Councillor Raffaelli declared that as he had been previously involved in discussions with a number of residents before his election he was not going to take part in any discussion in respect of item 2 of the grey pages of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.
- Councillor Earle declared a personal interest in respect of item 5 of the grey pages of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.
- Councillor Beavis declared in respect of item 8 of the grey pages of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive and used the Applicants catering services when he was Mayor so was declaring a personal interest.
- Councillors Allen, Mrs Batty, Beavis, Carter, Hook, Jessop, Raffaelli, Scard, Farr and Mrs Cully declared a personal interest in respect of items 9 of the grey pages of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive as they knew the Applicant.
- Councillors Allen, Mrs Batty, Beavis, Carter, Hook, Jessop and Scard declared a personal interest in respect of item 10 of the grey pages of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive as Applicant was a Councillor

**9. DEPUTATIONS**

Deputations had been received on the following items:

- Item 1 of the grey pages – 15/0015/FULL – The Slaughter House, Royal Clarence Yard
- Item 2 of the grey pages – 15/00229/FULL – Anglesey Hotel Crescent Road, Alverstoke
- Item 3 of the grey pages – 16/00059/FULL – Unit 3-4 Camden Street
- Item 4 of the grey pages – 16/00094/FULL – 10 Palmerston Way
- Item 5 of the grey pages – 16/00032/FULL – Land at 29-33 Anns Hill Road, Gosport
- Item 6 of the grey pages – 15/0686/VOC – Alverstoke Village Showroom, Green Road,
- Item 7 of the grey pages – 16/00015/FULL – Land rear of 363 Fareham Road
- Item 8 of the grey pages – 16/00163/FULL – 16 Marine Parade West, Lee-on-the-Solent

**10. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

The following public question had been received:

"Does the Regulatory Board operate a system of 'whipping' its members, either collectively or through its incumbent political parties, and approve planning applications as is suggested in the Localism Act 2011 with political will, or do individual Councillors hear evidence at Board meetings and make impartial decisions in accordance with the Council's 'Part 5 - Schedule 21 Code of Conduct for Councillors and Officers Involved in the Regulatory Process', and with this in mind, have any or all of the political parties met individually or collectively, or a member or two members or more met and had discussions about decisions of this evening's Board, or correspondences of an Council or private nature been entered into on paper, by email, social media, in person, or in voice?"

The question was answered by the Chairman of the Regulatory Board.

## PART II

### 11. 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:

### 12. 15/00153/FULL – CHANGE OF USE OF THE SLAUGHTERHOUSE TO CLASS A3 (RESTAURANT/CAFÉ) AND CLASS D1 (INCLUDING CHURCH AND MEETING SPACES) (CONSERVATION AREA) (as amended by information received 23.06.15 and 12.04.2016) The Slaughterhouse Royal Clarence Yard Weevil Lane Gosport

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 15/00153/FULL.

Mr Devrill was invited to address the Board.

Officers updated Members that Paragraph 3 under the site description and paragraph 9 under principal issues of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive described the parking as having four dedicated spaces. In addition to this however, there were 6 spaces allocated in North Meadow from 8am – 8pm making a total of 10 spaces allocated to the Slaughterhouse with the overflow and visitor parking within Cooperage Green. This provision was approved under application 15/00153/FULL with the assumption at the time that the D1 use would be permitted for the Slaughterhouse.

Mr Devrill informed Members that he was the Church Secretary of Gosport Baptist Church who had been renting units in Cooperage Green since 2011. Mr Devrill advised that the vision was to now move all community activities that were held in these units to the Slaughterhouse.

Mr Devrill further advised that the Church aspired to create a community hub with rooms within the Church being available for hire to businesses and community groups and would be equipped with multi-media facilities with the central area of the building proposed to be a café style area offering views both of the Slaughterhouse and the surrounding waterfront which, Mr Devrill felt would attract a footfall of visitors to the area.

Following a question from a Member, Mr Devrill advised the Board that daily uses of the building would vary between 3-4 hours in the morning, afternoon and evening. It was anticipated that more groups would seek to use the new facilities once established.

Councillor Philpott was invited to address the Board. He advised Members that although it was recognised that the proposed change of use would bring a long-term vacant building, that had been marketed for a number of years, into active use providing community facilities to residents, he felt that the use would result in a reduction of employment space within Royal Clarence Yard.

Councillor Philpott advised Members that there had been limited interest from the restaurant industry to move into the Slaughterhouse due to the size and required refitting of the building. He went on to further add that four parties had shown an interest but not pursued this due to the site being “too big a project” and “too expensive to fit-out.”

Councillor Philpott further advised Members that he believed Berkeley Homes had delivered on housing in Royal Clarence Yard but commercially, the site had never fulfilled its potential.

In conclusion, Councillor Philpott informed the Board that according to the Gosport Local Planning Policy LP31 the Slaughterhouse had been identified as being situated within a prime commercial location that provided an important economic role. He further went on to advise that he believed Berkeley Homes had inadequately marketed the site which he emphasised as being determined as a commercial site and crucial to the economic prosperity of the Borough.

Following Members discussion concerns were raised with regards to Berkeley Homes not meeting the requirements to market the Slaughterhouse; the methods used to generate interest and sufficient promotion of the building. Members further felt that the marketing process had not adequately demonstrated that all commercial purposes had been considered and further agreed that it was too soon to allow the change of use of the Slaughterhouse to a non-commercial unit.

It was therefore proposed, seconded and subsequently agreed that the application be refused due to the proposed change of use being contrary to LP31 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 15/00153/FULL be refused as the proposed change of use was contrary to LP31 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

13. **15/00229/FULL – DEMOLITION OF GARAGES AND BOUNDARY WALL AND ERECTION OF TWO STOREY BUILDING COMPRISING STAFF ACCOMMODATION AND GARAGES TOGETHER WITH BOUNDARY WALL (LISTED BUILDINGS IN A CONSERVATION AREA) (as amended by plans received 07.12.15 and 07.03.16)  
Anglesey Hotel, 24 Crescent Road, Gosport**

**Councillor Raffaelli 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 15/00229/FULL.

Mrs Chacon invited to address the Board.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Mrs Chacon advised the Board that she was the daughter of Mrs Holly who resided at 23 Crescent Road and stated that although objecting to the application they were in favour of, and supported a development on the site but felt the proposed application would far from enhance the property and surrounding areas, and would detract from the cultural heritage.

Mrs Chacon advised Members that this plan far from enhanced the site and surrounding area and would penalise the community and detract from the cultural heritage. As objectors; Mrs Chacon advised that they were in favour of and support a development on this site, not this one. She further advised that this proposal added further the 'unacceptability of planning creep'

Mrs Chacon informed Members that contrary to the Officer's report there had been no enforcement investigation regarding an outside catering business or the inspection of business plan/accounts and site inspections had been done with prior notice and, for a business specialising in spit roasts etc. at the wrong time of year. Mrs Chacon further added that the website mysteriously closed at time of inspection and advised that the running of this business inevitable had an impact on all aspects of the proposal particularly parking.

Mrs Chacon advised Members that LP10 of the Local Plan stated that 'Gosport Borough Council would protect public views of important landscape and town features' and that Historic England had rejected the application on the basis of 'the loss of the open character at the rear of the building'. Mrs Chacon advised that they had approved the amendment with reservations, saying that 'this amended scheme largely addresses the concerns' but advised 'we urge you to address the above issues and recommend that the application be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance'. The loss of the view of the 'reverse curve', an important historical view of this listed building, is unchanged by this amendment. Mrs Chacon felt strongly that the concerns raised should be taken into consideration when determining the application.

Mrs Chacon advised Members that the officer's report states: 'The Crescent is close to the graveyard wall to its north-east which was grade II listed in 1983. These structures and their relationship with each other form the character of this part of the Anglesey Conservation Area.' LP 10, states 'It is considered important that new development contributes to, or creates, a sense of place, emphasising what makes that particular locality distinctive'. And yet this distinctive view from the graveyard for local people and tourists will be lost as is the view for residents looking out to the graveyard. LP12 says: Proposals for development in Conservation Areas will be permitted provided that 'it conserves or enhances the setting of the Conservation Area and is not detrimental to inward or outward views. Not achieved.

Mrs Chacon advised Members that LP13 planning which results in harm should demonstrate 'that the benefits of the development outweigh the asset's historical significance'. The local economy is not diversified, there are no additional jobs created and no increased range in recreational activities therefore there are no benefits to outweigh the damage to the local amenity – referring to your LP18 for evidence of 'public benefit'

Mrs Chacon advised that LP11 the applicant 'will be required to describe the significance of the asset with proportionate level of detail relating to the likely impact a proposal could have on the assets historic interest' and according to your latest Local Plan, must refer to Box 8.1. The applicant's Heritage Statement is inadequate in this respect. This is an insult to the local people who have diligently ensured the preservation of their local heritage for years,

particularly since the business uses this heritage as an important backdrop. The applicant has not produced sufficient pictorial evidence of the visual effect of the proposed buildings - this is not difficult with modern technology.

Mrs Chacon advised that LP12 'proposals ... will need to consider characteristics such as traditional building form and scale'. If you consider scale, the proposal should be for a single storey building to conform to the current scale of the garages therefore retaining historic views.

Mrs Chacon advised Members that there was substantial reduction in the amenity available to anyone looking out of no.23. There would be further reduction in the amenity available to users of the garden – this added to the cumulative impact of previous extensions to the hotel. The 2009 application emphasised 31% of the garden would remain free of shadows. This proposal would mean the garden would be in almost permanent shadow, particularly in the winter months. Refer to LDF, 'Residential Amenity. A Key Design Principle no.9 concerning residential amenity and 'the extensive obstruction of sunlight.

Mrs Chacon advised that the Applicant runs a 26 room hotel and pub and a catering business with no parking provision. The space allowed in this proposal was inadequate and does not allow for goods vehicles, particularly in relation to the catering business, emergency/disabled vehicles, delivery lorries, manoeuvring coaches. Mrs Chacon felt that this proposal would result in the near complete development of the whole of the hotel plot. A single storey building was being replaced by a two storey building and more, and was not appropriate for the space.

Mrs Chacon advised Members that the Planning Officer's Report made it very clear that the proposed garages fall below current size standards. Properly sized garages, he points out, would affect the size of the rear courtyard and be potentially harmful to the character of the Conservation Area and the Crescent.' In other words there was not room for this overcrowded scheme to be properly executed. It should have no place as part of a Grade 2\* Listed building. We take this to be the council's own admission of overdevelopment – there is not enough space!

In conclusion Mrs Chacon referred Members to the conditions of the Officer's report advising that:-

- No 3 was unenforceable! (Hotel to keep notes on who stays in the accommodation). We would like to see a condition here that prevents the accommodation from being used as permanent/long term.
- No 4 appeared to contradict what you state in item 7
- No 5. We do not understand how "the yard area can be available at all times to allow for the parking of two vehicles in the rear courtyard'. You appear to have a condition on this condition that enables the condition to be removed.
- No. 7 good thank you – fire escape to be used only as fire escape.
- No. 8 please add no glass to be tipped into the bins on Sundays or evenings – respect noise nuisance.
- No.9 Future development resulting in further expansion in any direction should be banned.

Following a Member's question it was acknowledged that although Historic England had initially raised concerns on some aspects of the development, the final consultation response raised no objection to the proposal.

Mr Bezani was invited to address the Board. He advised Members that he had purchased the property in 2002 in a dilapidated state investing a large sum of money to bring the hotel back into use, thus providing employment opportunities and increased tourism to Gosport in a time where other nearby hotels in the area were closing.

Mr Bezani advised Members that the proposed scheme looked to address any parking issues experienced currently and reduced the need to park in surrounding streets. He also advised that the only vehicle in use was a van with the company logo advertised on the side which the Director used.

Mr Bezani felt that the residents constantly objected to improvements he wished to make to his property and that they could not empathise with him and the proposals as they were not business owners. He further added that consultation had taken place with both the Planning Department and the Conservation Officer to ensure that the scheme was deemed appropriate by all concerned and complied with all relevant planning policies.

Following a question from a Member the Planning Officer confirmed that site visits would be carried out to ensure compliance with any conditions imposed and to ensure that the identified garages would only be used for parking and not for storage purposes.

Following discussions Members felt that the proposal was an improvement to what was currently on site and therefore would be seen to enhance the character of the Anglesey Conservation area.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 15/00229/FULL be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

- 14. 16/00059/FULL – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING LIGHT INDUSTRIAL UNIT (CLASS B2) AND ERECTION OF 6 NO. TWO BEDROOM HOUSES AND 1 NO. THREE BEDROOM HOUSE WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING, CYCLE AND BIN STORAGE (as amended by design and access statement received 14.04.16 and plan and email received 31.05.16)  
Unit 3-4 Camden Street, Gosport**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00059/FULL.

Mr Fletcher and Mr Miles were invited to address the Board.

Members were advised that since the publication of the report two further letters of objection had been received to the amended plans. The new issues raised advised that the factory roof appeared to be made of asbestos and care would need to be taken in removing it. The Planning Officer advised that asbestos removal was a matter dealt with under separate legislation under guidance from the Health and Safety Executive. Therefore there was no change to the recommendation as set out in the report.

Mr Miles advised the Board that he was representing the residents of Camden Terrace and Camden Street and had lived in his property for over 10 years. Mr Fletcher advised the Board that he was the resident of number 6 Camden Street and would shortly be moving to Number 2 Camden Terrace.

Mr Fletcher went on to inform Members that although he had some concerns regarding the proposed development, he was generally supportive of the planning application, however the main objections for residents were in relation to the strip of land at the Northern edge of the site and the heavy weight of traffic congestion and parking provisions to an already overcrowded street.

Mr Fletcher further added that the proposed development would bring more traffic to an already dense area as tenants of the new properties were likely to be car owners.

Mr Miles advised Members that the land immediately outside of number 1-6 Camden Terrace was presently unregistered to which residents had vehicular access to. He further stated that it was the resident's intention to take the matter to court to seek formal registration of the land as being co-owned by the terrace block owners.

In response to a Member's question regarding the unregistered land being fenced off Mr Miles advised the Board that legal advice was being sought by the residents.

Following a Member's question regarding how many vehicles were owned and parked in Camden Terrace Mr Fletcher and Mr Miles advised that 10 vehicles utilised the space.

Mr John Bland and Mr Ian Knight were invited to address the Board.

Mr Knight advised Members that he was speaking on behalf of the Applicants TecSew Ltd. He advised that the site included a B2 light industrial unit and a service yard and within the application was a piece of unregistered land which the applicant and the residents of Camden Street had the rights of passage to.

With regards to parking concerns Mr Knight pointed out at present the B2 use on the site required 11 off street parking spaces and did not comply with planning regulations resulting in employees and deliveries adding stress to the local parking situation by the shift patterns from 7am starts and Saturday working.

Mr Knight therefore concluded that the parking situation would be eased as a result of the proposed scheme and considered the parking spaces proposed for the new properties to be fully compliant.

Mr Knight also advised the Board that the amended scheme complied with refuse requirements.

Following discussions Members felt the factory being replaced by residential properties was the way forward but felt that there were serious concerns with the quantum of development proposed and inadequate car parking provisions in Camden Street and Camden Terrace and on site to accommodate such a development.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00059/FULL be refused for the following reason(s):-

1. The proposed development, by reason of its design and layout would constitute an undesirable overdevelopment of the site that is not reflective of the established pattern of development in the area and would result in an unsatisfactory and undesirable environment for prospective occupants, contrary to Policy LP10 of Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011-2029, the Gosport Borough Council Design Guidance: Supplementary Planning Document.

2. Adequate provision has not been made for the parking of vehicles which would result in harmful overspill parking in the local road network to the detriment of local amenity and highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to Policies LP10 and LP23 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011 - 2029, the Gosport Borough Council Parking: Supplementary Planning Document.

3. Adequate provision has not been made for facilities for the storage and collection of refuse, to the detriment of the amenities of the prospective occupiers and the visual amenities of the area and contrary to Policy LP10 of Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011-2029, the Gosport Borough Council Design Guidance: Supplementary Planning Document.

4. Adequate provision has not been made for long stay and short stay cycle storage, contrary to Policies LP10 and LP23 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, 2011 - 2029, the Gosport Borough Council Parking: Supplementary Planning Document.

5. Adequate provision has not been made for mitigation against the harmful impacts of recreational disturbance on the Portsmouth Harbour SPA, the Solent and Southampton Water SPA and the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA sites to the detriment of the protected and other species for which these areas are designated, contrary to Policy LP42 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029.

**15. 16/00094/FULL – ERECTION OF OUTBUILDING TO BE USED AS CATTERY (AMENDED APPLICATION TO 15/00690/FULL) (as amplified by letter dated 20.02.16)  
10 Palmerston Way, Gosport**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00094/FULL.

Dr Ward was invited to address the Board.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Dr Ward advised Members that the large, white uVPC building was out of character with the appearance and scale of the area and overwhelmed a small 50 foot rear garden. He felt that in siting the temporary isolation facilities in the garage, the applicant had acknowledged that the rear garden was too small to fulfil the licensing requirements for new build catteries in the provision of a 10 metre separation for the required facility and further added that with no natural light or ventilation, the garage would not be conducive to the welfare of cats.

Dr Ward advised that if the proposal was approved there was likely to be significant noise nuisance being in such close proximity to neighbouring gardens.

In conclusion, Dr Ward informed the Board that West Sussex based RSPCA International had asked in their planning guidelines for animal shelters: “was the establishment at least 400 metres away from the nearest residential property”. Dr Ward added that the road was subject to “additional noise from unloading of cars with equipment, slamming of vehicle doors and boots.....clutch burning, gear crashing, and engine revving” from learner drivers, and the numerous summer visitors making use of free parking let alone noise from neighbouring gardens which clearly indicated that a small residential garden which was closely surrounded by neighbouring properties and gardens was no place for a cattery.

The Applicants Mr & Mrs Lee were invited to address the Board. They advised Members that they proposed to open a small scale cattery in order to provide a cat boarding service to local residents.

Mr Lee advised Members that they had listened to all of the objections that had been put forward and had ensured that the proposal complied with all regulations. He further added that they had been in consultation with an Animal Welfare Officer.

Following a Members question in relation to noise being generated from the proposal Mrs Lee advised that the proposed building would be subdivided to provide 6 separate pens and at no time would any cat be brought into contact with each other. She further added that unneutered cats would not be accepted.

Mr Lee further advised Members that it was not their intention to cause any adverse effects on the family home or immediate neighbours and would operate the cattery with minimal opening hours resulting in limited visitors, traffic and impact to neighbouring properties.

Following discussions by Members clarification was given by Officers relating to the hours of opening being secured by planning condition.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00094/FULL be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

16. **16/00032/FULL – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND ERECTION OF PART TWO AND PART THREE STOREY BUILDING TO FORM 3 NO. TWO BEDROOM HOUSES, 1 NO. TWO BEDROOM MAISONETTE, 2 NO. ONE BEDROOM FLATS AND 1 NO. BEDSIT WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING, CYCLE AND REFUSE STORAGE (as amplified by supporting document received 14.03.16)**  
**Land at 29-33 Anns Hill Road, Gosport**

**Councillor Earle declared a personal interest in respect of 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 16/00032/FULL.

Mr Howell was invited to address the Board.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Mr Howell advised the Board that he was speaking on behalf of the Applicant TSN Homes Ltd who had worked with the Planning Officers to consider the design, layout and scale of the proposed application and the constraints of the site. He further added that due to the objections raised by Officers at pre-application stage, amended plans had been submitted to address concerns.

Mr Howell informed Members that currently the building was in a dilapidated state to which the Applicant endeavoured to enhance. He further added that the proposal would allow residents to enjoy quick access to public transport routes.

Mr Howell advised Members that a site meeting had been held with Hampshire Highways to discuss entry and exit points from the site and that they were satisfied that the visibility on the corner between Brougham Street and Anns Hill was suitable for allowing parking and manoeuvring of vehicles.

Councillor Hylands was invited to address the Board as Ward Councillor. He thanked Members for the opportunity to speak on the application and advised Members that he was in agreement that the site needed to be redeveloped. He acknowledged that the disrepair of the building would incur significant costs and understood the need to demolish the property which had been left unattended to for a long period of time.

Councillor Hylands advised Members that although he had no objections in principle to the proposal he had serious concerns with regards to the proposed 7 new dwellings where parking was already congested and resulted in people using nearby streets as an overflow.

Councillor Hylands further added that residents occupying the new properties would potentially be car owners and would increase the traffic.

In conclusion, Councillor Hylands advised Members that the development did not provide sufficient car parking spaces and urged the Board to reject the application and ask the applicants to come back with a revised plan that could accommodate car parking requirements.

Following a question from a Member regarding car parking spaces proposed not meeting the Supplementary Parking guidance, the Planning Officer advised the Board that it had been felt this was acceptable in this location and for the type of proposed scheme, having regard to the fact that the existing Public House and residential accommodation had no parking spaces required a greater level than the proposal to comply with the SPD. Officers also clarified the position relating to the car parking management plan which was dealt with by condition 12 of the report.

**RESOLVED** That planning application 16/00032/FULL be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

17. **15/00686/VOC – VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 OF 13/00387/FULL TO AMEND APPROVED INTERNAL LAYOUTS, INTRODUCE UTILITY ROOMS AT REAR OF GARAGES, INCREASE WINDOW SIZES AND AMEND CHIMNEY DESIGNS ON PLOTS 1-5, AMEND APPROVED INTERNAL LAYOUTS, INTRODUCE UTILITY ROOM AT REAR OF GARAGE, INCREASE WINDOW SIZES AND AMEND CHIMNEY DESIGNS ON PLOTS 6-8 AND INTRODUCE VELUX WINDOW ON WEST ELEVATION AND RAISE ROOF HEIGHT OF THE SIDE EXTENSION TO PLOT 8**  
**Alverstoke Village Showroom, Green Road, Gosport**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 15/00686/VOC

Mr Gibson was invited to address the Board.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Mr Gibson advised the Board that he was speaking on behalf of 5 Little Lane which was directly opposite the proposed site.

Mr Gibson advised that when the original plans for the development were first submitted there had been reassurances that there would be no direct overlook to his property and that the roof height of plot 8 would not obscure the view of number 5 Little Lane across the trees in the churchyard which had previously been unobstructed.

Mr Gibson further advised that now plot 8 was structurally completed, the garage roof height had been increased by some 2 metres resulting in a massive black slab of roof tile, and an opening Velux window had been installed in the roof providing direct vision into the front windows resulting in a loss of privacy to his property

Mr Gibson concluded that neither of the variations that had taken place had been given approval and had been completed without any consent or consideration to neighbouring properties therefore; Mr Gibson requested that Members reviewed his objection as the proposal was not sensitive to the fact that the village was a designated conservation area.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 15/00686/VOC be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**18. 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 Read of 363 Fareham Road, Gosport**

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 Ayles was invited to address the board.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Mr Ayles advised Members that the proposed application had been submitted due to the need to accommodate family. He advised that no objections had been raised to the proposals from any consultee.

Mr Ayles advised that the layout of the site was large enough to accommodate the proposed bungalow and the existing property which would be similar to the volume and proportion. He further advised that he felt that there was adequate separation distances between the properties and that a driveway ran from the entrance between the bungalow and the south boundary into the site for approximately 30 meters.

Mr Ayles advised that he believed the application would not have a detrimental impact on the surrounding area or cause harm to the highway's safety and would be in keeping with the residential pattern of the area. Mr Ayles indicated that a building of similar size could be erected under permitted development rights and that the reason for refusal was subjective and unsupported.

Following Members discussions it was proposed, seconded and subsequently agreed that the application be deferred for a site visit to determine the accessibility of the existing property and the impact the proposal would have on the surrounding area.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00015/FULL be deferred for a site visit.

19. **16/00163/FULL – CONVERSION OF EXISTING DWELLING INTO 3 NO. TWO BEDROOM FLATS, ERECTION OF SIDE EXTENSION INCLUDING EXTERNAL STAIRS, THREE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO FRONT ELEVATION, INCLUDING THE PROVISION OF A SECOND FLOOR BALCONY, WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING, BICYCLE AND REFUSE STORAGE (AMENDMENT TO 15/00051/VOC) (as amended by plan received 6.5.16)  
16 Marine Parade West Lee-on-the-Solent**

**Councillor Beavis declared a personal interest in respect of this item.**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00163/FULL.

Mr Feast was invited to address the Board.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Mr Feast advised Members that he was the owner and occupier of number 27 Promenade Court and had been elected as the spokesperson for Promenade Court to object to the proposal.

Mr Feast advised Members that number 16 Marine Parade West was a detached Victorian house and gave the seafront a special character, he added that the spaces between the houses and apartment blocks were important to retain as they prevented properties merging into a continuous mass of buildings and gave appropriate separation distances.

Mr Feast informed Members that Promenade Court and 16 Marine Parade West were linked by a single storey structure that acted as a covered walkway from the front to the rear of number 16 concluding that if this application was approved, it would be the first to link 2 buildings above ground floor level.

Following a question from a Member regarding the linking of the buildings and the Party Wall Act, the Planning Officer advised that matters relating to the Party Wall Act were not planning issues that could be considered when determining the application and that the Marine Parade Area of Special Character SPD had been considered and the proposals were considered to be in accordance with this guidance.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00163/FULL be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

20. **16/00222/FULL – ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO EXISTING SUMMER HOUSE FOR USE AS 2 NO. OFFICES  
Northcott Summer House, God's Port Housing Society Ltd, Northcott Close**

**Councillors Allen, Mrs Batty, Beavis, Carter, Hook, Jessop, Scard declared a personal interest in respect of this item.**

**Councillors Farr and Mrs Cully declared a personal interest in respect of this item; they left the meeting room and took no part in the discussion or vote thereon.**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00222/FULL.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00222/FULL be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**21. 16/00204/FULL – ERECTION OF PART SINGLE STOREY AND PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION (as amended by plan received 08.06.16)  
48 Foster Road, Gosport**

**Councillors Allen, Mrs Batty, Beavis, Carter, Hook, Jessop and Scard declared a personal interest in respect of this item.**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00204/FULL.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00204/FULL be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**22. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business

The meeting concluded at 20:50

CHAIRMAN