

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

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

**23. APOLOGIES**

An apology was received from Councillor Mrs Batty.

**24. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- Councillors Allen, Beavis, Carter, Jessop, Councillor Raffaelli and Scard advised that in respect of Item 7 of the agenda they had each written a letter of objection to Fareham Borough Council.
- Councillor Carter declared a personal interest in respect of Item 4 of the grey pages as his property was shown on the map.
- Councillor Beavis declared a personal interest in respect of item 2 and 3 of the grey pages of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive as he was a Member of the Sailing Club.

**26. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the Regulatory Board meeting held on 27 June 2016, be approved and signed by the Chairman as a true and correct record subject to the following two changes:

Councillor Raffaelli be added to the list of attendees.

In the final paragraph of the discussion prior to the Resolution for application 16/00059/FULL the word 'serious' be changed to 'some'.

**25. DEPUTATIONS**

Deputations had been received on the following items:

- Item 1 of the grey pages 16/00015/FULL – Land rear of 363 Fareham Road, Gosport
- Item 2 of the grey pages 16/00189/FULL – 46 Marine Parade East, Lee-on-the-Solent
- Item 3 of the grey pages 16/00156/DETS – 47 Marine Parade East, Lee-on-the-Solent
- Item 4 of the grey pages 16/00246/FULL – Drake Road, Lee-on-the-Solent
- Item 6 of the grey pages 16/00223/FULL – 92 The Avenue, Gosport
- Item 7 of the grey pages 16/00226/ADVT – Beechcroft Manor, 1 Beechcroft Road, Gosport

**26. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

There were no public questions.

## **27. LAND AT THE FORMER HMS DAEDALUS**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive to advise the Board of a request from the Homes and Community Agency to vary the Section 106 Agreement dated 28 January 2016 (the 'Agreement') relating to the redevelopment of land at the Former HMS Daedalus.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Members welcomed the additional investment to the waterfront area and the proposal to support Starter Homes for local people.

**RESOLVED:** that the Board agree to vary:-

1. The planning obligations relating to the provision of Affordable Housing contained in the Agreement as set out in paragraphs 2.4 and 2.6 of the report; and
2. The definition of the Value of the Manor Way Open Land contained in the Agreement as set out in paragraph 2.7 of the report.

## **28. FAREHAM BOROUGH CONSULTATION D.11/004/16 ELECTRICAL INTERCONNECTOR WITH AN APPROXIMATE CAPACITY OF 1000 MEGAWATTS EXTENDING FROM TOURBE, NORMANDY TO CHILLING, HAMPSHIRE FORMER HMS DAEDALUS, STUBBINGTON, HAMPSHIRE**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive which advised the Board that a planning application had been received by Fareham Borough Council from National Grid IFA 2 Limited (National Grid) for the installation of an electrical interconnector with an approximate capacity of 100 megawatts (MW) extending from Tourbe, Normandy (France) to Chilling, Hampshire.

The Planning Officer referred Members to paragraph 2.8 of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive where it was clarified that the approved building height measurements were to the eaves of the buildings.

Members raised concerns about locating the cabling equipment at Daedalus and the impact that this would have on the local amenities and aircraft operations. It was further felt that alternative and possibly more suitable sites, such as Chilling, had not been investigated.

A Member queried whether it would be more appropriate for the Secretary of State to determine the application rather than a local planning authority. In response, the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive advised that the Secretary of State has the power to determine any planning application he or she chooses and the local planning authority only has to refer to the Secretary of State those applications which are departure applications as set out in the relevant Regulations, otherwise local planning authorities retain the power to determine their own applications.

**RESOLVED:** That Gosport Borough Council:

Raise objection on the following grounds:

- a) Harmful impact on the Strategic Gap; and

Raise concern on the following grounds:

- a) Noise

- b) Failure to deliver employment opportunities.
- c) Impact on specialist employers for whom the site is allocated.
- d) The impact on the quality and attractiveness of the proposed open space and the planned Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG)
- e) Suitable alternative sites have not been fully evaluated.

## PART II

### 29. 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:

- 30. 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 Rear of 363 Fareham Road Gosport Hampshire PO13 0AD**
- Councillor Wright advised that although the estate where he lives is mentioned in the report after taking advice he was not declaring an interest as the application did not affect his property.**

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 Trevor Ayles was invited to address the Board.

The Board was advised by the Head of Development Management that Members had attended a site visit at 2pm earlier that day at the property whereby Members had the opportunity to gain access to the site and also view the property from Wych Lane and at the junction of Wych Lane and Fareham Road to look at access proposals.

Mr Ayles thanked Members who had attended the site visit. Mr Ayles reiterated to Members the positive points of the proposal and felt that the design and mass was acceptable and would not have a harmful impact on the existing dwelling or surrounding area.

Mr Ayles added that access via the side of the existing building would not generate any noise disturbances and that the amenity space was of an sufficient size to accommodate the proposal.

Mr Ayles advised Members that the capacity of the highway could accommodate both the existing dwelling and the proposal and that no increase of traffic would be generated. He further added that Hampshire County Council had raised no objection to the proposals and had highlighted the improvements to the access as a consequence of this proposal.

Mr Ayles advised that the proposal would not be out of keeping with the residential area due to there being substantial outbuildings in the rear of other dwellings in Fareham Road, further adding that the commercial development across the road from the site had a far greater impact than the proposal being considered.

Following discussion Members felt that the number of vehicles coming out of the property would not be increased and that the site was large enough to accommodate the proposed building.

Members recognised that this site was a unique on Fareham Road in that it was the only one to have sufficient width to allow access for this type of development, and a sufficiently long garden to accommodate an additional dwelling in this way. It was further felt that the outbuildings already in place along Fareham Road were consistent with the proposal.

It was proposed and seconded that the proposal be approved and that delegated authority be given to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive to impose appropriate conditions.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00015/FULL be approved and that authority be delegated to the Head of Development Management, in consultation with the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive to impose appropriate planning conditions.

31. **16/00189/FULL - DEMOLITION OF SAILING CLUB (AND ASSOCIATED FLAT) AND ERECTION OF DETACHED BUILDING TO FORM SAILING CLUB AND 9 NO. TWO BEDROOM FLATS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, CAR PARKING, CYCLE AND REFUSE STORES (as amplified by additional ecological information received 2.6.16 and additional information received 7.7.16)  
46 Marine Parade East Lee-On-The-Solent Hampshire PO13 9BW**

**Councillor Beavis 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 16/00189/FULL.

Mr Temperton was invited to address the Board.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Mr Temperton advised Members that residents had concerns regarding the information relating to the access of the site and the associated responsibilities of Hampshire County Council's Highway Department and Gosport Borough Council's Planning Department.

Mr Temperton went on to say that the original case officer had advised that the decision to allow access to the site from the rear access way was a Hampshire Highways Department decision and not a matter that Gosport Borough Council could rule on. However, Mr Temperton added that a Senior Transport Planner at the Hampshire Highways Department had advised that they were purely a consultee and that any decision rested with the Local Planning Authority. Mr Temperton further advised that Hampshire County Council had based their response to this application on their response to the original application; they have "no objection".

Mr Temperton felt that it should therefore be requested that the application was deferred until such time as Gosport Borough Council and Hampshire County Council Highways Department produced a more considered response than "no objection."

Mr Temperton advised Members that the residential population of the proposed development would generate noise, light pollution (from both internal and external lighting) and an increase in traffic movements in the immediate area, specifically in the rear access way.

Mr Temperton advised Members that there was not anything in the proposal that suggested a positive environmental dimension and that addressed the effect that the development might have on the amenities of the neighbouring properties such as the overlooking and loss of privacy; incompatible location, design or mass.

Mr Temperton advised Members that the design was inappropriate in terms of both scale and massing and was therefore inconsistent with Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Council Local Plan.

Mr Temperton advised Members that it could be seen from the elevation plans submitted that the mass of the proposal was considered greater than that of both the existing building and the extant proposal. He further felt that the proposal sought to add more than the equivalent of a floor to the mass of the existing building and added that the present club house had a roof line roughly level with the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of Seaview Court.

Mr Temperton advised Members that there was nothing in the application that in any way protected the amenities of the residential properties in Cambridge Road and the proposals were therefore contrary to Policy LP14 of the Gosport Borough Council Local Plan.

Mr Temperton advised Members that the proposal did not meet the criteria of LP24 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan because the proposal was based on the presumption that the height and ridge line was taken from the highest point of Seaview Court, the only structure on that stretch of Marine Parade East to be of such a height.

Mr Temperton also noted that the 8 residential properties and the Old Ship Inn, extending to the south-east of the Sailing Club, were generally of a similar height to the current club house, with one being a bungalow.

Mr Temperton advised Members that the proposed parking provision for the site for 26 vehicles reflected a significant increase in the current usage of the rear access way.

In conclusion, Mr Temperton advised Members that the plan for the rear elevation showed 18 separate windows on the first and second floor levels and a very large glazed section on the second floor committee room of the Sailing Club providing panoramic views of Cambridge Road and beyond. The combined effect of these glazed areas would be to provide a level of overlooking and loss of privacy not seen on any other block of flats on Marine Parade East or West.

Following a Member's question as to whether the correct process was followed to advertise and notify residents affected by the proposals, the Head of Development Management advised the Board that a press notice would have been published and site notices erected. It was also confirmed that residents within 5 metres of the development site should have received a letter advising that an application had been received.

Mr Warburton was invited to address the Board. He advised Members that he was the Commodore of the Sailing Club and speaking in support of the proposal.

Mr Warburton provided Members with background details of the Sailing Club and advised that the proposal incorporated changes and adaptations needed to meet current demands and promote health for the whole community.

Mr Warburton advised Members that the Sailing Club was a thriving volunteer-run club and supported community events such as the Gosport Marine Festival; providing local people with access to sailing facilities.

Mr Warburton advised that presently the club house was an iconic building on the seafront but was in a state of disrepair and of little visual benefit. He felt that the new design would be more neighbourly and energy efficient and would make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

Mr Warburton further clarified that 4 windows proposed on the south-eastern side elevation of the new building would be obscure glazed to protect privacy.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00189/FULL be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

- 32. 16/00156/DETS – DETAILS PURSUANT TO APPLICATION 15/00316/OUT – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND ERECTION OF BUILDING TO FORM 5 NO. FLATS WITH CAR PARKING, REFUSE AND CYCLE STORAGE (DETAILS OF ACCESS, LAYOUT, SCALE, APPEARANCE AND LANDSCAPING) (as amended by plans received 15.05.2016)  
47 Marine Parade East Lee-on-the-Solent Hampshire PO12 9BW**

**Councillor Beavis 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 and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00156/DETS.

Mr Temperton was invited to address the Board.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Mr Temperton advised the Board that he was speaking on behalf of a group of neighbouring properties to the application site that had raised concerns that neither the outline application nor the full application had been correctly processed and that nobody was formally aware of the submission of either application.

Mr Temperton advised Members that should the development go ahead it was clear that there would be an effect on the local environment. The increased residential population of the proposed development would generate noise, light pollution (from both internal and external lighting) and an increase in traffic movements in the immediate area, specifically in the rear access way. Mr Temperton added that there was not anything in the proposal that suggested a positive environmental dimension.

Mr Temperton reminded Members of Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan that is permissive of development within the defined urban areas subject to the development being of appropriate design, scale and massing for its setting. Mr Temperton advised that in relation to its setting, the design was inappropriate in terms of both scale and massing.

Mr Temperton further advised Members that it could be seen from the plans submitted that the mass of the proposal was greater than that of the existing building and that the proposal sought to add another floor to the mass of the existing building.

Mr Temperton added that a particular concern was the inclusion of a lift tower on the north-west side of the proposed development and that the planning document provided had only seemed to consider the impact of the structure in relation to it being viewed from the front of the proposed building. Mr Temperton also noted that the lift tower had a flat roof, whereas the Marine Parade Area of Special Character SPD "encourages roof forms that are hipped, pitched or gabled". Mr Temperton concluded that the proposals did not follow the SPD.

Mr Temperton advised Members of Policy LP14 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan which – sets out special criteria for development proposals on Marine Parade including the protection of amenities of neighbouring residential properties. Mr Temperton advised that there was nothing in the application that protected the amenities of the residential properties in Cambridge Road.

Mr Temperton advised Members that the proposal did not meet the criteria of LP24 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan. The height of the proposed development was based on an arc drawn from the top of the south-east corner of Seaview Court over the roof of the proposed Sailing Club development to the roof of 48 Marine Parade East.

Mr Temperton advised Members that it should be noted that the 6 residential properties extending to the south-east of the application site were generally of a similar height to the present house at No.47. Mr Temperton felt that in terms of visual consistency the deciding factor on height should be based on the majority of properties along the stretch of Marine Parade East not Seaview Court or the proposed Sailing Club development. Mr Temperton further advised that it should also be noted that No.47 was comparable in height to the present Sailing Club and No.46.

Mr Temperton advised Members that the planning document stated that the distance between the proposed development and the Cambridge Road properties is sufficient and complies" with the Design SPD, noting that these distances are general guidance not regulations and should be considered in the context of the setting to which they relate.

Mr Temperton advised that the garage at the rear of the application site was not referred to in the planning application. This omission meant that a separate application would be required to approve its demolition. Mr Temperton added that the garage, over 5 metres in height, was what provided significant privacy between No.47 and the Cambridge Road properties. It had been suggested that plantings would quickly attain a similar height to the garage and mitigate the issue of overlooking and add an environmental dimension to the proposal.

Mr Temperton advised Members that no consideration had been given to the strength of the surface of the rear access way adding that, should the application be approved, this brings into question the ability of the surface of the rear access way to withstand use by construction traffic and the long term significant increase in traffic.

Mr Temperton advised Members that the proposed parking provision for the site was for 8 vehicles, a significant increase in relation to the current level of use.

In conclusion Mr Temperton advised Members that there were numerous important issues relating to the application that required more thought to ensure that the application was correctly processed and considered.

Mr Tony Allies was invited to address the Board whereby he thanked Members for the opportunity to speak on the application. Mr Allies explained that he was the architect speaking in support of the proposal and on behalf of the Applicant.

Mr Allies advised Members that the Planning Officer's report was comprehensive and that the applicant had worked with Planning Officers to comply with all applicable planning policies and frameworks to ensure that the proposed design was responsive to the local environment.

Mr Allies advised Members that the proposal was to replace a large detached house which had some damp issues, was difficult to heat and no longer met the requirements of the occupants who love the locality and plan to live in the replacement building should it receive planning consent.

Mr Allies advised Members that the proposal was of a similar scale to the existing property on the site and would therefore have a similar impact on neighbouring properties.

Mr Allies advised Members that the previously approved plans for the adjacent sailing club were larger in scale than the existing building on this site and justified a modest increase in size adjacent to the boundary.

Mr Allies advised Members that the issues that had been raised in respect of the application were the same as those that had been raised at the outline stage and concluded that these were responded to in detail at the time of the outline application and the outline application had been subsequently approved with appropriate conditions.

Mr Allies advised Members that the Planning Officer's report confirmed that the distances between windows were considered acceptable and that all practical arrangements were acceptable with no objections having been raised by Council Departments, Hampshire Highways or any other statutory consultees.

Mr Allies felt that there was no planning policy basis to refuse this application, which had been carefully designed to respect the local environment and to comply with all reasonable requirements for a proposal in the location.

In conclusion, Mr Allies requested that Members approve the application on the basis of the current planning policy framework which would apply to any application for the site, the outline consent already approved which had been supported by full and essentially identical details to this proposal and the Planning Officer's detailed and considered recommendation.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00156/DETS be approved subject to the conditions in the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**33. 16/00246/FULL - ERECTION OF 2NO. MODULAR BUILDINGS (TO PROVIDE 3NO. SHOW HOMES) AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AND PARKING (as amended by plans received 21.06.2016)  
Drake Road Lee-On-The-Solent Hampshire**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00246/FULL.

Mr Stephenson was invited to address the Board. He advised Members that he was speaking on behalf of several residents in Drake Road who have been resigned to the fact that further residential development was certain. However, he felt that the proposal should take into account the interests of other Drake Road residents that had been in residence for more than 62 years.

Mr Stephenson advised the Board that concerns had been raised with regards to vehicle parking. He advised that Drake Road was a narrow cul-de-sac and was the only refuge off Marine Parade West for some distance in both directions and was effectively an overspill car park for Marine Parade West residents. Mr Stephen concluded that current parking provisions were inadequate and that further congestion would be experienced from people viewing the show homes.

Mr Stephenson advised Members that the majority of dwellings fronting Marine Parade West to the west of Richmond Road were either rendered or all plain brick and added that concerns had been raised by residents that the proposal would look out of keeping with the surrounding area.

Mr Stephenson advised Members that dwellings in Drake Road were all of some age; Wharfedale, for example was almost 100 years old and had never been overlooked at the front nor the back. Mr Stephenson believed that this proposal would cause a loss of privacy with views directly into the private front garden of Wharfedale.

Mr Stephenson advised Members that residents felt that any new homes being built in Drake Road should be orientated, such that back gardens, with no access, were presented to Drake Road, with frontage facing west or into the development area. Mr Stephenson felt that there was ample space available to site show homes away from Drake Road, which would avoid congestion and loss of privacy for existing residents.

Mr Stephenson concluded that residents were concerned by the lack of plan for the derelict site between Drake Road and the Ross House boundary.

Mr Jonathan Moore was invited to address the Board. He advised Members that he was the Architect speaking on behalf of the Applicant, Offsite Homes Limited, who are a locally-based company that developed prototypes for a new model of housing utilising modular technologies.

Mr Moore advised Members that the new homes were intended to be built to maximise quality of construction, minimising waste, impact on the environment and lengthy build times and to deliver cost effective housing.

Mr Moore further advised Members that the proposed show homes would showcase the modular housing system developed by a local company.

Mr Moore advised Members that concerns regarding parking provisions were being addressed and that visitors to the show home would be limited to business customers and by appointment only. It would not be open to members of the public.

Following a question from a Member Mr Moore advised that Offsite Homes had looked at other areas in Daedalus to accommodate the proposal but had concluded that the site proposed was a strong preference because it was within a residential area and would set the buildings into context.

Following a question, Mr Moore advised Members that the modular show homes on the site were temporary and could be moved. It was also indicated that the proposed units were 'proto-types' and likely to be replaced by new models in the future.

Members were further advised by the Planning Officer that if the buildings were to become permanent dwellings for occupancy, a further planning permission would need to be sought.

Following discussions Members felt that the proposal would create employment opportunities and generate interest in the Daedalus site.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00246/FULL be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**34. 16/00186/FULL – CHANGE OF USE OF PREMISES FROM FINANCIAL AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES (CLASS A2) TO CLINIC (CLASS D1)  
5-6 The Precinct South Street Gosport Hampshire PO12 1HA**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00186/FULL.

Members were advised that an additional letter of representation from a local business had been received. This letter was read out by the Planning Officer as follows:

"Firstly I would like to touch on the comment from the applicant in their additional information document that 'it is not known where the assumption that hazardous substances will be brought on site has arisen from. Within the application form it was not stated'. Section 7 states clearly that 'Hazardous waste to be stored internally and disposed of via private contractors'. If this is an oversight on their part then you would hope that their attention to details like this does not extend to the rest of their Application form, if this was a deliberate omission and an attempt to discredit those raising concerns then I would like to suggest that they are not an organisation that the Council might like to support.

This directly leads to one of my concerns that has effectively been ignored and that is a simple question of how do these 'hazardous materials' get on-site. It's easy to dispose of them afterwards securely but the only possible way for them to get onsite is for clients to bringing them with them through an open precinct where children do play and families pass through regularly. As to the type of potential hazardous waste then I will also refer the applicant to their application where it clearly states that they will operate a needle exchange.

The danger of any hazardous materials is that they can be dropped by clients either passing through, or congregating in, the shopping precinct prior or after therapy.

I can only imagine what the outcry would be if a needle happened to be dropped and picked up by a child. This type of impact on the public needs to be considered properly and not swept under the carpet as I feel the applicant's response, and the note to councillors for this meeting, has attempted to do.

Surely this is a public health risk. This is a designated shopping precinct and the proposed clinic must be considered incompatible with the Precinct location, even though it might conform to the Gosport Borough Local plan 2029. There are other more appropriate areas with less public access within scope of the Local plan 2029. To justify the location as appropriate, just because of the plan, does not take into account local knowledge and the variations in suitability of certain locations covered by that plan.

I also note with interest that in the guidance for the public on raising a concern there were strict guidelines on what can, and can't be considered as a valid grounds for comment. Whilst not allowed as a valid concern I do notice that in the application form it talks about bringing a new business into a vacant unit in the Precinct thereby improving its utilisation. It all sounds very positive but the alternative view was not an area that would have been recognised as a formal concern. However, now that it has been raised by the Applicant, I would suggest that the impact

will be that other vacant units are now less likely to be filled and that those units that are filled are more likely to find locations more suitable to their businesses. As a co-owner of one of the recent businesses in the Precinct I can state that it is very unlikely that we would have taken the unit had the proposed clinic been present. The impact on the Public through the variety of shops and shopping experience available to them, will in the mid to long term be detrimental. By accepting this application the Council will be making it far less attractive for businesses to operate out of the Precinct and in future there could well be more vacant units than now.

In summary I don't believe all the considerations have been addressed by the applicant and the Council in taking this decision to base a rehabilitation clinic in a local shopping precinct. Not being a planning officer or in any way aware of the procedures/processes of the Council, I am deeply concerned that this has not been more openly discussed within the Council and that no wider debate has been held by all Councillors on the issues of public health and the longer term future of one of Gosport's shopping areas."

The response from the Applicant was read out as follows:

"The hazardous waste confusion was the result of the planning application team, and nothing to do with SSSFT NHS. It was believed this comment was referring to drugs (i.e. methodone) being dispensed, which is not the case for the service.

All pharmacies in the local area are required to do needle exchange, and it is not planned that SSSFT's service would replace these. The service provided is simply an obligatory emergency exchange service and not something that is anticipated to become a regular service.

The service offers vaccinations against blood borne diseases and as such is required to safely dispose of this type of hazardous waste.

SSSFT currently have a local service in Fareham and are expecting to open another in Rowner. Therefore the people that will utilise this service are from Gosport and are already localised in the area.

There will be a dedicated smoking area away from the central precinct area.

As stated in the management plan, should anything be considered anti-social it will be dealt with by the staff.

The police station neighbouring the precinct is considered to be a powerful deterrent of any negative behaviour.

The service is in place to improve public health and improve the lives of a vulnerable section of the local population.

It is understood that MIND (already in the precinct) offer a weekly alcohol and drug public group on a weekly basis."

Following a Member's question regarding the location of the smoking area, the Planning Officer advised that the Applicant would manage the site and that staff and customers at the facility would not be provided with a smoking shelter to allow them to smoke outside the facility.

Following discussions Members recognised that this proposal would provide a facility in the community and that this facility was ideally placed for accessibility to public transport routes and parking.

**RESOLVED** That planning application 16/00186/FULL be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**35. 16/00223/FULL – ERECTION OF TWO STOREY FRONT/SIDE EXTENSION  
92 The Avenue Gosport Hampshire PO12 2JU**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00223/FULL.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Mr Forshaw was invited to address the Board and advised Members that whilst he understood the Applicants wished to extend their home, he objected to the effects that the proposal would have on his residential amenity due to overshadowing and overlooking.

Mr Forshaw advised Members that two of his lounge windows and two bedroom windows faced south, with a separation of 20ft to the north wall of No.92. Mr Forshaw added that, should the proposal be allowed, the visual impact of the extension would be oppressive and overbearing and that they would suffer an unacceptable loss of light and outlook from the lounge windows.

Mr Forshaw advised Members that the views of St Mary's Church and Alverstoke Village that used to be enjoyed had largely disappeared over time due to the trees in the garden of no.92 growing taller and wider. However, Mr Forshaw advised that the sunlight still flooded through the south facing windows throughout the day. In conclusion Mr Forshaw stated that if the proposal was approved, his residence would suffer a huge loss of natural light making his lounge become colder and darker.

Mr Forshaw also expressed concerns with the potential risk of structural damage to his property as the footings under his house were very shallow and major construction work being carried out so close could cause damage.

In conclusion, Mr Forshaw advised Members that The Avenue was characterised by large detached houses, set in spacious gardens with wide gaps between properties. Mr Forshaw felt that the proposed extension would reduce the gap between the two properties to 9ft which was not in keeping with the area.

The Applicant Mr Collins was invited to address the Board.

Mr Collins advised Members that he believed the reason for their application was irrelevant, however it was being sought to provide accommodation for his son and, to a limited extent his children, for the foreseeable future.

Mr Collins advised that currently they had a total of 4 fully opening windows facing the south wall of No 90 The Avenue, these being the ground floor garage, plus the bathroom, lavatory and landing on the first floor. Until all the windows were replaced, the landing window was clear glass and looked directly into the south-facing window of one of the bedrooms at No. 90. Mr Collins further advised that the proposal would reduce these to a side door into the garage and a single, non-opening and obscured glass window on the first floor, thereby improving the privacy of No. 90 The Avenue..

Mr Collins felt that there were a number of contradictions in the concerns raised regard to outlook and visual impact since, on the one hand No. 90 The Avenue mentioned the impact of trees at No 92 blocking views of the church, whilst ignoring the fact that such a view has largely disappeared over many years due to the growth of trees and buildings far beyond the boundary. Mr Collins also noted that the residents at No 90 say that "during the circa 25 years we have lived at No 90 my wife and I have enjoyed a pleasant outlook on the south side", but then concluding that this outlook had always been dominated by sheds and the caravan in the carport at No 92, which had abutted the boundary since 1986.

Mr Collins further advised that, in addition, two very large bay trees, which were particularly high and still shown on the “Google Earth” website, were also on the shared boundary adjacent to No. 90 The Avenue’s south-facing windows until early 2015 when he had cut them down. Mr Collins added that there was also a large “Bird Cherry” tree close to the shared boundary which he had also cut down. Mr Collins stated that these trees had always dominated any view from No. 90 The Avenue’s small, south facing windows and added that there had been trees along the shared boundary since before they had bought their house in 1986.

Mr Collins advised Members that No. 90 had also raised concerns about a “two storey solid brick wall circa 9 feet from the house”, with further concerns that the extension would project several feet forward from the present building line. Mr Collins advised that the proposed extension would be, at its closest, 3.08 metres or a little over 10 feet from the boundary wall, and would project forward by just 1.2 metres or a little less than 4 feet, meaning that the proposed new wall would be just 0.8 metres or just over 2 and a half feet closer to No.90 The Avenue than the footprint of the existing car port, and certainly beyond the 3 metre limit required by the Party Wall Act for the foundations required.

Mr Collins concluded that the footprint of the proposed extension was therefore not much greater than the existing car port; therefore, any loss of light to No 90 would be minimal. The main windows serving No. 90 The Avenue’s ground floor room face east and west, and the extension would have no impact on these, therefore, Mr Collins believed that the statements regarding “a huge loss of natural light” and “our lounge would become colder and darker” are fanciful. Meanwhile, no 90’s bedrooms are similarly served with large windows on the east and west sides, so the same argument applies.

Mr Collins advised that the concern of structural damage to a neighbouring property was completely unfounded, given that the separation between the walls would exceed 10 feet. Furthermore Mr Collins added that the excavation of the deep and much closer footings required for the recently built orangery at No.90 clearly had had no impact on No.90 The Avenue’s foundations, and neither had the second floor extension which No 90 had built on the north-west corner of their house some years ago.

Mr Collins advised that anyone familiar with the area would recognise that the proposed extension was entirely in keeping with the area, being not dissimilar to a number of others along The Avenue. The proposal was developed by a qualified architect familiar with the area, but not before notifying Mr. Forshaw of their intentions.

In conclusion, Mr Collins asked Members to consider the similarities with the recently completed extension at No. 66 The Avenue, approved by the planning board on 2 June 2015 under Planning Application 15/00081/FULL. Mr Collins advised Members that this project had been much more ambitious than the one proposed, and had resulted in the extensive development of both north and south aspects, with the northerly aspect being very similar to his proposal.

A Member asked for clarification on how the impact of the proposal and the consideration of loss of light to neighbouring properties was assessed. The Planning Officer advised that the height, proximity and orientation of the existing building and the proposed development were taken into account when considering the impact of the application.

Following Members’ discussions, it was proposed and subsequently agreed that the application be deferred for a site visit.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00223/FULL be deferred for a site visit.

**36. 16/00226/ADVT – RETENTION AND CONTINUED DISPLAY OF 2 NO. NON ILLUMINATED SIGNS  
Beechcroft Manor 1 Beechcroft Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 2EP**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00226/ADVT.

Mr Lazenbury was invited to address the Board.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Mr Lazenbury advised Members that he lived and worked in Gosport, employing some 15 staff, and had lived at 32 Anglesey Road for a number of years.

Mr Lazenbury advised Members that the two signs at Beechcroft Manor were out of keeping with the residential area Mr Lazenbury referred Members to photographs that he had circulated to the Board and advised that the two signs were differing heights and far too big and high.

In conclusion Mr Lazenbury advised that the signs and the height of the wall above which they stand, and due to their new positioning, could cause a distraction to drivers turning into and out of Beechcroft Road. Therefore, Mr Lazenbury asked Members to refuse the retrospective planning application.

**RESOLVED:** That the application for advertisement consent 16/00226/ADVT be approved.

- 37.                   16/00215/FULL – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING OFFICES AND TEMPORARY WAREHOUSE AND ERECTION OF EXTENSIONS TO NORTH AND EAST ELECVATIONS TO FORM PRODUCTION AREA, WAREHOUSE AND OFFICES, PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL CAR PARKING AREA, RECONFIGURATION OF INTERNAL LAYOUT, RELOCATION OF EXISTING CYCLE AND PALLET STORE, PROVISION OF SMOKING SHELTER AND REPLACEMENT SPRINKLER TANK (as amplified by supporting documents received 04.07.16 and 12.07.16 and 18.07.16)  
Huhtamaki (UK) Ltd Rowner Road Gosport Hampshire PO13 0PR**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00215/FULL.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Following discussions Members felt that this application proposed an increase to the number of employment opportunities within Gosport and as a consequence they welcomed the application.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00215/FULL, be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**38.                   ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business

The meeting concluded at    20:10

CHAIRMAN