

**A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD  
WAS HELD ON 19 OCTOBER 2016 AT 6PM  
*Subject to approval***

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

**It was reported that in accordance with Standing Order 2.3.5, Councillor Hook had been nominated to replace Councillor Jessop for this meeting.**

**It was reported that Councillor Bergin had permanently replaced Councillor Scard as a Member of the Regulatory Board.**

In the absence of the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Allen chaired the meeting.

**52. APOLOGIES**

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

**53. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- Cllr Raffaelli declared a personal interest in respect of Items 1 & 2 of the grey pages of the report of the Borough Solicitor and deputy Chief Executive as he was the Ward Councillor and had spoken to the residents regarding the proposal.
- Councillor Beavis declared a personal interest in respect of Items 1 & 2 of the grey pages of the report of the Borough Solicitor and deputy Chief Executive as he had worked on marine projects with the applicant's sister
- Councillor Allen declared a personal interest in respect of Item 3 of the grey pages of the report of the Borough Solicitor and deputy Chief Executive as he had made a comment at the previous meeting in relation to the proposed development which had been reported in the press. He advised that he would leave the meeting room when this item was being considered and that Councillor Carter would chair the meeting for that item.
- Councillor Ronayne declared a personal interest in respect of Item 3 of the grey pages of the report of the Borough Solicitor and deputy Chief Executive as he had discussed the proposals with residents.

**54. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the Regulatory Board meeting held on 20 September 2016 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a true and correct record.

**55. DEPUTATIONS**

Deputations had been received on the following items:

- Item 1 of the grey pages 16/00401/FULL – Fighting Cocks, 78 Clayhall Road
- Item 3 of the grey pages 16/00382/FULL – 3-4 Camden Street, Gosport
- Item 4 of the grey pages 16/00353/FULL – 30 Marine Parade East, Lee-On-The-Solent
- Item 5 of the grey pages 16/00350/FULL – 151 Privett Road, Gosport
- Item 7 of the grey pages 16/00040/FULL – 7A Stoke Road, Gosport

**56. PUBLIC QUESTION**

The following public question had been received:

“In a situation that can be seen by the general public where a planning application is made and the public comment section shows response to an application that it is full of lies why can the application not be brought back in for review as it doesn't give the correct Information to the professional bodies that make the comments to determine the outcome of the application?”

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

**PART II**

**57. 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:

**58. 16/00401/FULL – RETENTION OF PLAY EQUIPMENT AND THE ERECTION OF ADDITIONAL FENCING (as amplified by Design and Access Statement received 26.09.16 and photographs received 03.10.16) Fighting Cocks 78 Clayhall Road Gosport**

**Councillors Beavis and Raffaelli declared a personal interest in this item. They remained in the meeting room and took part in 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 16/00401/Full.

Mrs Alexander was invited to address the Board.

Members were advised by the Deputy Head of Planning Services that since the publication of the report, two further representations had been submitted by existing objectors. He advised that as discussed in paragraph 1 of the principal issues within the Planning Officer's report, the behaviour of the Fighting Cocks' patrons, including adults using the play equipment, is not controlled by planning legislation. Therefore no new material planning considerations had been raised and there was no change to the recommendation as set out in the report.

Mrs Alexander advised Members that she had lived in St Francis Road for 25 years and ran a business from her property. She advised that her office was in the upper back room of her house overlooking the pub gardens.

Mrs Alexander advised Members that since the new play equipment had been built, the increase in noise pollution had at times made working from her office impossible (even with the windows closed). She continued that there had been a number of days this summer where the noise was so loud that she and her husband were not able to work in the office at all.

Mrs Alexander advised the Board that most of her neighbours had lived next to the pub for the last 20 - 30 years and, until May 2016, there had been no major noise issues.

Mrs Alexander advised the Board that the play equipment had been constructed in May without Planning Permission. Since then, Mrs Alexander explained that residents have had to endure the vocal noise aroused by the equipment.

Mrs Alexander advised that the new structure was positioned much closer to neighbours than to the Public House and felt that it was in no way a 'one for one' replacement for the previous plastic slide which had only accommodated two or three small children.

Mrs Alexander advised that the new equipment was a large timber structure with two viewing platforms, three stairways, a walkway, a slide and a wooden ship frontage accommodating up to 20 children of varying ages and sizes. She added that adults had also been seen and heard by neighbours using the equipment.

Mrs Alexander advised that raising the boundary fence by 0.6 metres would make no difference to the noise pollution. She further advised that deeds clearly indicated that the southern boundary fence was the property of 8 Wilberforce Road and 19 St Francis Road and that increasing the height would require consultation or the owners' permission.

Mrs Alexander advised Members that given that children were admitted to the garden until 9pm, and often beyond that time, she didn't feel that the use of the play equipment would be controlled or monitored after 6pm.

Mrs Alexander advised Members that due to the noise caused by the use of the play equipment, residents had suffered much distress simply trying to enjoy their homes and gardens and were unable to plan their lives or how they use their properties. Mrs Alexander felt that this was a severe loss of residential amenity.

In conclusion Mrs Alexander advised Members that conditions 1 and 3 did not pass the six NPPF tests and were therefore unenforceable and urged Members of the Board to refuse the application.

Mr McDermott was invited to address the Board and advised that he was speaking on behalf of his clients who owned the Public House. He advised that the Public House was very popular and exceeding the client's expectations.

Mr McDermott advised Members that the play structure replaced a former plastic tree that was on the site. He advised that his clients felt that the siting of the play equipment had not had an adverse impact on neighbouring properties or generated excessive noise.

Mr McDermott further advised that the structure would not cause any overlooking of surrounding residential properties and that his clients had looked into modifying the play structure to include screening but had been advised by the Local Planning Authority that this was not necessary.

Following a question from a Member regarding the possible relocation of the play equipment, Mr McDermott advised that the structure was fairly heavy and to move it would be a big operation.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00401/FULL be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**59. 16/00377/FULL – ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION (as amplified by letter received 01.09.16 Fighting Cocks 78 Clayhall Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 2AJ**

**Councillors Beavis and Raffaelli declared a personal interest in this item. They remained in the meeting room and took part in the voting thereon.**

Consideration was given to the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00377/FULL.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

A Member sought clarification on the Public House being a locally listed heritage asset. The Deputy Head Of Planning Services informed Members that the Public House was not a listed building and that the location of the proposal did not physically or visually impact on the historical building so would not harm the special interest of the building and the reason it was locally listed.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00377/FULL be approved subject to the conditions of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

60. **16/00382/FULL – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING LIGHT INDUSTRIAL UNIT (CLASS B2) AND ERECTION OF 5 NO. TWO BEDROOM HOUSES AND 1 NO. THREE BEDROOM HOUSE WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING, CYCLE AND BIN STORAGE**  
**Unit 3-4 Camden Street Gosport Hampshire PO12 3LU**

**Councillor Allen declared a personal interest in respect of this item and left the meeting room. He took no part in the discussion or voting thereon.**

**In the absence of the Chairman Councillor Allen, Councillor Carter chaired the meeting for this is item.**

**Councillor Ronayne declared a personal interest in respect of this item however he remained in the meeting room and took part in the discussion and voting thereon.**

Consideration was given to the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00382/FULL

Mr Baker was invited to address the Board.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Mr Baker advised the Board that should the application be approved his children's safety would be compromised due to there being no footpath between his property and the proposed development.

Mr Baker advised that his camper van that had been reported abandoned at a previous meeting had been parked outside his property for the past 12 years. He reported that no residents of Camden Terrace had any problems with the vehicle being there.

Mr Miles was invited to address the Board. He advised that he was once again making a statement regarding his community's reasons for asking Members of the Board to accept the professional Officer's recommendation for refusal of the application.

Mr Miles advised the Board that the Planning Officer's reasons for refusal were borne out of the adopted legal documents that were backed by government policy and reflected a government, that although keen to develop the land, wished to not overdevelop and detract from the amenity that all citizens deserved to enjoy.

Mr Miles advised the Board that the Government had adopted, as had Gosport Borough Council, the Human Rights Act 1998. Mr Miles referred Members to Article 6 – Right to fair trial, Article 8 – The right to respect for private and family life and Article 1 – The protection of property.

Mr Miles advised the Board that he believed this and the previous application showed no respect for residents' private and family life and no respect for the adopted documents that support Article 8 or Article 1 of the Human Rights Act 1998 and that the same contempt for the community, for the Planning Officers and for the Regulatory Board existed within the proposed application.

Mr Miles advised that within the application, there was insufficient parking for the community and only for the development itself. He added that there was no inclusion of a safe footpath access to the existing cottages as per planning policies yet residents were asked by the applicant to not only give up vehicular access and parking rights but more of their existing amenity by moving their gardens back to accommodate a safer passage which Policy LP23 expected of the design.

Mr Miles advised the Board that the footprint of the adjacent cottages was 0.6hectares returning a residential density of 100 dwellings per Hectare (DPH). He reported that he believed the proposed application should be designed to modern day policies, using the design principles of the Local Plan

and its supporting Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) yet, although the proposal returned a residential density of 85 DPH using the whole footprint including parking, the actual amenity that would be enjoyed was 0.036 hectares returning a figure of 166DPH which was 4.76 times the average 35 DPH. This Mr Miles believed was an overdevelopment of a massive scale and reiterated that the parking aspect of the proposed application ignored both the existing and the future needs of the community.

Mr Miles advised the Board that residents urged the Board to consider the facts rather than the tactics of the applicant and designer, who were well aware that they were not using the design principles currently in place and refuse the application with the same fervour as the previous one and with the same 'serious concerns' used in that determination.

Mr Miles advised the Board that residents understood that the factory had now been sold and that the new owner/developer would seek to replace it, to which he advised that this was something that in itself residents were not against, just a design that showed a continuous bullying of its neighbourhood, rather than a concept that would one day encourage further development prospects in the vicinity. The existing staff would now move to Lee-On-The-Solent as intended, whatever the outcome of today's meeting.

Mr Miles advised the Board that he accepted that he was not a professional designer, but was a professional engineer that had worked within the construction industry for 35 years and understood the tactics used to blind Members to the real and true issues of professionally managing the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 within the year 2016.

In conclusion, Mr Miles advised Members to not consider the perceived 'threat' that the factory could operate 24 hours under a B2 classification, as the Council had a duty of care under Section 79 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to protect the community from certain 'pollutions' that would and have been suggested could occur.

Mr Knight was invited to address the Board. He advised Members that he was the designer and agent for the application.

Mr Knight advised the Board that the parking facilities proposed for the site were deemed compliant and pointed out that at present workers from the factory parked on the street therefore he concluded that the parking situation would be eased as a result of the proposed scheme.

Mr Knight advised the Board that the proposal provided 18 secure cycle provision and therefore, compliant with the planning policies in place. He further added that there was adequate storage for refuse.

Mr Knight advised the Board that although residents had been critical of the design, the proposed houses would be of a modern construction with a low pitch standing seam roof, metal eave detail and mixture of grey brick, white render and timber cladding for the walls. He further advised that this style of build and materials had been chosen in order to create an aesthetically pleasing building, whilst keeping the height similar to the existing. Mr Knight felt that this would complement the surrounding area and the existing neighbouring properties.

Following a question from a Member, Mr Knight confirmed that the sale of the land was subject to planning permission being obtained.

Councillor Hylands was invited to address the Board and advised that he was speaking as the Ward Councillor. He advised Members that the application in front of them was similar to the previous application that had been refused. The proposal now was for one less dwelling however it still took up the same footprint and mass to what had been previously rejected.

Councillor Hylands urged Members when determining this application to consider it on its own merits and not compare the application with the Barley Mow site as the location was different and did have immediate on street parking. Furthermore Councillor Hylands advised that the Barlow Mow

application was situated on a bus route and that the Highways Authority had not objected to the application.

Councillor Hylands advised Members that the proposed application would constitute an overdevelopment of a built-up residential area. He further advised that there was an insufficient parking arrangement for the site and that it did not take into account neighbouring properties. In addition, Councillor Hylands stated that there were concerns from residents regarding the parking layout, width of footpath proposed and the quality of the design. Councillor Hylands concluded that this application was something that should not be supported.

Further to a question from a Member regarding parking requirements of a development situated close to public transport routes, the Head of Planning Services advised Members that the layout proposed had been considered and it had been determined that not all of the proposed spaces complied with the minimum dimensions of the Parking Supplementary Planning Design and that the space in the southern eastern corner would be difficult to access due to restricted manoeuvring space at the end of the It was further reported that presently there was a significant demand for parking in Camden Street and it had been considered that this application would potentially result in further congestion and overflow. Reference was also made to the other reasons for refusal, noting that parking was not the only relevant planning consideration.

A Member reported that this application would remove a non-conforming industrial unit and replace it with residential use and provide much needed affordable family homes in the Borough. They advised that the car parking requirements could be delivered by the applicant as they had the opportunity to deliver 9 spaces on site. They also advised that the applicant had provision to include cycle storage on the site and concluded that the design and layout was sufficient to accommodate the proposal.

It was proposed and seconded by a Member that the application be approved(not sure what this was?). A vote was taken and was subsequently lost.

Following discussions it was felt by Members that the area was too small a space to accommodate the proposed development and would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding area.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00382/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 be harmful to the character and visual appearance of the area and would result in an unsatisfactory and undesirable environment for prospective occupants, contrary to Policy LP10 of the 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.

**Councillor Hook left the meeting room at 19:10 and took no further part in the meeting.**

- 61. 16/00353/FULL – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND ERECTION OF 6 TWO BEDROOM APARTMENTS IN A DETACHED 4 STOREY BLOCK WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING, CYCLE AND REFUSE STORES (as amended by plans and additional information received 23.09.16)  
30 Marine Parade East Lee-on-the-Solent Hampshire PO13 9BW**

**Councillor Allen resumed the role of Chairman of the Board.**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00353/FULL.

Mr Birch was invited to address board.

Members were advised that an additional letter of representation from the Lee-on-the-Solent Residents Association had been received. The letter was read out by the Deputy Head of Planning Services as follows:

“The Lee Residents Association objects on the grounds that it contravenes the Marine Parade Area of Special Character. They acknowledge that the amendments to the application has addressed some of their original objections. The building has been set back to the 6 metre guideline although the balconies were still set forward. The application had been reduced to 6 flats which had allowed for the roof line to reduce down in height to match the next adjacent westerly house. At the rear of the development they have altered the layout to enable cars to turn around within the parking area and there are 2 additional parking spaces to the front of the development. Some of the residents are still concerned that there is not enough spaces.”

“The main consideration from the Association is that this application will set a precedent being four story in an area of the Sea Front which has predominately two storey dwellings. That it will enable future developers to use the precedent if approved”.

Mr Birch thanked Members for the opportunity to speak on the application and advised that he was from Barclay Phillips Architects speaking on behalf of his clients.

Mr Birch advised the Board that this scheme was a 4 storey residential build providing two bed apartments. He advised that his clients had consulted extensively with the Planning Officers and had referred to the Marine Parade East SPD guidance. He further advised that his clients had listened to concerns raised by neighbouring properties and had modified and altered the scheme from 7 flats to 6 flats. In addition Mr Birch reported that there had been an open day at the site which had been well attended by residents.

Mr Birch advised the Board that the proposal would provide private amenity space that gave residents a view of the waterfront. He further added that windows in the side elevations would be obscure glazed.

Mr Birch advised the Board that the design was a mix of materials comprising a pale render, grey cement board cladding, timber framed balconies, glazed balustrades and a slate roof. He further added that the scheme would see high quality landscaping and boundary wall being either reinstated or retained and concluded that there would be 9 allocated parking spaces on site with 12 secure bicycle spaces provided.

Officers responded to a Members question relating to potential loss of light and advised that any impact from the development would not be considered to be harmful.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00353/FULL be approved subject to the conditions of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**62. 16/00350/FULL – INSTALLATION OF NEW SHOPFRONT AND AIR CONDITIONING UNITS AND LADDER (as amplified by email received 30.08.16)  
151 Privett Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 3SS**

Consideration was given to the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00350/FULL

Members were advised by the Head of Planning Services that in paragraph 2 on page 29 in the site and proposal section of the Planning Officer's report, the 'north' in line 5 should read 'south' and in paragraph 3 on page 30 in the principal issues section 'southern' in the second line should read 'northern'. An email from the applicant had also been received, dated 6 September 2016, confirming that the existing air conditioner units were to be removed and the new ones would not be operated overnight.

In the absence of the depute speaker Mr John Sadler, Ward Councillor Mrs Forder was invited to address the Board. She advised Members that she would be reading a statement from Mr Sadler whose property backed onto the Co-op store. The statement read as follows:

"Dear Ladies and Gentleman of the Board, if you are hearing this it means that I am still abroad on business and have been unable get home to address you in person. I and my family have lived at 2 Ladram Road since 1964. Our house and the houses around were there before the supermarket. When the original 'SPAR' shop opened, it was little more than a corner store, with minimal freezer capacity. Even so, they erected a sound barrier to stifle the noise of their refrigerators. This barrier subsequently proved to be something of a Trojan horse because, over the years, subsequent owners incrementally added more and more refrigeration capacity, hidden by the barrier and with no planning permission.

It was only when Alldays removed the sound barrier in 2002, because it was an asbestos health hazard, that the full impact was revealed. The noise, coupled with the installation of three air-conditioning units on the roof in a direct line with our bedroom window, again with no planning permission, was unacceptable.

This led me to approach Alldays seeking a resolution to the problem. I was reassured by Alldays that they would resolve the problem but, unbeknown to me, they were selling out to the Co-op. The co-op subsequently obtained retrospective Planning Permission for the main refrigeration plant but despite vague promises of a sound barrier this did not materialise and I had to finance and construct a concrete wall in front of their main refrigeration plant to cut down the noise which has been further exacerbated by their failure to maintain the existing louvers doors to the point where they are loose and do not close correctly. To this day no sound barrier has been installed on the roof of their building despite more air conditioning units having been added without planning permission.

The application in question takes no account of the noise generated by the existing air conditioning units on the roof and no measurement of this noise level has been taken or quoted. Indeed the existing air conditioning units are not even shown on the plans submitted in the application. However, the application does quote the noise levels to be generated by the proposed new air conditioning units. Ergo there will be an augmentation of the noise at my property which is already at an unacceptable level. I would challenge any assertion that these levels are within acceptable limits because there has been no improvement since the noise survey conducted in February, which clearly did not meet the standards required by BS 4142:1997. Furthermore, the February survey did not include the air-conditioning units which are situated on the roof. (I was in attendance and can vouch for this).



At this juncture, you may wonder why I am alone in objecting to this application. I cannot say for certain, because I have been unable to consult my neighbours, but I believe this may be because they are rightly concerned that a dispute with the supermarket will blight their property resale values. On the other hand, I have no such qualms. Having lived there for 50 years, I intend to die there.

Finally, may I say that I am not a Luddite and accept that refrigeration is a necessary requirement for modern supermarkets. Further, I am sure that we could reach an amicable agreement if there was a guarantee to construct simple and relatively inexpensive sound barriers especially on the roof.

In closing, may I thank you, the Ladies and Gentleman of the Board, for your kind attention and I look to you to do the right thing.”

A Member asked for clarification on the noise report assessment that had been carried out and the Head of Planning Services advised Members that the existing 3 air conditioning units had a cumulative sound power level of 76dBA whereas the proposed 2 units would have a cumulative sound power level of 71-74dBA. Therefore it had been considered that this would be an improvement to the current situation.

Following a question from a Member, it was advised that the refrigeration unit and louvre doors were not a material planning matter to consider when determining the application.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00350/FULL be approved subject to the conditions of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

- 63. 16/00444/VOC – VARIATION OF CONDITIONS 2 (APPROVED PLANS) AND 9 (DETAIL OF STAIRCASES) OF PLANNING PERMISSION REFERENCE 13/00312/EXT RENEWAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION TO EXTEND THE TIME LIMIT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PLANNING PERMISSION REFERENCE K9316/7 (08/00423/FULL) – RESTORATION OF GRADE II LISTED BUILDING AND SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENT AND CONVERSION TO 26 DWELLINGS, RESIDENTS STORES AND INTERPRETATION ROOM TO ENABLE THE CONSTRUCTION OF STAIRS BETWEEN GROUND AND FIRST FLOORS OF 1-2, 4-18 AND 20-22 (LISTED BUILDING AND SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENT)  
Fort Gilkicker Fort Road Gosport Hampshire**

Consideration was given to the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive that consideration be given to planning application 16/00444/VOC

Members were advised that since the publication of the report, the Environment Agency had raised no objection to the proposed variations to planning conditions 2 and 9.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00444/VOC be approved subject to:

1. A Deed of Variation to the existing Section 106 agreement relating to the payment of a commuted sum towards the provision and/or improvement of outdoor playing space; the provision of affordable housing; public access works; the provision of an interpretation centre and access to the parade ground; a flood warning and evacuation plan; a flood mitigation management plan including works to the beach to enable the new culvert to function effectively; the provision of mitre gates and details of the access gates at Fort Road; CCTV; the appointment of a management company; and
2. the conditions of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive

**64. 16/00040/FULL - PROPOSED PART DEMOLITION OF 7A STOKE ROAD AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW BUILDINGS TO FORM 1NO. ONE BEDROOM AND 4NO. TWO BEDROOM DWELLINGS AND 2NO. ONE BEDROOM FLATS AND 2NO. RETAIL SHOPS (CONSERVATION AREA) (AMENDMENT TO APPLICATION 13/00381/FULL) (as amended by plan received 26.09.16) 7A Stoke Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 1LT**

Consideration was given to the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 16/00040/FULL.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Mr Tutton was invited to address the Board.

Mr Tutton advised the Board that the building had been vacant since June 2009. He advised that it was in a dilapidated state of disrepair and detracted from the Stoke Road Conservation Area.

Mr Tutton advised the Board that in December 2013 planning permission had been granted for 6 dwellings on the site and reported that this consent was still live.

Mr Tutton advised the Board that the scheme would bring the ground floor of the building back into retail use after 7 years of being vacant and would therefore generate full time employment opportunities.

Mr Tutton advised that the development would be served by 3 undercroft parking spaces accessed from Jamaica Place.

In conclusion, Mr Tutton advised the Board that the development was within 400 metres of the Town Centre and situated in an accessible area with access to public transport and was an attractive location for people with low car ownership.

Following a question from a Member relating to recycling bin storage, the Head of Planning Services informed Members that storage was available on site and that recycling bins would be put out on the footpath on the designated collection day.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 16/00040/FULL approved subject to the conditions of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**65. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Members were advised that an appeal had been submitted in respect of the previous application relating to 4-6 Camden Street. Comments were to be submitted by 14 November 2016.

The meeting concluded at 19:40

CHAIRMAN