

**A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD
WAS HELD ON 17 JANUARY 2018 AT 6PM**

Subject to Approval

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

It was reported that in accordance with Standing Order 2.3.6, Councillors Miss Kelly and Scard had been nominated to replace Councillors Ms Diffey and Raffaelli respectively for this meeting.

87. APOLOGIES

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting were received from The Mayor and Councillors Raffaelli and Ms Diffey.

88. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mrs Hook declared a personal interest in grey pages agenda items 1 and 8

89. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Regulatory Board meeting held on 6 December 2017 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a true and correct record.

90. DEPUTATIONS

Deputations had been received on the following items:

- Agenda Item 1 of the grey pages - 17/00358/FULL – 12 Grafton Close
- Agenda Item 3 of the grey pages – 17/00549/FULL – Carisbrooke Centre
- Agenda Item 4 of the grey pages – 17/00496/OUT – Land to the West of the Control Tower, Solent Airport, Daedalus
- Agenda Item 5 of the grey pages – 17/00523/FULL– 20 Woodstock Road
- Agenda Item 7 of the grey pages – 17/00510/FULL – 58 Western Way
- Agenda Item 8 of the grey pages – 17/00486/FULL – 31 Frater Lane

91. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no public questions

92. REPORTS OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING AND REGENERATION

The Head of Planning and Regeneration 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:

- 93. 17/0358/FULL - RETENTION OF PERGOLA (as amplified by letter received 05.12.17)
12 Grafton Close Gosport Hampshire PO12 4GD**

Councillor Mrs Hook declared a personal interest, remained in the room but took no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 17/00358/FULL.

Members were advised that a site visit had taken place and that the pergola had been viewed from the garden of both the application property and that of the objector.

Mr Savage was invited to address the Board. He thanked the Board for their attendance at his property and reiterated that he felt that the planning process had been undermined by the applicant seeking planning permission retrospectively.

He reiterated that the pergola was dominant across the rear of his garden and that a reduction in its height would not solve the issue. Mr Savage felt that the structure would not fade into the landscape over time.

Mr Savage advised the Board that he had no issue with his neighbours and that he would abide by any decision made, but that he would be disappointed if permission were to be granted as the situation had occurred as a result of the ignorance of the builder and he expressed concern that this could be repeated elsewhere.

Mr Savage concluded by advising the Board that he had wished them to consider the application from both sides and reiterated his disappointment at the abuse of the planning process.

In response to the deputation, a Member clarified that retrospective planning applications would be considered on their merits, if presented, and that if the structure had been 300mm lower it would not have required planning permission and could have been constructed under general permitted development rules.

In answer to a Member's question, Mr Savage advised the Board that he had not considered mitigation measures to screen the structure from his property but that he would have no option but to do so should the application be approved. He advised that he was not a keen gardener as he had hoped Members had appreciated from their site visit, and that he would need to consider a low maintenance option to mitigate the effects of the structure.

Mr Hovington was invited to address the Board. He advised that he was the applicant and thanked Members for attending the site visit. He advised the Board that he had not been aware that planning permission was required for the structure and that he had undertaken some research and had incorrectly assumed it was not. He advised the Board that it was a mistake on his part and on that of the builder and was human error rather than a deliberate attempt to undermine planning rules.

He welcomed the recommendation of the Planning Officer and was happy to answer any questions from the Members.

RESOLVED: That planning application 17/00358/FULL be approved.

- 94. 17/00549/FULL - REFURBISHMENT OF CARISBROOKE CENTRE COMPRISING: (I) GROUND FLOOR EXTENSION TO SHOP (53 SQ.M.); (II) REFURBISHMENT AND RECONFIGURATION OF UPPER FLOORS OF WEST AND NORTH WINGS OF CENTRE TO PROVIDE 17 ONE BEDROOM AND 8 TWO BEDROOM FLATS INCLUDING THE ADDITION OF 2ND FLOOR TO NORTH WING; EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND ENCLOSURE OF EXISTING OPEN STAIRCASES SERVING FLATS; (III) CONSTRUCTION OF 2 SEMI-DETACHED, THREE BEDROOM HOUSES TO SOUTH OF CAR PARK ENTRANCE; AND, (IV) ENLARGEMENT OF CENTRE CAR PARK AND RATIONALISATION OF REAR SERVICE AREAS AND RESIDENTS PARKING SPACES, AND LANDSCAPING (RESUBMISSION 16/00599/FULL) (as amplified by parking plan received 19/12/2017 and phasing plans received 21.12.2017)**
Carisbrooke Centre, 43-61 Carisbrooke Road, Gosport, PO13 0QY

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 17/0549/FULL.

Matthew Pickup and Lauren Atkins were invited to address the Board.

Lauren Atkins advised that she was the managing director of Zionstone Limited, the applicant and owner of the site and that Matthew Pickup was the planning consultant for the application.

The Board was advised that a previous application had been considered for the site in October 2017 and had been refused by the Board. The current application included a rationalisation of the parking provision on the site and a redesign of the units to reflect a greater mix of unit size.

The Board was advised that the only previous reason given for refusal was that the application did not provide an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes and that this had been considered before resubmission of the application.

The Board was advised that the existing three bedroom units on the site were not used as long-term homes but rather as stepping stones for the residents to more settled accommodation. In an area with a high density of family homes, smaller homes were considered appropriate and were needed.

The Board was advised that the proposed scheme provided a good mix overall with little else amended within the proposal and was advised that the McColls store would increase in size by 53sqm and that additional parking was being provided on the site.

Lauren Atkins advised the Board that the development would be carefully phased to allow the shops to remain open through the refurbishment and that the result would be a more attractive, economically sustainable development that was supported by the Economic Prosperity team at the Council.

The Board was advised that the parking provision for the site would be increased from the current 35 spaces to 69 spaces. Of these 23 would be reserved for residents, 42 would be available for shoppers, and four would be allocated to the semi-detached properties and that this far exceeded the number required.

The Board was advised that the proposal was first submitted in May 2016 and that the applicant had taken on board advice and comments from the Local Highway Authority, the Police, ecologists, drainage experts and the planning officers and had responded positively to any concerns raised.

It was reiterated that the only reason the previous application had been refused was because the mix of dwellings was not considered to be suitable and that this had been addressed within this application.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that the turnover of occupants in the three bedroom flats was high as they were often used as a stop gap on the way to other properties and, as a result, residents only tended to stay for 6-12 months. It was confirmed that all the flats were leasehold and that the new proposal offered a greater number of two bedroom flats and greater parking provision for all of the flats.

The parking provision included 15 spaces at the rear of the properties and eight within the centre and that the spaces defined at the rear of the property in the service road had been subject to tracking to ensure that service vehicles would have appropriate room and access.

In answer to a subsequent question, Lauren Atkins advised the Board that she was working with commercial tenants to patrol and monitor the parking and that if the planning application was successful she would look to extend the link with the commercial tenant to formalise this monitoring arrangement. The Board was advised that she was also working with the tenants to explore and establish ways for some users of the Centre to extend their time for parking, particularly if they were using facilities such as the hairdressers and beauty salon, accommodating the additional time needed for such appointments.

A Member questioned why the property did not contain provision for affordable housing in line with Policy LP24 of the Local Plan as it comprised more than 10 dwellings. Ms Atkins advised the Board

that a viability appraisal had been submitted as part of the application that had been independently assessed by the District Valuer, and that had shown that there was absolutely no profit that could be made as a result of the application. Policy LP24 stated that it was acceptable in those circumstances not to make provision for affordable housing. In addition, the Board was advised by the Planning Officers that there was no specific mix of properties advocated by the Local Plan and that the proposed amendments were seen as more appropriate than the current mix and those previously proposed, as it was now proposed that 40% of the units would be two bedroomed properties. In addition, the Board was advised that the development of residential properties above commercial units was advocated but that it was very difficult to include family properties within this as no or very limited outdoor space could usually be provided.

In answer to a Member's question, the Planning Officer advised that the housing need of the Borough had evolved and that there was now a shortage of all types and tenures of property within the Borough and that Planning Officers were satisfied that the proposed mix of dwellings was acceptable and complied with the Local Plan. The Board was advised that the Policy had been designed for brownfield sites and that the constraints of this already established and defined site needed to be acknowledged and taken into account when considering the proposed housing mix.

Members reiterated their concerns about the mix of dwellings on the site, the loss of three bedroom properties and the lack of affordable housing within the development and felt that the proposal did not meet the requirements of Policy LP24.

The Board was advised by the Planning Officers that a viability assessment had been submitted by the applicant with regard to the affordable housing element of the proposal as part of the application. This had been independently reviewed by the District Valuer who had confirmed that its contents were robust and accurate and that the development could not bear the costs of making provision for affordable housing.

Members were advised by the Planning Officers that Policy LP24 of the Local Plan focussed on brownfield sites and that the site was small and constrained in comparison. It was felt that what was proposed was acceptable for the site and included houses with gardens, smaller sized units and a wide mix of one and two bedroom properties which was in accordance with Policy LP24.

It was reiterated to the Board that Policy LP24 advocated affordable housing, but also set out options for developments where this was not viable. The applicant was required to submit an appraisal document supported by financial evidence that was independently and robustly reviewed by the District Valuer, The Board was advised that this has been satisfied and that therefore the proposal was compliant with Policy LP24 with regard to affordable housing.

Members accepted that the proposal was located on a bus route but stated that the services were infrequent and that the occupiers of the proposed properties might have at least two, perhaps three or even four cars per flat. Planning Officers advised that the application had included a rationalisation of the car parking spaces and that there was an adequate increase in the number of spaces to cater for the increase in demand.

Members expressed concern regarding the monitoring of car parking and were advised that a condition could be imposed requiring a car parking management plan to be submitted and agreed.

Some Members expressed concern that the proposal would set a precedent for future applications and reiterated concern that the proposal did not meet policy LP24 of the Local Plan with regard to affordable housing and appropriate mix of properties.

RESOLVED: That planning application 17/00549/FULL be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report and a section 106 agreement relating to a re-evaluation of the financial viability appraisal if construction has not reached 'core and shell' completion within a specified period.

**95. 17/00496/OUT - HYBRID APPLICATION COMPRISING: (I) FULL APPLICATION FOR ERECTION OF FIVE MIXED USE HANGARS (COMPRISING C3 DWELLING AND CLASS B1(A) OFFICE) WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, PARKING AND CYCLE & REFUSE STORAGE FACILITIES; AND, (II) OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR ERECTION OF HANGAR HERITAGE CENTRE (CLASS D1) AND PROVISION OF PLAY AREA (WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED) (as amplified by additional supporting information received 09.1.2018)
Land West Of Control Tower Solent Airport Daedalus Drive Lee-on-the-Solent Hampshire PO13 9FZ**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 17/00496/OUT.

The Board was updated that the applicant had amended the application by removing the outline elements relating to the erection of a hangar heritage centre and the provision of an external play area. Amended plans had been received reflecting these amendments.

The Board was requested to consider and determine the proposal as a full application for the erection of five mixed use hangars (comprising C3 dwelling and Class B1(A) office) with associated access, parking and cycle & refuse storage facilities.

The covering email to the amendments also included comments on matters raised by a number of consultees. The Board was advised that the issues raised by the applicant in response to these consultee comments were dealt with in the Planning Officer's report.

The Board was also advised that an additional letter of support had been received but that the matters raised were also covered in the Planning Officer's report.

Members were requested to disregard the references to the outline elements of the application in the Planning Officer's report as they were no longer relevant.

The Board was advised that by deleting elements from the application, the applicant had simplified the proposal so that it now only related to the proposed mixed use hangars. The officer's recommendation to refuse and the reasons for refusal all related to the proposed mixed use hangars and were therefore unaffected by the amendments.

The Board were also advised that officers recommended that the first of the reasons for refusal should include a reference to the proposal being contrary to Policy LP16 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

Mr Day was invited to address the Board.

He thanked the Board for the opportunity to address them and advised that he would like the Board to be aware of the benefits of hanger homes as they made airports more sustainable by bringing in income through tax and runway fees.

Mr Day advised the Board that there were over 600 licensed airfields in America with hanger homes and 12 sites in Europe but as yet there were none in the United Kingdom. He advised that they were similar to the concept of marina homes and golf homes and that they would safeguard flying activity and aviation interest at the airport.

He advised that the proposal would bring likeminded people together and give kudos to the airfield.

The Board was advised that, although the heritage centre and play centre had been removed from the proposal, space for them remained should they wish to be provided at a later date.

Mr Day advised the Board that the two red lines indicated on his plan indicated that the proposal had the correct category B airfield separation distance and the green line showed how the line of

view from the control tower would not be obstructed by the proposed properties and that, even if there was an obstruction, this could be overcome by the installation of cameras as was often used in other airports.

He advised the Board that the proposal was a good and efficient use of the land and that each unit could provide employment for 5 people and would increase the employment level on the site.

Mr Day advised that the units would comply with the Civil Aviation Authority and Border Force and European Union rules with regard to access for the site and that unauthorised access would not be permitted.

The Board was advised that the proposal was supported by 90% of residents and 100% of businesses in the locality and the flying community, and would be a first for the United Kingdom. The proposal would not only put Gosport on the map, but would support the sustainability of the airport.

In answer to a Member's question, Mr Day advised the Board that the project had been a long term ambition of his and that he had gleaned that there had been a desire for a heritage centre and that this was something he would have undertaken. He also advised that he would be willing to meet with the airport operator but that the opportunity had not occurred.

He advised the Board that advice had been sought from an aviation consultant and that the proposal was fully compliant with the requirements of the Civil Aviation Authority and that the proposal presented no safety issues and did comply with the Civil Aviation Authority's required distance of 21.5 metres.

Some Members advised that they felt that the proposal was innovative and good for the Borough.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised by the Planning Officer that the Civil Aviation Authority had been consulted as part of the proposal, but had not responded. A Member advised the Board, that the Civil Aviation Authority allowed the airport operator to respond on its behalf. The Planning Officer advised that the airport operator had objected to the proposal as it did not meet Civil Aviation Authority guidelines.

A Member advised that they felt that the objection of the airport owner, although not a material planning consideration, was detailed in the report and that the objection from the airport operator was significant and included concern regarding the contravention of Civil Aviation Authority requirements, obstruction of views, Border Force access, fire risk from smoking on balconies and that there was also an objection from the land owner.

They advised that, as stated in the officer's report, the proposal was prejudicial to the airport and the Enterprise Zone and that the proposal did not go well with the proposed mixed use for the site and that they felt the Planning Officer's recommendation should be supported.

Members reiterated that the airport operator had responded on behalf of the Civil Aviation Authority and had stated that the safety guidelines had not been met and that, whilst it was accepted that the concept was popular in America and offered an exciting opportunity, unfortunately the proposal was not appropriate for the site as a result of the adverse effect it would have on the function of the airport and the impact on the Daedalus Enterprise Zone.

Some Members felt that the proposal was an acceptable use of a working airport and that any associated noise was to be accepted on an airfield.

The recommendation of the Planning Officer, to refuse the application for the reasons set out in the report, was put to the Board and was not carried.

It was subsequently proposed and seconded that the application be deferred to a future meeting of the Board and this was carried.

RESOLVED: That planning application 17/00496/FULL be deferred to a future meeting of the Board.

**96. 17/00523/FULL - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND ERECTION OF TERRACE OF 3 THREE BEDROOM HOUSES AND 1 TWO BEDROOM MAISONETTE OVER AN UNDERCROFT VEHICULAR ACCESS FROM WOODSTOCK ROAD WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING, REFUSE AND CYCLE STORAGE (RESUBMISSION OF 17/00001/FULL)
20 Woodstock Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 1RS**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 17/00523/FULL.

Mr Newman was invited to address the Board.

He advised the Board that his continuing objection to the proposal was that in 2016 a wall adjacent to 18 Woodstock Road had been removed and that this had given access to the site from Cranbourne Road and Dock Road along the rear service road.

He advised the Board that the Local Highway Authority had objected to a previous application which had been refused, mainly as the access arrangements were detrimental to highway safety and that replacing the wall would address this.

Mr Newman advised the Board that properties 14-18 Woodstock Road did not have side access and that the service road was utilised by them as a result, but that 20 Woodstock Road did not need this as it had sufficient side access.

Mr Newman commended the report of the Planning Officers but felt that it did not address the issue of access from the service road. He felt that, although the report stated that the proposal did not indicate that the service road would be used from the gated access at 20 Woodstock Road, it also did not state that it would not be used. He felt that this was a risk for both residential use and use throughout the construction and that this went against the reasons for refusal of the application made in 2016.

Mr Newman advised that he would withdraw his objection to the proposal if the site was walled off preventing access from the rear service road.

Councillor Mrs Cully, Ward Councillor for Town, was invited to address the Board. She advised that the proposal would add high density development to the site where currently only one property existed, and that neighbouring residents were unhappy with the lack of privacy that the proposal offered them. She advised that the addition of the undercroft to allow the proposal to have additional parking had significantly reduced the size of the gardens.

The Board was advised that, in addition to lack of privacy, the main concern was the increase in vehicles arriving at and departing from the development site, and she supported Mr Newman's request that a condition be placed upon the application to ensure that access via the service road was not permitted.

Councillor Mrs Cully advised that only two properties had garages on the service road and that it was also used by children playing and that its use as an access point for the development was a safety concern.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that it would be possible to impose a condition to any permission that would prevent vehicular access to the site from the rear service road both during construction and following completion.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved subject to delegated authority being granted to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to attach appropriate conditions to the application to prevent access to the site by the service road.

RESOLVED: That planning application 17/00523/FULL be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report and delegated authority being granted to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to attach a suitably-worded additional condition to prevent access to the site by the rear service road.

**97. 17/00510/FULL - ERECTION OF PART TWO STOREY AND PART THREE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND INSTALLATION OF SIDE DORMER WINDOW (as amended by plans received 29.11.2017)
58 Western Way Gosport Hampshire PO12 2NQ**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 17/00510/FULL.

Mr Goulding was invited to address the Board.

He advised that he was the applicant and that he had lived in the property for 13 years, along with his wife and 4 children and that the additional space was needed to accommodate his family.

He advised that he agreed with the Planning Officer's recommendation to approve the application and advised the Board that he took the structural stability of the proposal very seriously.

Mr Goulding advised the Board that he was an experienced building surveyor and had previously worked for Savills. He also advised that he was an expert on Party Wall matters. He advised that he was seeking to reassure Members that the proposal was safe, and that it was in his own interest to ensure that the development was structurally sound as any collapse would impact on his property before his neighbours'. He advised that the application would be constructed correctly, and in compliance with the appropriate Party Wall Act requirements.

He advised the Board that the proposal would be built in accordance with Building Regulations, as required by law, and that he would be employing a structural engineer, as well as consultant and would be project managing the construction himself. He advised that the proposal and construction would be carried out diligently and professionally and that he took these matters and the build very seriously.

RESOLVED: That application 17/00510/FULL be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report.

**98. 17/00486/FULL - ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION (RESUBMISSION OF 17/00370/FULL)
31 Frater Lane Gosport Hampshire PO12 4AU**

Councillor Mrs Hook declared a personal interest, remained in the room but took no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 17/00486/FULL.

Mr McDermott and Mr Wright were invited to address the Board.

They advised that they were representing the applicant and that they wished to address some of the concerns identified.

Mr McDermott advised the Board that the identified issues were minor in relation to the overall balance and merit of the application and that the Council had a duty to approve the application.

He suggested that Members should make a site visit to view the application site and advised that the applicant had instructed him to appeal if the application was refused.

Mr Wright advised the Board that the applicant had a young family and wished to remain in the area as his children were settled in local schools, but that wanted to improve and extend the property to accommodate their family.

He advised that the design was sympathetic and that other changes required by Planning Officers following submission of initial plans had been made. He believed the proposal was compliant with requirements and felt that as Frater Lane was an eclectic mix of properties the proposal would not look out of place.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised by Mr McDermott that the original plans had been refused and that the applicant had now addressed the reasons for refusal in the new application.

In answer to a Member's question, the Planning Officer advised that a previous application had been refused and that the applicant had discussed options to improve the proposal informally with Planning Officers.

The Board was advised that whilst the applicant had made some improvements to the proposal, the Planning Officers did not support the application as the design was still unsympathetic.

In answer to a subsequent question, it was clarified that, although Frater Lane contained a mixture of property types, the proposal was considered unsympathetic because the existing property was narrow and deep and that the proposal would add significant width to the rear of the building and would not respect the original building. The Board was advised that the proposals were not sufficiently different to the original application for it to be considered acceptable for recommendation for approval.

It was further clarified that the design principles for developments were set out in the Design Supplementary Planning Document and that the principles set out a vertical emphasis on narrow properties, whereas the proposal would make the property horizontal and box-like. The Board was advised that the proposal would be viewed from a number of vantage points, not just from the front and that, whilst it was accepted that design was subjective, it was felt on balance that the proposal did not respect the design principles set out in the Design SPD.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred for a site visit and this was carried.

RESOLVED: That application 17/00486/FULL be deferred for a site visit.

**99. 17/00203/OUT - OUTLINE APPLICATION - ERECTION OF NEW SCIENCE PARK COMPRISING FOUR 3-STOREY BUILDINGS (COMPRISING 7,500 SQUARE METRES OF NEW OFFICE (Use Class B1(a)) AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FLOORSPACE (Use Class B1(b)) WITH 222 ADDITIONAL PARKING SPACES AND 74 CYCLE SPACES (ALL MATTERS RESERVED) (as amended by Transport Modelling Note received 7.11.17 and amended Travel Plan received 13.11.17)
Unit 50 Hoeford Point Barwell Lane Gosport Hampshire PO13 0AU**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 17/00203/OUT.

In answer to a Member's question the Board was advised that a phase one desktop study had been submitted identifying potential contamination on the site, but that the site was deemed suitable for occupation for industrial purposes.

The Board was advised that conditions 11, 12 and 13 of the report of the Planning Officer covered the measures needed to ensure that further investigations and, if required, remediation would take place before any development were occupied..

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that the application was for outline permission for a science park, that the applicant was Wickham Laboratories and that the occupants of the building had not been identified.

A Member expressed concern that the proposal would create additional problems with the already congested A32, particularly as there were 222 car parking spaces proposed. Members acknowledged that the site had previously had the Cyanamid Factory located on it, but were concerned at the impact the new development would have.

The Board was advised that the Local Highway Authority had recognised the impact that the proposal would have on the A32 and advised that mitigation measures were required to ensure that the impact of the development did not prejudice the safety or convenience of users of the A32. A legal agreement was therefore required to secure a financial contribution towards junction improvements to increase road capacity and that that the development was prevented from being occupied until the necessary contribution had been made and the improvement works to the highway delivered.

It was acknowledged that the proposal was well served by the Eclipse Bus Rapid Transport Route.

Members welcomed the potential for the site to deliver an additional 120-180 jobs and recognised that there would be additional applications for reserved matters at a later date.

RESOLVED: That application 17/00203/OUT be granted subject to the conditions contained in the report and a Section 106 agreement relating to a financial contribution towards improvements at the A32 Fareham Road/Lederle Lane junction and the A32 Fareham Road/Wych Lane Junction; a travel plan and associated set-up and monitoring fees bond; and an Employment and Skills Plan.

**100. 17/00402/FULL - CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FROM AMENITY TO RESIDENTIAL GARDEN (USE CLASS C3), RETENTION OF GARDEN SHED AND ERECTION OF ADDITIONAL GARDEN SHED AND 2M HIGH FENCE AND GATE
Land Adjacent 12 Moat Walk Gosport Hampshire PO12 2SP**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 17/00402/FULL.

RESOLVED: That application 17/00402/FULL be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report.

**101. 17/00527/FULL - ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE/REAR EXTENSION, FRONT PORCH AND GARAGE
8 Anglesea Road Lee-On-The-Solent Hampshire PO13 9HD**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 17/00527/FULL.

RESOLVED: That application 17/00527/FULL be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report.

102. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

The meeting concluded at 19.40

CHAIRMAN