

**A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD
WAS HELD ON 28 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 6PM**

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

It was reported that in accordance with Standing Order 2.3.6, Councillors Miss Kelly and Hook had been nominated to replace Councillors Hicks and Bergin respectively for this meeting.

103. APOLOGIES

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting were received from The Mayor and Councillors Bergin and Hicks.

104. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Hook and Mrs Hook declared a personal interest in grey pages agenda items 2
Councillors Ronayne and Miss Kelly declared a personal interest in grey pages agenda item 3.

105. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Regulatory Board meeting held on 17 January 2018 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a true and correct record.

106. DEPUTATIONS

Deputations had been received on the following items:

- Agenda Item 1 of the grey pages – 17/00496/FULL – Land to the West of the Control Tower, Solent Airport, Daedalus Way
- Agenda Item 2 of the grey pages – 17/00486/FULL – 31 Frater Lane
- Agenda Item 3 of the grey pages – 17/00579/FULL – 35 Elmhurst Road
- Agenda Item 4 of the grey pages – 17/00502/FULL – 9 Harwood Road

107. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no public questions

108. 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:

- 109. 17/00496/FULL - ERECTION OF FIVE MIXED USE HANGARS (COMPRISING CLASS C3 DWELLING AND CLASS B1(A) OFFICE) WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, PARKING AND CYCLE & REFUSE STORAGE FACILITIES (as amplified by additional supporting information received 09.1.2018 and amended by revised plans received 12.01.2018)**
Land West Of Control Tower Solent Airport Daedalus Drive Le 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 17/0496/FULL.

The Board was updated that it had been agreed with the applicant that the kitchen and cloakroom to the ground floor of the proposed buildings as shown on the submitted plans were to be considered as part of the commercial element of the proposed mixed use. This would equate to approximately 8 square metres of floor space increasing the overall level of non-residential floorspace to 44 square metres. The proportion of the each building to be used for non-residential purposes would therefore be just under 12% of the total floor area of the building.

The Board was also advised that the applicant had submitted additional supporting highway information relating to access and servicing.

The Board was advised that the Airport Manager had advised that under the terms of the CAA licence for the aerodrome, the licence holder was authorised to make comments on behalf of the CAA and that the licence holder was responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions of the licence.

The Board was advised that Gosport Borough Council's Transport Officer had provided comments on the additional highways-related information and had raised concerns about the practicality of the proposed access arrangements if used by vehicles larger than a private car. Deliveries or servicing by vehicles larger than a medium sized van could not be carried out within the site and would require vehicles to stop on Daedalus Drive.

The Board was advised that the clarification of the extent of the non-residential element of the proposed building did not alter Officer's views on the unacceptable nature of the proposal.

The Officers advised that their view was that the additional highways-related information that had been submitted demonstrated that the site could be accessed by private cars and small vans. Any vehicles larger than this (for example a refuse collection vehicle) would not be able to enter the site and would have to stop on Daedalus Drive. Whilst this section of Daedalus Drive was currently an un-adopted cul-de-sac it would, in due course, be open to through traffic via the junction with Stubbington Lane that was currently under construction and would be adopted as part of the public highway. This part of Daedalus Drive was relatively narrow such that vehicles stopping on Daedalus Drive for loading or unloading would have the potential to disrupt the free flow of traffic and interfere with vehicles using any junction forming part of the emerging residential development of land immediately to the south of the site. In addition, the layout of the access road would not allow vehicles to pass if a small delivery (or similar) vehicle was unable to use the echelon parking and had stopped in the carriageway. The additional highway information demonstrated that the proposal would not provide safe and convenient access by the range of vehicles likely to visit the site.

The Board was advised that an additional reason (number 6) for refusal for the application was to be added in that;

The proposal fails to demonstrate that safe and convenient access would be provided to serve the range of vehicles likely to visit the site. The proposal is therefore potentially prejudicial to the safety and convenience of future occupiers of the site and the users of the adjacent road network. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies LP10 and LP23 of the Local Plan and to the Parking Supplementary Planning Document.

Mr Mansbridge was invited to address the Board, he advised that he was representing Lee-on- the-Solent Residents Association.

He advised that the Association did not object to the principle of the proposal of Hangar Homes but objected to the proposed location by the Solent Airport Control Tower as it prejudiced the future viability of the Airfield and the Solent Enterprise Zone (SEZ).

The Board was advised that the applicant had advised the previous meeting of the Regulatory Board that the proposed plans met Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) regulations and requirements and, that as

the CAA had not replied, they had no concerns regarding the proposal. Mr Mansbridge advised the Board that this was not the case as the CAA had not responded because their advice was provided through the objection letter of the Airfield Manager who was delegated to do so and who supported Mr Mansbridge's deputation.

The Board was advised that the objections centred around breaches of safety, and breaches of CAA and Border Force requirements with the end result being that approving the application in its present location would likely prejudice the future viability of the airport as a self-sustaining venture.

The Board was advised that any compromise to security and government regulations would undermine the principle for setting up the SEZ and the overall Daedalus plan. There was also a Government circular that required Planning Authorities to safeguard aerodromes.

The Board was advised that Fareham Borough Council had objected to the proposal as it had not been demonstrated adequately that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the operation of the airport and that it had been indicated by the leader of Fareham Borough Council that the airfield had to be viable to continue with the progression of the SEZ as the loss of this would jeopardise the industry and jobs that Gosport was keen to retain.

It was reiterated to the Board that the Residents Association was not objecting to the principle of the proposal, but the location proposed and felt it should only be approved with adequate safeguards so as to not impact on safety, customs and Border Force requirements. It was suggested that there may be space for the proposal in the Hangars North and Hangars East sites and that the Residents Association had not objected to these hangars. The Board was advised that given the importance of the airfield and the vital contribution of it to the SEZ any potential risk to it must be taken seriously.

In answer to a Member's question, Mr Mainsbridge advised that the objections to the proposals could not be mitigated as the proposed location of the properties would give access to the runway which would breach Border Force requirements and present a security risk and as a result restrict the use of the airfield.

Mr Day and Mr Tutton were invited to address the Board. They advised that they did not agree with the recommendation of the Planning Officers as the proposal included four-bedroom dwellings for which there was a need in Gosport and that the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2015 stated that there was a need for mixed use development and that the proposal for four-bedroom properties with hangar and office space would be a good mixed use as the offices were allocated for employment.

The Board was advised that Daedalus SPD should help decision making and be sufficiently flexible to allow such proposals and that the document would take a long period to implement and was progressive as opposed to prescribing an end design.

Mr Tutton reiterated that there was a need for four-bedroom properties in the Borough and that these were often difficult to build as a result of environmental constraints and that this was an ideal opportunity to provide them in the Borough.

The Board was advised that the applicant would make the necessary SPA mitigation payment should the application be approved.

Mr Tutton advised the Board that the National Planning Policy Framework advised that local authorities should not stifle innovative design and that the proposal was innovative and well supported. 41 letters of support had been submitted in respect of the application

The Board was advised that the aviation consultant had rejected the safety concerns raised by the Planning Officers and supported the view that the proposal would bring mixed residential and employment use to the site. The Board was also advised that the proposal would add a level of protection from the airfield to the 200 additional homes to be built.

Mr Day concluded by advising the Board that the proposal would work closely with CEMAST and would put Gosport on the map.

A Member stated that they acknowledged that there had been a number of letters of support for the proposal, but that the majority of these were not local residents of Lee-on-the-Solent.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that with regard to the Border Force's concern about safety, the applicant had provided details about the proposed safety measures, including details of access from the hangar to the homes, and self-closing coded doors but had received no response from the Border Force to the proposals.

In answer to a Member's question the Board was advised that three staff would be working for Mr Day in his own hangar to help build the new velocity kit aircraft which would be the first in the UK and that if approval was given to be the business agent for the UK and Ireland to make additional aircraft, this could be extended to use the students at CEMAST. The Board was advised by Mr Day that the bulk of the employment generated by the units would be located on the opposite side of the airfield in the hangars and that it was believed the proposal would generate a total of about 20-25 jobs.

It was clarified that the hangars underneath the properties would be used for the storage of personal aeroplanes, with the exception of a potential temporary use of the applicant's hangar for the construction of the velocity kit aircraft.

The Board was advised that the kitchen and the toilet located on the ground floor would be ancillary to the ground floor office space.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that one of the prospective residents was a business owner in the innovation centre but Members felt that overall the proposal would not address the shortage of four-bedroom properties as the take up of the proposed properties would be from people currently living outside the Borough.

Mr Day advised that the Airport Manager had been obstructive in not allowing the Airport Safety Assessor access to the Airfield and that as a result the proposed drawings showing the distance between the Airport Tower and the proposal were based on Ordnance Survey Maps and had to be undertaken as a desktop exercise. Mr Day advised that the proposals met the 21.5m clearance required by the CAA. Members were also advised that planes would only use the taxiway if they were taxiing to or from the runway.

In answer to a Member's question, the Planning Officer advised that large vehicles stopping on Daedalus Drive whilst serving the proposed development would block one side of the carriageway.

Councillor Beavis advised that he was Ward Councillor for the area and advised that he supported the deputation of the Lee-on-the-Solent-Residents Association. He advised that the proposal was 88% residential and 12% business use and was not an appropriate development for this location. The Board was advised that there had been seven objections to the proposal from the Airfield Managers acting on behalf of the CAA all on the grounds of security and safety. In addition, Fareham Borough Council was the land owner and it was not believed that they would sell the land to allow the proposal to be developed as they themselves had made three objections to the proposal. He concluded by advising that he agreed with the Planning Officers and that the proposal was inappropriate for the location.

Councillor Carter, Ward Councillor, advised that he also agreed with the Officer's recommendation to refuse, as he felt that the proposal, whilst acceptable in America where there was vast real estate, was an inappropriate proposal for Lee-on-the-Solent.

Members expressed concern that the proposal did not have the support of the Airport Manager and that this was representative of the CAA's views. Members also expressed concern at the potential disruption to the highway and the impact on the wider development of the Daedalus site.

Members accepted that it was a difficult application to consider and that the project was innovative. It was also reiterated that the proposal was on land owned by Fareham Borough Council. Members felt

that there were other obstacles that would prevent the airfield from being a success, but that the proposal was not included in this.

Members expressed concern that the airport operator had refused to meet the applicant to discuss the proposal and that as a result, the information provided had been a desktop exercise.

Members also expressed concern that any future occupants of the properties would jeopardise the safety of the airport.

Some Members expressed concern that the proposal did not present enough employment opportunity and that the opportunities proposed were not within the homes and units proposed.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration advised the Board that should the Board wish to approve the application authority would need to be delegated to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to complete a section 106 agreement and attach appropriate conditions to the application as considered necessary.

The Board was advised that it was difficult to control use of floor space within this type of proposal and that the purchasers and end users of the proposal could not be controlled. The Board was advised that attempts to control the balance of commercial and residential use in previous live/work units in St George's Barracks had been unsuccessful and these units were now in residential use.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved subject to authority being delegated to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to attach appropriate conditions and complete a Section 106 agreement as necessary for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed development would enhance the provision of employment in the Daedalus Regeneration Area and the Solent Enterprise Zone, initially during the development phase and thereafter by generating and promoting additional use of the operational airfield facility. As such the proposal is seen to align with Policy LP5 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 and the Daedalus SPD.
2. The proposed development would because of its modest density have minimal impact on adjacent industrial or business units and would make an effective and efficient use of land in accord with Policy LP24 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.
3. Future residential occupiers will be aware that there may be excessive noise and disturbance associated with the proximity of the adjacent operational airfield. But this application is not seen to introduce such a significant rise in air traffic that would increase the current risk above that which currently exists. As such this is not believed to be inconsistent with Policies LP10 and LP46 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.
4. It is not considered that the proposed residential accommodation would, by reason of its layout and juxtaposition give rise to an unacceptable outlook. Future occupiers would be aviation enthusiasts who would welcome the opportunity to accept the amenities provided to enable their enjoyment and use of the on-site airfield facilities. Given the nature of the aircraft operating environment being somewhat different to that of a residential development, it is considered that in this case the provision of an appropriate standard of accommodation is satisfied in accordance with Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029
5. It is not considered that there would be a harmful impact due to additional recreational disturbance over and above that which currently exists from the existing or proposed business, Commercial and industrial use of the site. As such it is not considered to be contrary to policies LP2 and LP42 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2019 and the Solent Special Protection Areas, Gosport Bird Disturbance Mitigation Protocol 2014.

RESOLVED: That planning application 17/00496/FULL be approved subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement to control the use of the floorspace within the units and/or appropriate conditions to control the development and that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to enter into a Section 106 agreement if necessary and/or attach appropriate conditions.

**110. 17/00486/FULL - ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION (RESUBMISSION OF 17/00370/FULL) (as amended by plans received 18.01.2018)
31 Frater Lane Gosport Hampshire PO12 4AU**

Councillors Hook and Mrs Hook declared that they lived in close proximity to the site and left the room and took no part in the discussion or voting in respect of this application.

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 17/0486/FULL.

The Board was advised that Members had attended a site visit.

Mr Wright was invited to address the Board. He thanked Members for the opportunity to speak and for attending the site visit.

He advised the Board that the proposal had been amended from its original plans to make it more sympathetic and that it would enhance the lives of a young family who wished to remain in the area as they were settled.

He advised the Board that there were a number of different designs of properties in the street and that it was difficult to understand that the proposal was not sympathetic to the streetscene as there was great variety of properties in the road.

Members advised that following their visit to the property they did not feel that the proposal was overbearing or incongruous and that the proposal could not be seen from the rear service road.

Members noted that there were no objections from the neighbouring properties.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved and that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to attach appropriate conditions to the application.

This was unanimously agreed by Members.

RESOLVED: That planning application 17/00486/FULL be approved subject to appropriate conditions and that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to attach such conditions as considered appropriate

111. 17/00573/FULL- CHANGE OF USE FROM DWELLINGHOUSE (CLASS C3) TO HOUSE IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION WITH SEVEN BEDROOMS (SUI-GENERIS) 35 Elmhurst Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 1PQ

Councillor Mrs Kelly declared a personal interest, left the meeting room and took no further part in the discussion or voting in respect of this application.

Councillor Ronayne declared a personal interest and remained in the room to allow him to address the Board as Ward Councillor. He took no part in the discussion or voting in respect of this application.

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 17/00573/FULL

Mr McDermott was invited to address the Board. He thanked Members for allowing him to address the Board.

Mr McDermott advised the Board that he would like them to consider the difference in harm between what could be completed under permitted development, and what required planning permission. The difference between the two was one bedroom.

Mr McDermott advised the Board that the proposal accommodated the required parking as it included a garage.

In answer to a Member's question the Board was advised that the proposal development would be most likely used by blue- and white-collar workers, as that was the demographic within the landlord's existing portfolio, but that this could not be guaranteed.

Members expressed concern that, should the proposed rooms be occupied by blue- and white-collar workers, that there was a risk that all of the occupants, some rooms being double rooms, would have cars and that this would increase the pressure on parking conditions in the locality.

Mr McDermott advised that it was felt that the property would be attractive to those that worked in the Town Centre.

Councillor Ronayne was invited to address the Board as the Ward Councillor.

He advised the Board that, although the property was described as a two-storey mid terrace property, it was in fact now a three-storey property, and that this had been achieved by the addition of a dormer window, that did not require planning permission, but covered the entire rear of the roof.

He advised the Board that extensive drainage work had been undertaken with changes to the plumbing and sewerage to accommodate the additional four bedrooms in the property.

Councillor Ronayne expressed concern that adding an additional storey, with two additional bedrooms and en-suites in the roof space did not require planning permission and expressed concern that any similar terraced house in Gosport could do the same. In addition, he expressed concern that the work already undertaken had more than doubled the number of bedrooms in the property and that some, but not all, of the bedrooms were capable of being occupied by two residents and that as a result this would indicate that the total number of residents in the proposal would exceed seven and potentially be up to 11.

Councillor Ronayne advised the Board that under legislation contained in the Housing Act in 2004, subsequent changes in 2010 meant that Houses of Multiple Occupation for up to six people would be permitted development and not require a planning application. He advised that permitted development rights allowed a Class C3 family dwelling to become a Class C4 House of Multiple Occupation without the need for planning permission. He advised that the application proposed would clearly exceed six persons and as a result was a Sui Generis use and would require planning permission. He advised that Section 55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 stated that a development required planning permission if there had been a material change of use of the building and suggested that the increase from six people to even seven people, with the capacity for more, constituted a material change of use and therefore required planning permission.

Councillor Ronayne advised that there had been no assessment by the highway authority and provided the Board with photographs showing the level of congestion and lack of parking within Elmhurst Road. He also advised that access for emergency services was becoming increasingly problematic and that the vehicles currently far exceeded what was intended for the properties

when they were built and that the proposal would further exacerbate the diminished amenity of residents in Elmhurst Road and similar neighbouring streets.

Councillor Ronayne advised the Board that paragraph six of the Planning Officer's report stated that houses of four or more bedrooms should make provision for three off street parking spaces, and also stated that the fall-back position was that the property could be occupied by up to six people with no off street parking. He advised the Board that given the fall-back position, it was considered that the proposed use as a seven-bedroom HMO with a garage to the rear did not conflict with Policy LP23 of the Local Plan.

He advised the Board that the property had seven bedrooms and would house an undetermined number of people and as a result the additional demand for on street parking as a result of the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the already diminished level of parking. The Board was advised that the report stated that the proposal had the potential to increase traffic movements, but that there was no evidence to suggest that it would increase any more if the house was occupied as a HMO in comparison to a family of six persons.

Councillor Ronayne advised the Board that he had knowledge of the rear access way of the property as he had previously been a resident of St Edwards Road. He advised that the access lane was barely wide enough for the existing service road and that there was little provision for oversize bins. In addition, he advised that the access way was susceptible to fly tipping and the insufficient provision of refuse bins would worsen this.

Councillor Ronayne concluded by advising that the proposal set a dangerous precedent for properties of this type in the Borough and requested that the Board make a site visit before determining the application.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that the dormer that had been constructed was permitted development and did not require planning permission.

It was clarified to the Board that the dormer construction and the change to a six bedroom HMO (Class C4) could be undertaken under permitted development and that planning permission was only required to change the property to a seven bedroomed HMO, a sui-generis use .

Members accepted that the fall-back position did not require there to be any parking provision and that the current proposal only required the provision of one off road space. Concern was expressed, however, that the agent had stated that the proposed occupants were likely to be blue- and white-collar workers, which would increase the likelihood of them having vehicles as opposed to the low income occupants usually associated with HMOs.

Members requested that consideration be given to the amendment of the Local Plan to apply a requirement for additional parking for such properties.

The Board was advised that the licensing of the HMO was not a material consideration for the Regulatory Board and that the licence would dictate the number of occupants based on the size of the rooms and the layout of the property. The Planning Officer advised the Board that a license was would restrict the number of occupants to 10.

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

This was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That planning application 17/00573/FULL be deferred for a site visit.

112. 17/00502/FULL RETENTION OF AND FURTHER WORKS FOR THE ERECTION OF A FRONT AND REAR DORMER AND HIP TO GABLE ROOF EXTENSION 9 Harwood Road Gosport Hampshire PO13 0TU

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 17/00502/FULL.

The Board was advised by the Planning Officer that a visit had been undertaken to the property and that the rear dormer window had now been completed.

Miss Briggs was invited to address the Board. She advised that she was the owner of the property and that she had recently sold her café business to allow her to extend her residential property to allow her to support the young people in her care. She told the Board that she had been advised by officers that she did not require planning permission for the changes that she has made.

She advised the Board that initially she had allocated one room of her property to supporting young people, but had subsequently moved her own bedroom into the front room of the property to allow her to accommodate an additional young person as she was considered to be a competent and supportive carer.

Miss Briggs advised the Board that she had spent £40,000 on alterations to the property which had included replacing doors and ceilings to meet building regulations and commissioning suitable cladding for the dormer to ensure it was acceptable.

She advised the Board that she did not drive and as would not be bringing any vehicles to the property and that the provision of a 101 room was desperately needed to support young people in difficulty or that required emergency accommodation.

Members thanked Miss Briggs for her deputation and commended the work that she undertook in supporting young people in difficulty.

In answer to a Member's question, Miss Briggs advised the Board that she had changed builders midway through the project as they had misinformed her and that a visit from Building Control had confirmed that additional work was needed with the installation of fire doors, replacement ceiling and built in fire alarms.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that that the length of stay of the young people varied depending on the level of help and support required. She advised that the loft room would provide her with her own bedroom and bathroom facility and that young people could be placed with her from Social Services or the Police depending on their circumstances.

Miss Briggs advised that she was registered to undertake the care work that she did and that there was a shortage of facilities of this type available.

In answer to a Member's question, the Planning Officer advised that the rear dormer could be built under permitted development if it was finished to an acceptable standard and material to match the main roof, but that the front dormer would need planning permission.

The Board was advised that for the front dormer to be acceptable it would need to be reduced in size and be of a material that was in keeping with the existing roof finish. It would also require submission of new plans showing this proposal and this would be subject to the statutory publicity and consultation period.

In answer to a further question, the Board was advised that there would be no method of control regarding the required number of car parking spaces should the applicant move on and the property revert to use as a dwellinghouse with no element of care.

It was proposed, seconded and unanimously agreed that the application be deferred for a site visit.

RESOLVED: That planning application 17/00502/FULL be deferred for a site visit.

**113. 17/00540/FULL - ERECTION OF DETACHED DWELLING
Land To Rear Of 181 Portsmouth Road Lee-On-The-Solent Hampshire**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 17/00540/FULL.

The applicant was invited to address the Board but advised that he did not wish to speak.

A Member advised the Board that the proposal was for a two storey property that would be built in the rear garden of 181 Portsmouth Road and would overshadow a bungalow in Queens Road and affect the privacy of the owners. The Board was advised that it was the intention that the garage at 2 Queens Road would be converted to a bedroom and that this would be overshadowed by the proposal.

Some Members felt that they considered the proposal to be garden grabbing and that it should not be granted permission.

Members compared the proposal to others within the locality and questioned whether the parking provision for the site was acceptable as the proposal appeared to have less provision than other nearby redevelopments and advised that the use of on-road parking for the proposal was inappropriate as Portsmouth Road was already congested.

The Board was advised by the Head of Planning and Regeneration that the proposal included the recommended number of car parking spaces within the Gosport Borough Council Parking Supplementary Planning Document.

Members discussed the car parking provision for the proposal, some Members felt that the provision was acceptable, but others were not satisfied that the provision of parking and the resulting sight lines would be acceptable.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred for a site visit. This was subsequently agreed.

RESOLVED: That application 17/00540/FULL be approved deferred for a site visit.

**114. 18/00008/FULL - ERECTION OF TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION
30 Bay Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 2QA**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 18/00008/FULL.

RESOLVED: That application 18/00008/FULL be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report.

115. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Board was advised that the three appeals had been determined by the Planning Inspectorate.

142 Portsmouth Road – The Planning Inspector upheld the Council's refusal to grant planning permission and dismissed the appeal and supported the protection of wildlife through the Solent Mitigation Policy.

The Victualler – Gosport Borough Council had successfully prosecuted the owner of The Victualler for non-compliance with the enforcement notice and been awarded costs. The Planning Inspector had also supported the removal of the furniture, using even stronger wording than the LPA with reference to the impact on the Listed Building. .

Netherton Road – An appeal had been made against the Council's refusal of the application on the grounds of size, mass and access. The Planning Inspector did not consider that the size or mass of the proposal would cause harm and noted that the dispute regarding access rights was a private legal matter between the parties. The applicant had been awarded partial costs for the Council's unreasonable behaviour in determining the application and the Planning Inspector noted in the decision letter that planning officers had made it clear to the Board that private access rights were not a planning consideration.

The meeting concluded at 20.08

CHAIRMAN