

Please ask for:

Lisa Young

Direct dial:

(023) 9254 5651

Fax:

(023) 9254 5587

E-mail:

lisa.young@gosport.gov.uk

17 September 2012

S U M M O N S

MEETING: Regulatory Board
DATE: 25 September 2012
TIME: 6pm
PLACE: Council Chamber
Democratic Services contact: Lisa Young

LINDA EDWARDS
BOROUGH SOLICITOR

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

The Mayor (Councillor Dickson) (ex officio)
Chairman of the P and O Board (Councillor Hook) (ex officio)

Councillor Ronayne (Chairman)
Councillor Carter CR (Vice Chairman)

Councillor Ms Ballard	Councillor Henshaw
Councillor Beavis	Councillor Mrs Hook
Councillor Ms Diffey	Councillor Jessop
Councillor Farr	Councillor Langdon
Councillor Gill	Councillor Wright

FIRE PRECAUTIONS

(To be read from the Chair if members of the public are present)

In the event of the fire alarm being activated, please leave the room immediately. Proceed downstairs by way of the main stairs or as directed by GBC staff, following any of the emergency exit signs. People with disability or mobility issues please identify yourself to GBC staff who will assist in your evacuation of the building.

Legal Democratic and Planning Services: Linda Edwards – Borough Solicitor
Switchboard Telephone Number: **(023) 9258 4242**
Britdoc Number: **DX136567 Gosport 2** Website: **www.gosport.gov.uk**

IMPORTANT NOTICE:

- If you are in a wheelchair or have difficulty in walking and require access to the Committee Room on the First Floor of the Town Hall for this meeting, assistance can be provided by Town Hall staff on request

If you require any of the services detailed above please ring the Direct Line for the Democratic Services Officer listed on the Summons (first page).

NOTE:

- i. Councillors are requested to note that, if any Councillor who is not a member of the Board wishes to speak at the Board meeting then the Borough Solicitor is required to receive not less than 24 hours prior notice in writing or electronically and such notice shall indicate the agenda item or items on which the member wishes to speak.
- ii. Please note that mobile phones should be switched off for the duration of the meeting.

AGENDA

Recommended
Minute Format

PART A ITEMS

1. APOLOGIES FOR NON-ATTENDANCE

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All Members present are required to declare, at this point in the meeting or as soon as possible thereafter, any personal or personal and prejudicial interest in any item(s) being considered at this meeting.

3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD HELD ON 10 JULY 2012

4. DEPUTATIONS – STANDING ORDER 3.5

(NOTE: The Board is required to receive a deputation(s) on a matter which is before the meeting of the Board provided that notice of the intended deputation and its object shall have been received by the Borough Solicitor by 12 noon on Friday, 21 September 2012. The total time for deputations in favour and against a proposal shall not exceed 10 minutes).

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS – STANDING ORDER 3.6

(NOTE: The Board is required to allow a total of 15 minutes for questions from Members of the public on matters within the terms of reference of the Board provided that notice of such Question(s) shall have been submitted to the Borough Solicitor by 12 noon on Friday, 21 September 2012).

6. TREE PRESERVATION ORDER G.123 – THREE HORSE CHESTNUT TREES WITHIN THE GROUNDS OF ST VINCENT COLLEGE, GOSPORT

PART II
Contact Officer:
Hilary Hudson
Ext 5611

The purpose of the report is to request the Board to consider whether to confirm, confirm with modifications, or not to confirm Tree Preservation Order G.123 as modified where an objection has been received.

7. REPORTS OF THE BOROUGH SOLICITOR

*Schedule of planning applications with recommendations.
(grey sheets – pages 1 –10 /1)*

PART II
Contact Officer:
Debbie Gore
Ext 5455

8. ANY OTHER ITEMS

- *which by reason of special circumstances the Chairman determines should be considered as a matter of urgency.*

Board/Committee:	REGULATORY BOARD
Date of meeting:	14 AUGUST 2012
Title:	TREE PRESERVATION ORDER G.123 – THREE HORSE CHESTNUT TREES WITHIN THE GROUNDS OF ST VINCENT COLLEGE, GOSPORT
Author:	BOROUGH SOLICITOR AND DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE
Status:	FOR DECISION

Purpose

The purpose of the report is to request the Board to consider whether to confirm, confirm with modifications, or not to confirm Tree Preservation Order G.123 as modified where an objection has been received.

Recommendation

That, in accordance with the provisions of Section 199 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and despite a letter of objection, the Board confirm Tree Preservation Order No G.123 with modifications removing three horse chestnut trees T1, T3 and T5 within the grounds of St Vincent College, Gosport.

1. Background

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's decision whether to confirm, confirm with modifications, or not to confirm the Tree Preservation Order where an objection has been received

2. Report

- 2.1 The Tree Preservation Order G.123 dated 17 January 2012 relating to six horse chestnut trees at St Vincent College has been made as a provisional order.
- 2.2 The Order has been made because in the opinion of the Head of Development Control the trees make a significant positive contribution to the character and appearance of the local environment.
- 2.3 Notice of making of the Order has been served as required by the Regulations on the owners of the land concerned. Any person wishing to object to the Order had a period of one month to submit that objection for consideration by the Council.

- 2.4 The Regulations provide that if a Tree Preservation Order is to continue in effect it must be confirmed by the Authority within a period of six months from the date on which the Order is made and after consideration of any objection received.
- 2.5 This six month period has been extended in this case because new Regulations relating to tree preservation orders were introduced on 1 April 2012. The transitional provisions in the new Regulations allow any provisional tree preservation orders made but not confirmed on 1 April to be extended to a maximum of six months from that date.
- 2.6 One objection to the Tree Preservation Order was received. The issues raised were as follows:
- The St Vincent estate is currently being upgraded.
 - The upgrading works will require the opening up of some areas.
 - The Horse Chestnut trees have outgrown their space, have impacted the ground and therefore made a very unpleasant environment.
 - The removal of some trees would be favoured to free up some space outside of the Sports Centre.
- 2.7 The provisional Tree Preservation Order covered six trees located within the site. These trees were considered both individually, and as a group, to contribute to the visual amenities of the area. However, upon a detailed inspection of the trees, three were found to be diseased meaning their life expectancy was short. Consequently it is proposed that these three trees be removed from the Tree Preservation Order (T1, T3 and T5) leaving only the three healthy trees under its protection.
- 2.8 Members may decline to confirm the Order or they may confirm the Order with or without modifications. The proposal before Members is for the TPO to be confirmed with the one modification that three of the trees be removed from the Order as explained above.

3. Risk Assessment

- 3.1 The trees may be in danger of being removed if the Order is not confirmed.

Financial implications:	None
Legal implications:	As set out in the report
Service Improvement Plan implications:	None

Corporate Plan	None
Risk Assessment	See paragraph 3.1
Background papers:	Tree Preservation Order G.123
Appendices/Enclosures:	None
Report author/Lead Officer:	Hilary Hudson, Solicitor, Legal Services 023 9254 5611

GOSPORT BOROUGH COUNCIL – REGULATORY BOARD

25th September 2012

ITEMS WITH RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Copies of drawings and accompanying planning applications referred to in this schedule will be made available for inspection by Members from 5.00 pm immediately prior to the meeting. Unless otherwise advised, these plans will be displayed in the room in which the Regulatory Board is to be held.
2. The number of objections and representations indicated in the schedule are correct at the time the recommendations were formulated. Should any representations be made after this date, these will be notified to the Regulatory Board during the officer presentation.
3. Copies of all representations received from the public will be made available for inspection by Members in the same way as drawings will be made available, referred to in Note 1 above.
4. An index of planning applications within this schedule can be found overleaf, together with a summary of each recommendation.

INDEX					
<u>Item</u>	<u>Page No</u>	<u>Appl. No.</u>	<u>Address</u>		<u>Recommendation</u>
01.	03-06	K18091	9 The Haven Gosport Hampshire PO12 2BD		Grant Permission
02.	07-10	K18099	26 Highcliffe Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 3RD		Grant Permission

ITEM NUMBER: 01.
APPLICATION NUMBER: K18091
APPLICANT: Mr Lewis Mansfield
DATE REGISTERED: 23.05.2012

DEMOLITION OF GARAGE AND ERECTION OF PART SINGLE AND PART TWO STOREY SIDE/REAR EXTENSION (as amended by plans received 02.07.12 and 11.07.12 and amplified by letter received 26.07.12)
9 The Haven Gosport Hampshire PO12 2BD

The Site and the proposal

The application property is the northern half of a pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings located at the terminus of The Haven cul-de-sac, backing onto the Haslar Lake tidal inlet. The area is characterised by semi-detached properties of similar ages, design and scale and a number of properties have been extended to the rear in the past. The application property is finished in white render and has a hipped, tiled roof. It has a 2.2m deep single storey rear extension adjacent to the south eastern boundary with a 3.4m deep conservatory alongside. The site is generally triangular in shape and is approximately 5.5m wide at the front. It is 20m deep along the southern side boundary and approximately 40m deep on the northern side boundary. It is enclosed by 1.8m high fencing. There is a detached single garage adjacent to the north western boundary.

The adjoining property to the south, number 10 The Haven, has a two storey rear extension that projects approximately 2.8m beyond the rear of the original dwelling. It has a hipped roof and is set in from the north western boundary at first floor level by approximately 1m. It has a centrally placed first floor bedroom window in the rear north east facing elevation and a door and two windows at ground floor level that serve the kitchen. The rear garden of this property is approximately 8m deep and contains semi-mature planting along the boundaries.

The adjacent property to the north west, number 8 The Haven, is positioned at an approximate 70° angle to the application property and the front elevation is set a minimum of 4m away. It has a flat roofed, two storey, extension on the side elevation facing the application site that is set back from the front elevation of the property. There are also single storey, flat roofed, extensions that project in excess of 5m beyond the rear elevation. There are two ground floor windows and a single obscure glazed first floor window in the side extension facing onto the application site. The first floor window serves a bathroom. The southern elevation also contains a pedestrian door. This property similarly has a detached single garage alongside the common boundary, adjacent to the garage on the application site.

It was originally proposed to erect a two storey side/rear extension following the demolition of the garage and the existing rear extension and conservatory. It would have been 5.2m deep and 10m wide, projecting 5m beyond the side elevation of the original dwelling. However, to address concerns raised regarding the scale of this extension, amended plans have now been received which show a rear extension that would also wrap around the side elevation, with a 1.8m wide and 2.3m deep single storey element forward of this on the north western elevation. The two storey section would extend 3.9m beyond the rear of the original dwelling, projecting 0.9m beyond the rear elevation of the adjoining property. It would be 7.5m wide at the rear, extending 2.5m beyond the north western side elevation. The two storey element would be set back from the front elevation by 5.3m and the single storey section by 3m. The single storey section would contain the main access door to the dwelling and would similarly have a hipped roof. There would be a set of folding doors in the rear elevation of the two storey element with two first floor bedroom windows over, a ground floor window in the side (north western) elevation serving a utility room and a window in the first floor front (south western) elevation serving a bedroom. There would be an additional bedroom created as a result of the proposal. The extension would be constructed using matching materials.

The application is supported by a planning statement.

Relevant Planning History

Nil

Relevant Policies

Gosport Borough Local Plan Review, 2006:

R/T11

Access and Parking

R/DP1

General Standards of Development within the Urban Area

Consultations

Local Highway Authority

No objection. The applicant is proposing no alteration to, or additional provision for, car parking. The applicant should ensure that sufficient parking provision is made to avoid any parking with the carriageway on The Haven.

Response to Public Advertisement

6 letters of objection (to original plans)

Issues raised:-

- dust, noise and traffic/parking disturbance during works
- not all neighbours were notified of development
- given scale of extension, the properties could be subdivided at a later date
- loss of view
- loss of light
- loss of outlook
- extension is too large for property
- extension would result in terracing effect
- extension is out of character with the area
- access and parking issues in locality

6 letters of objection (to amended plans)

Issues raised:-

- approval would set a precedent for other extensions
- plans are inaccurate and unclear
- dust, noise and traffic/parking disturbance during works
- not all neighbours were notified of development
- given scale of extension, the properties could be subdivided at a later date
- loss of view
- loss of light
- loss of outlook
- extension is too large for property
- extension would result in terracing effect
- extension is out of character with the area
- access and parking issues in locality

1 letter of support (to amended plans)

Issues raised:-

- proposal includes measures to reduce amount of disturbance during works
- off street parking will be provided

Principal Issues

1. A degree of disturbance during building works is inevitable, however, any statutory noise or dust nuisance would be dealt with under Environmental Health legislation and should the public highway be obstructed during works this would be a matter for the Police. The application has been advertised by the Local Planning Authority for public comment by way of letters sent to neighbouring properties within 5m of the application site, in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. The application forms and submitted plans are of adequate detail and the plans show the relationships between the properties, and, in conjunction with the site visit, are sufficient to enable the application to be determined. The subdivision of the property in the future would require a further application for planning permission and all planning applications are considered on their own merits. There is no right to a view under planning legislation. The main issues in this case, therefore, are the acceptability of the design of the extension and the impact on the visual amenity of the locality, the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings and highway and pedestrian safety in the locality.

2. There are other examples of two storey rear extensions in The Haven and the adjacent property to the northwest, number 8, has an existing two storey side extension. As such, the development would not be out of character with the area. The proposed extension has a subservient design, is set back from the front elevation of the property and would be constructed using matching materials. Furthermore, the property occupies a relatively substantial plot and given the scale of the existing dwelling, the extension is of appropriate size and a sufficient amount of garden area would be retained to the rear. The hipped roof would match that of the original dwelling and given the size, position and design of the extension and the orientation of the properties, the extension would not be readily visible from The Haven or Little Anglesey Road to the north, beyond Stoke Lake. A visual gap in excess of 4m would also be retained between the application property and number 8, and in conjunction with the orientation of the properties, the proposal would not result in a terracing effect. Under the circumstances, the development would not have a harmful impact on the appearance of the dwelling or the character and visual amenity of the locality and complies with Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

3. The proposed extension would only project 0.9m beyond the two storey rear extension on the adjoining property to the south. Therefore, given the orientation of the properties, in conjunction with the location and scale of the proposed extension, there would be no harmful impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of that property. Furthermore, having regard to the position of the windows and the orientation of and separation distances between the application property and the neighbouring property to the northwest, number 8, the extension would not harmfully increase the propensity to overlook this property, and would not have a harmful impact in terms of loss of light or outlook, particularly given that the opposing first floor window of that property is obscure glazed and serves a bathroom. Having regard to the above, the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings and would comply with Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

4. The access to and from the site remains unchanged. Despite the loss of the garage, sufficient parking provision is available on the site and a condition is proposed to ensure that sufficient parking remains available within the curtilage of the dwelling once the development is completed. As such, the proposal complies with Policy R/T11 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant Permission**Reason(s) for granting permission:**

1. Having regard to the provisions of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and all other material considerations, the proposed development is acceptable in this location. It is acceptable in design terms and will not have a harmful impact on the amenities of the area or the occupiers of the neighbouring properties or highway and pedestrian safety and, as such, complies with Policies R/DP1 and R/T11 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

Subject to the following condition(s):-

1. The development hereby permitted must be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.

Reason - To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Sheet 1 of 12 Issue 02, Sheet 2 of 12 Issue 02, Sheet 3 of 12 Issue 02, Sheet 4 of 12 Issue 02, Sheet 5 of 12 Issue 02, Sheet 6 of 12 Issue 02, Sheet 7 of 12 Issue 02, Sheet 8 of 12 Issue 02, Sheet 9 of 12 Issue 02, Sheet 10 of 12 Issue 02, Sheet 11 of 12 Issue 02 and Sheet 12 of 12 Issue 02

Reason - To ensure that the development is completed satisfactorily in all respects and to comply with Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

3. The materials to be used shall match in type, colour and texture, those on the existing dwelling unless otherwise agreed, in writing, with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To ensure satisfactory visual relationship of the new development to the existing, and to comply with Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

4. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until areas for the parking of two vehicles have been provided and these areas shall be surfaced and subsequently retained and kept available at all times for this purpose in accordance with a scheme that has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Planning Authority.

Reason – In the interests of highway safety and to ensure adequate car parking provision is provided and retained within the site and to comply with Policy R/T11 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

ITEM NUMBER: 02.
APPLICATION NUMBER: K18099
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs P Jacobs
DATE REGISTERED: 25.05.2012

ERECTION OF SINGLE AND TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS (as amended by plans received 23.07.12 and 7.09.12)
26 Highcliffe Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 3RD

The Site and the proposal

The application property is a two storey terraced dwelling of brick construction under a tiled roof. The site is located in an established residential area on the western side of Highcliffe Road and is approximately 21 metres in length and 9 metres in width. The rear of the site is bounded by fencing approximately 1.8 metres in height. There is an uneven building line to the dwellings on the western side of Highcliffe Road whereby the front, eastern elevation of number 26 is set forward of the neighbour to the north by 1.7 metres and the neighbour to the south by 1 metre. The rear elevation of number 26 is staggered whereby the southern end is set behind the northern end of the rear elevation by approximately 2 metres. The rear elevation of the dwelling is set behind those neighbouring properties to the north and south by 2 metres.

The adjacent dwelling to the north, number 24, is of similar construction. The site is approximately 21 metres in depth and 5 metres in width. On the rear ground floor elevation of the dwelling is a kitchen door sited to the southern end and a kitchen window located on the northern end. On the first floor are two windows and the northernmost window is obscure glazed. The rear first floor window at the southern end is set in approximately 0.9 metres from the south west corner of number 24.

Beyond number 24 to the north is number 22 which is of similar size and construction to number 24. On the rear elevation of the dwelling is an addition located on the southern boundary approximately 3 metres in depth and 3 metres in height under a mono pitched roof that slopes away from the rear of the dwelling.

The adjoining dwelling to the south, number 28, is of similar size and construction to number 26. On the rear, northern corner of the dwelling is a conservatory approximately 3 metres in depth, 3 metres in width and 3.5 metres in height, with the northern elevation sited on the northern boundary. The northern elevation of the conservatory has 4no. obscure glazed windows positioned approximately 2 metres above ground level. There is glazing along the full height and width of the western elevation of the conservatory. On the first floor of the rear elevation of the dwelling there are two windows.

It was originally proposed to erect a two storey and single storey extension to the rear of the dwelling. The two storey extension would have been 3.4 metres in depth, 6.6 metres in width, 4.6 metres in height to the eaves and 7.4 metres to the ridge of the roof. On the ground floor of the two storey extension there would have been a window positioned 0.5 metres from the south west corner and 3no. windows were to be installed in the first floor of the west elevation. The single storey extension was to be sited on the rear, western elevation of the two storey extension. The northern elevation of the single storey extension was to be sited on the boundary shared with number 24. The southern elevation of the proposed single storey extension would have been set back 1.5 metres from the south western corner of the proposed two storey extension. The single storey addition would have been 1.6 metres in depth, 5 metres in width, 2.3 metres in height to the eaves and 3.7 metres in height to the ridge of the mono pitched roof. On the western elevation of the single storey element there would have been a sliding patio door with full length glazing.

To address concerns relating to overshadowing, amended plans have been submitted altering both the proposed two storey and proposed single storey extensions. The dimensions of the two storey extension would remain unchanged with the northern elevation being sited on the boundary

between numbers 24 and 26. The fenestration of the western elevation of the proposed two storey extension has changed. On the ground floor of the two storey extension would be 2no. windows both positioned 0.4 metres from the corners of the rear western elevation on either side of the single storey extension. On the first floor of the two storey extension would be 2no. windows both positioned 1.2 metres from the corners of the rear west elevation. The single storey extension has been reduced to 4.3 metres in width, 1.6 metres in depth 2.2 metres in height to the eaves and 3.5 metres in height to the ridge of the hipped roof. The proposed single storey extension has been positioned centrally to the western elevation of the two storey extension and as a result, the northern elevation of the single storey extension would be set back 1.2 metres from the boundary between numbers 24 and 26. The southern elevation of the single storey extension would be set back 2.1 metres from the boundary between numbers 26 and 28. Both the north western and south western corners of the single storey extension have angled corners with windows. Windows are also proposed on the northern and southern elevations of the proposed single storey extension. A glazed door is proposed to be installed on the western elevation. Both extensions would be of brick and tiled construction to match the existing dwelling. The windows and door of the proposed extensions would be white UPVC to match the existing dwelling.

Relevant Planning History

Nil

Relevant Policies

Gosport Borough Local Plan Review, 2006:
R/DP1
General Standards of Development within the Urban Area

Consultations

Nil

Response to Public Advertisement

1 letter of objection (to original plans)

Issues raised:-

- addition on the rear of number 22 Highcliffe Road is not on the drawings and elevations
- overshadowing to the rear windows of number 24
- loss of outlook from rear windows of number 24
- noise during construction
- extension would join the southern elevation of number 24
- possibility of the later addition of windows to the northern elevation of the two storey component of the extension

1 letter of objection (to amended plans)

Issues Raised:-

- overshadowing to the rear windows of number 24
- loss of outlook from rear windows of number 24
- extension would join the southern elevation of number 24

Principal Issues

1. There is no requirement for an applicant to indicate additions on other properties as part of a planning application and during the site visit the case officer assesses the surrounding area and relationships between adjoining properties. A degree of disturbance during building works is inevitable, however, any statutory noise nuisance would be dealt with under Environmental Health Legislation. The issue relating to the proposal being joined to the wall of number 24 would be dealt with under the Party Wall Act and is not a material planning consideration in this instance. A condition preventing the construction of any windows to the northern elevation of the two storey

extension without the prior consent of the Local Planning Authority is proposed to protect mutual privacy. The main issues in this case are the acceptability of the design of the extensions, the impact on the visual amenity of the locality and the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining dwellings in terms of overshadowing, loss of outlook and loss of privacy.

2. The proposed extensions have been designed with materials sympathetic to both the existing dwelling and neighbouring properties. The scale, height and massing of the extensions are in keeping with the residential character of the area. The proposal is therefore acceptable in design terms and will not have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the dwelling or the character and visual amenity of the area. The development is, therefore, acceptable and complies with Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

3. The two storey extension projects 2 metres beyond the rear elevation of number 28 and would not project past the conservatory on the rear of number 28. There is a separation distance of 1 metre between the southern elevation of the two storey element and the southern boundary onto which the northern elevation of the conservatory of number 28 is sited. The proposed single storey extension projects past the rear conservatory of the neighbour to the south, number 28, by approximately 1.5 metres. In view of this and the existing boundary treatment, there would be no mutual overlooking between the occupiers of the proposed single storey extension, the conservatory and rear garden of number 28. The proposed extensions would be on the western elevation of number 26. This orientation means there would be no significant impact on the property to the south, number 28, in terms of overshadowing. In view of this, the distance between the windows and the existing boundary treatment between numbers 26 and 28 there would be no harmful overshadowing, loss of privacy to or loss of outlook from, the occupiers of number 28.

4. As the two storey extension would project beyond the rear elevation of number 24 by only 1.2 metres and the roof of the two storey extension would slope away from number 24, there would be no harmful overshadowing to the rear of number 24. As the single storey extension is set in from the northern boundary by 1.2 metres and projects beyond the rear elevation of number 24 by approximately 3.2 metres there would be no mutual overlooking between the windows of the extension and the rear elevation of number 24. In view of this, there would be no harmful overshadowing, loss of privacy or loss of outlook for the occupiers of number 24. The development is, therefore, acceptable and complies with Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant Permission

Reason(s) for granting permission:

1. Having regard to the provisions of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and all other material considerations, the development, as proposed, is acceptable in this location. It is acceptable in design terms and will not have a harmful impact on the visual amenity of the area or the occupiers of the neighbouring properties and, as such, complies with Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

Subject to the following condition(s):-

1. The development hereby permitted must be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date on which this permission granted.

Reason - To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Plan 1, Plan 2.

Reason - To ensure that the development is completed satisfactorily in all respects and to comply with Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

3. The materials to be used shall match in type, colour and texture, those on the existing dwelling unless otherwise agreed, in writing, with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To ensure satisfactory visual relationship of the new development to the existing, and to comply with Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows shall be constructed in the northern elevation of the two storey extension hereby permitted, without the prior consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - In order to protect the amenity of the occupiers of the adjoining property and to comply with Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.