

**A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD
WAS HELD ON 5 MARCH 2013**

The Mayor (Councillor Dickson) (ex-officio); Chairman of the P & O Board (Councillor Hook (ex-officio); Councillors Ms Ballard (P), Beavis (P), Carter CR (P), Ms Diffey (P), Farr (P), Gill (P), Henshaw (P), Mrs Hook (P), Jessop, Langdon (P), Ronayne (P) and Wright (P).

66 APOLOGIES

An apology for inability to attend the meeting was received from the Mayor.

67 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

68 MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Regulatory Board meeting held on 10th December 2012 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a true and correct record.

69 DEPUTATIONS

Deputation had been received on the following applications:

- 11/00366/FULL – 4A Prideaux-Brune Avenue, Gosport
- 13/00007/FULL – 159 Elson Road, Gosport
- 13/00004/FULL – 34 Carnarvon Road, Gosport

70 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been received

PART II

71 REPORT OF THE BOROUGH SOLICITOR

The Borough Solicitor submitted a report on applications received for planning consent setting out the recommendation in each case (a copy of which is attached in the Minute Book as Appendix 'A').

RESOLVED: That the decisions be taken on each application for planning consent as detailed below:

**72 11/00366/FULL – RETENTION OF AND FURTHER WORKS TO
ERECT A DETACHED OUTBUILDING (AMENDED MATERIAL
DETAILS RECEIVED 22.11.12)
4A PRIDEAUX-BRUNE AVENUE, GOSPORT, HAMPSHIRE**

Members were advised that there were no updates to the Report.

Mr Keith Salmon was invited to address the Board. He advised that he was the owner of 8 Prideaux-Brune Avenue and that he wished for photographs to be circulated to Members detailing the views of the detached outbuilding.

It was confirmed that the applicant was not present upon the distribution of the photographs.

Mr Salmon advised that he would like the Board to refuse the planning application on the basis that the applicant had not taken into account any neighbours views, concerns, or impact that the building may have on surrounding properties.

Mr Salmon felt that the garden was too small to accommodate a large imposing structure and expressed concerns that the fence on the north side may collapse.

Mr Salmon further felt that there was insufficient space around the building for on-going maintenance works.

Mr Salmon feared, whilst the final works were being carried out, the property would become a 'dumping ground' with a build up of rubbish.

Members questioned the size of the structure and the footprint of the area that it covered and were advised that the outbuilding did not cover more than 50% of the total garden area which included the front and rear garden area.

A Member expressed concern as to why there was no guttering or soakaway on the outbuilding and the possibility of roof leaks and water draining onto the neighbouring property.

Members were advised that the provision of gutters was a matter for Building Regulations and, as detailed in the Officer's report, it was felt that surface water would not encroach onto the neighbouring property and this was therefore not a matter to be covered by planning condition and would be addressed by Building Regulations, if required, for this structure.

It was proposed that a site visit be made.

RESOLVED: That application 11/00366/FULL – 4A Prideaux-Brune Avenue be deferred for a site visit.

**73 13/00007/FULL – ERECTION OF TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION
(AS AMENDED BY PLAN RECEIVED 08.02.13 AND AMPLIFIED BY
LETTER RECEIVED 19.02.13)
159 ELSON ROAD, GOSPORT, HAMPSHIRE**

Members were advised that there were no updates to the report.

Mr Thomas Mitchell was invited to address the Board. He advised that he was the owner of 161 Elson Road and wished for photographs to be circulated to Members of the Board.

Mr Mitchell advised that, although he had sympathy with the applicant's desire to make the neighbouring property habitable, he felt that it was already the largest in comparison to other properties within the vicinity.

Mr Mitchell felt that the proposed two storey rear extension would be too large and overbearing for the area and that he would see a reduction of afternoon light, loss of privacy and overshadowing to his property.

Mr Mitchell also felt that a comparison to number 153 Elson Road was not a consideration when determining this application due to this property being a two bedroom cottage.

The Applicant Mr Batt was invited to address the Board and advised Members that no changes would be made to the property view of no 159 Elson Road and felt that the suggested loss of light or overshadowing would not occur.

Members were further advised that the planned re-location of the bathroom to the rear side of the property and the installation of obscured glazing would provide more privacy to the property and surrounding properties.

Further to a question from a Member, Mr Batt advised that he would not be currently residing at this property.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board were advised that there was a shared access point and that this had no bearing on the neighbouring property.

RESOLVED: That application 13/00007/FULL - 159 Elson Road be approved subject to the conditions in the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive, for the following reasons:

1. That 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 and, as such, complies with Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review

**74 13/00004/FULL – ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE AND PART
SINGLE PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS (AS AMENDED
BY PLAN RECEIVED 18.02.13)
34 CARNARVON ROAD, GOSPORT, HAMPSHIRE**

Members were advised that there were no updates to the report.

Mr Stephen Pestell was invited to address the Board, and advised that he was the owner of number 32 Carnarvon Road.

Mr Pestell expressed concerns with the noise that would be generated and that it would have a significant impact on his autistic son whose bedroom was directly adjacent to the proposed construction.

Mr Pestell advised the Board that he felt that there were no plans in place to facilitate working at heights, maintenance of guttering or ongoing alterations that may be required.

Mr Pestell also advised that no access would be permitted to pebbledash the extension which subsequently meant that the extension would have a different finish to the rest of the area and be out of character.

Mr Pestell further went on to advise that the proposed side extension would be overbearing and ultimately incur loss of light and privacy within his property.

In answer to a Member's question relating to the proposed footings affecting the conservatory at number 32, the Board were advised that this was not a planning consideration and would be dealt with under Building Regulations.

A Member queried the '45 degree' guideline. The 45 degree relationship was explained and Members were advised that each planning application was considered on its own individual merits and there was no such requirement within the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

The Applicant was invited to address the Board and advised that the purpose of the proposed extension was to accommodate the growth of their family.

It was further advised that previous plans had been altered to try and accommodate their needs and minimise disruptions to neighbours but that ultimately space for the family was required.

RESOLVED: That application 13/00004/FULL – 34 Carnarvon Road be approved subject to the conditions in the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive, for the following reasons:

1. That 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 and, as such, complies with Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport

Borough Local Plan Review.

75 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

The meeting concluded at: 6:47pm