

**A MEETING OF THE EXTRAORDINARY REGULATORY BOARD
WAS HELD ON 7 MAY 2013**

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

85 APOLOGIES

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting were received from the Mayor.

86 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- Councillor Gill declared a non pecuniary interest in Item 5 of the agenda and advised that he was on the Governing body of St Vincent College and that he would remain in the room, but take no part in discussion or voting on the application.

87 DEPUTATIONS

Deputations had been received on the following applications:

- K18151 – Gosport Waterside – The Chairman asked the Board, under Standing Order 6.3.6, to consider receiving the deputation despite notice under Standing Order 3.5.1 not being given. The Board agreed to receive the deputation notwithstanding the notice under Standing Order 3.5.1 had not been given.
- 12/00499/FULL – Land Adjoining 24 Ashburton Road, Gosport

88 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been received.

**89 REPORT ON CONSULTATION FROM FAREHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL ON
PLANNING APPLICATION FOR FAREHAM COLLEGE CENTRE OF
EXCELLENCE FOR ENGINEERING, MANUFACTURING AND ADVANCED
SKILLS TRAINING (CEMAST) AT DAEDALUS**

Councillor Gill advised that he was on the Governing body of St Vincent College; he remained in the room, but took no part in the discussion or voting on the consultation.

Consideration was given to a report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive on the consultation from Fareham Borough Council on a Planning Application for Fareham College Centre of Excellence for Engineering, Manufacturing and Advanced Skills Training (CEMAST) at Daedalus.

It was advised that original design plans for the college building had been changed. Members acknowledged that the design of the building proposed should be of a significant character to enhance the area and set the standard for future development on the site.

Concerns were raised over the teaching of automotive engineering and the potential closure of the existing facility at Fareham Reach. It was expressed that the proposal should be an opportunity to develop aviation, marine engineering and advanced technology.

An amendment to the recommendation was proposed, seconded and approved.

RESOLVED: That Fareham Borough Council be advised that Gosport Borough Council has serious concerns as set out in Section 2 of the report in respect of the following:

- a) The design of the building;

- b) The provision of space for a landmark feature at the entrance to the Enterprise Zone;
- c) The appropriateness of the proposal in respect of the Enterprise Zone provisions.

And that Gosport Borough Council has concerns as set out in Section 2 of the report in respect of the following:

- d) Highways matters; and
- e) Ecological issues.

90 K18151 – OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS TO CREATE A MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT WITH UP TO 150 NO. RESIDENTIAL UNITS (CLASS C3), INCLUDING A RESIDENTIAL TOWER BLOCK, A HOTEL WITH UP TO 75 NO. BEDROOMS (CLASS C1) AND FLEXIBLE GROUND FLOOR USES WITH FLOORSPACE OF UP TO 1250 SQ. METRES, INCLUDING RETAIL SHOPS, RESTAURANT AND PUBLIC HOUSE (CLASSES A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1 AND D1) – WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED (AS AMENDED BY INDICATIVE LAYOUT AND BUILDING PARAMETER PLANS RECEIVED 16.04.13 AND 17.04.13 AND ADDENDUMS TO DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT RECEIVED 16.04.13 AND DRAFT CAR PARKING STRATEGY RECEIVED 15.03.13)

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application K18151.

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

Mr Haddock was invited to address the board whereby he advised that he had operated a boat yard business from an adjacent site for 40 years.

Mr Haddock advised that Gosport Boat Yard operated 7 days a week and whilst he acknowledged that the proposed development was much needed in Gosport, he felt that it was sited in the wrong place and could create conflict between residential and commercial occupiers. Mr Haddock further expressed concerns regarding pedestrian access to the site and felt that the design was not workable with the volume of traffic in the area.

Mr Haddock advised that the proposed car parking provision was inadequate and expressed concerns regarding the proposed loss of existing on-street car parking.

Mr Haddock further raised concerns regarding the stability of the ground and advised Members that the site was within the flood zone. Members were advised by Mr Haddock that there was a condition imposed on Gosport Boat Yard to undertake repairs of the quay walls. Mr Haddock queried whether the proposed development would also have to contribute to the on-going maintenance of the flood defences.

The applicant, Mr Benge, and Planning Consultant, Mr Hall, were invited to address the board.

Mr Benge advised Members that he had owned the site for 14 years, during which he had engaged in extensive discussions with Gosport Borough Council to progress the regeneration of the waterfront and address the condition of the buildings that currently occupied the site, which have begun to deteriorate over the years.

Mr Benge further advised that he had been working closely with occupiers currently on the site to extend leases and felt that with the redevelopment of the site and the creation of 180 additional jobs, that this would represent a trigger for the regeneration of Gosport and represent a catalyst of future investment into the Borough. Mr Benge advised that one of the previous operators at the site had already relocated to another facility in the Borough, thereby safeguarding existing jobs for residents of the Borough.

Extraordinary Regulatory Board
7 May 2013

Mr Hall advised Members that ongoing ground investigations were being carried out and that consultation with the Southern Coastal Partnership in relation to the flood defence levels had taken place and measures had been incorporated into the indicative design.

Members queried whether there were any restrictions in place to ensure the commercial units would not to be left empty. It was clarified that this would be addressed at the detailed planning stage.

Further to a question raised by a Member regarding the increased generation of traffic on Mumby Road, Mr Hall advised that consultation had taken place with Hampshire County Council (Highways) and the Borough Council's Head of Traffic and Transport. Members were advised that the proposed quantum of car parking at the site had been increased so that the residential parking allocation would comply with the average car ownership levels in the Town ward, as indicated by the 2011 Census information. Mr Hall advised that some of the car parking could be accommodated within undercroft and basement car parking areas. Mr Hall clarified that there would be no net loss of short stay parking.

Members were advised that the application had been submitted in Outline form, with all matters reserved.

RESOLVED: that application K18151 be granted Outline planning permission subject to:

- a) Appropriate conditions covering those matters set out in Appendix A of the report and appropriate planning obligations to secure the provision of or a contribution towards improvements to the highway; traffic, transport and pedestrian safety; open space; educational facilities; affordable housing; ecological mitigation measures; and a training and employment plan.

For the following reason:

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, will provide a mix of uses that will positively contribute to the regeneration for the area, will provide employment opportunities and will enhance the character and visual amenity of the locality. The quantum of development could be accommodated on the site so as not to harm the historic or architectural setting of the adjacent Locally Listed Building, highway safety, or the interests of archaeology, land contamination, flooding, nature conservation, noise, drainage, energy efficiency. Adequate provision is made for open space, affordable housing and training and employment, in accordance with the National and Local Policies set out within Section 5 of the report.

- b) Delegate Authority to the Head of Development Control in consultation with the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive to determine the appropriate conditions and appropriate planning obligations.

PART II

91 REPORT OF THE BOROUGH SOLICITOR

The Borough Solicitor submitted a report on applications received for planning consent setting out the recommendation in each case.

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

**92 12/004999/FULL – ERECTION OF 1 NO. THREE BEDROOM DETACHED DWELLING, DETACHED GARAGE, GARDEN STORE AND ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING (CONSERVATION AREA) (AS AMENDED BY PLANS RECEIVED 15.02.13 AND 11.04.13 AND AMPLIFIED BY LETTERS RECEIVED 21.01.13 AND 18.02.13
LAND ADJOINING 24 ASHBURTON ROAD GOSPORT PO12 2LJ**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 12/00499/FULL Land adjoining 24 Ashburton Road. Members were advised that a site visit had taken place at 3.30pm whereby Members viewed the

Extraordinary Regulatory Board
7 May 2013

application site and also viewed from the rear garden of number 26 Ashburton Road.

Mr Milligan was invited to address the Board and circulated photographs.

Mr Milligan advised that he would like the Board to refuse the planning application on the basis that although he accepted the principle of the development, he felt that the proposed dwelling would be too large and overbearing for the residential area and that he would see a reduction of light, loss of privacy and overshadowing to his property.

Mr Milligan further advised the Board that the proposal would dominate his property with a 30 square metre roof terrace.

The applicant, Mr Knott, was invited to address the Board whereby he advised that he had lived at number 24 Ashburton Road for 33 years. Mr Knott advised Members that the original dwelling was now too large and he was proposing a smaller dwelling to accommodate his current needs.

Mr Knott circulated a photograph detailing perspective views of the new dwelling and advised that the picture clearly illustrated the spatial relationship between neighbouring properties.

Mr Knott advised the Board that he had sought advice from the Conservation and Design Officer who had expressed a view that a contemporary design would be in keeping with the 60, 70, and 80's features that are currently sited in Ashburton Road.

Mr Knott advised that the amended plans submitted addressed the previous privacy concerns. .

Mr Knott further advised that the second floor terrace would be a sitting area for the summer months only.

In answer to a Member's question, Officers explained why a contemporary approach was appropriate and acceptable in this instance. .

RESOLVED: That application 12/00499/FULL – Land adjoining 24 Ashburton Road be approved subject to Section 106 agreement relating to the payment of a commuted sum towards the provision and/or improvement of outdoor playing space and the payment of a commuted sum towards the provision of transport infrastructure and subject to the conditions in the report of the Borough Solicitor and the Deputy Chief Executive for the following reasons:

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 character and visual amenity of the area. It will preserve the character and appearance of the Alverstoke Conservation Area and will enhance the character and appearance of the Anglesey Conservation Area and will not have a harmful impact on the amenities of nearby or prospective residents or the interests of nature conservation. Adequate provision is made for open space, transport infrastructure, car and cycle parking and refuse storage and appropriate measures are in place to manage land contamination and flood risk. As such the development complies with the NPPF and Policies R/DP1, R/BH1, R/H4, R/T11, R/DP3, R/T4, R/OS8, R/OS13 and R/ENV5 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

93 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business

The meeting concluded at: 19:16 pm

CHAIRMAN