

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

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

It was reported that in accordance with Standing Orders, Councillor Kimber had been nominated to replace Councillor Carter (CR) and Councillor Chegwyn had been nominated to replace Councillor Diffey for this meeting.

**7 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting were received from Councillor Hook Ballard, Diffey and Carter CR.

**8 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

**9 DEPUTATIONS**

Deputations had been received on the following applications:

- 13/00115/FULL – 178 Portsmouth Road & 3-5 Elmore Road, Gosport
- 13/00067/FULL – Land to Rear of 206-216 Brockhurst Road, Gosport
- 13/00009/FULL – 51 Western Way, Gosport

**10 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

No public questions had been received.

**PART II**

**11 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:

**12 13/00115/FULL – DEMOLITION OF 2 NO. DWELLINGS (3 AND 5  
ELMORE ROAD) AND ERECTION OF EXTENSION TO PROVIDE NEW  
WORKSHOP FACILITY AND INSTALLATION OF CLADDING  
178 PORTSMOUTH ROAD & 3-5 ELMORE ROAD, LEE-ON-THE-SOLENT**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 13/00115/FULL.

Members were advised that there had been 1 additional letter of support received in respect of the application.

Mr Littlefield was invited to address the Board whereby he expressed concerns of the impact the proposed extension to the existing industrial unit would have on the residential area, which he felt would be overbearing and out of character.

Mr Littlefield circulated a photograph detailing the current car parking congestion within Elmore Road and advised that the parking situation had deteriorated since the implementation of the previous extension.

Mr Littlefield felt that if this application was approved, traffic activity would be significantly increased, with the loss of further parking; concerns were also expressed over the adjacent alley being used for access purposes which was close to a school route.

Mr Littlefield advised that substantial noise was generated daily from the site and expressed concerns that the proposed inclusion of four additional roller shutter doors to the west elevation serving the workshops along with the existing rear door could potentially create further disturbances to neighbouring properties.

The Agent, Mr Haberfield, was invited to address the Board whereby he advised that he was speaking on behalf of the owners of Fine Cars Limited and that the application was being submitted for the survival of a well established local business.

Members were advised that the site had been used as a purpose built workshop and showroom display with vehicle sales since 1934 and that Fine Cars Limited were a long standing Kia dealer, currently under termination of the franchise due to not being able to meet the minimum standards of Kia motors as the existing showroom did not meet the display area requirements.

Mr Haberfield further advised that Fine Cars have extensively attempted to relocate to accommodate the expansion on the business but had so far been unsuccessful in securing a suitable site as they do not meet the criteria of the enterprise zone at Daedalus with the only option left was to develop the existing site.

Further to a question by a Member, it was advised that potentially ten MOTS' could take place per day and although activities would increase, the development if approved would allow many activities to be carried out inside the building alleviating the current parking situation.

**RESOLVED:** That application 13/00115/FULL - 178 Portsmouth Road & 3-5 Elmore Road, be refused for the following reason(s):-

1. The proposals would result in the inappropriate extension of a non-conforming commercial use into the adjacent residential area and would, by reason of the proposed extension's size, location, excessive mass and industrial appearance and the activity generated by its use, harm the residential character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies R/DP1, R/EMP5 and R/ENV10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.
2. The proposed development, by reason of the close proximity of the new access, parking area and associated activity to the adjacent houses and gardens, notably 7 Elmore Road to the north, would result in vehicle movements and activities over and above those normally found in a residential area, which would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupiers of those residential properties in terms of noise and disturbance. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to Policies R/DP1, R/EMP5 and R/ENV10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.
3. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed use of the extension would not have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and the wider area. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies R/DP1, R/EMP5 and R/ENV10 of the

Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

4. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the level of parking proposed is adequate to meet the parking demands of the development and would not have a detrimental impact on highway safety and the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residents, contrary to Policy R/T11 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**13                    13/00067/FULL – ERECTION OF 4 NO. DETACHED BUNGALOWS WITH  
ASSOCIATED ACCESS, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING (AS AMENDED  
BY PLANS RECEIVED 21.03.13, 26.03.13 AND 17.05.13  
LAND TO REAR OF 206-216 BROCKHURST ROAD, GOSPORT**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 13/00067/FULL.

Members were advised that an additional plan to show large vehicle tracking within the site had been submitted by the applicant. The Highway Authority had considered the plan and advised that it had been demonstrated that an 8.01m (vehicle can turn within the site and exit in a forward gear.

Members were further advised that the Section 106 Agreement to secure contributions towards Transport Infrastructure, Services and Facilities and Open Space had been completed.

Mrs Pilcher was invited to address the Board whereby she circulated a photograph to Members detailing the impact of the proposed new access through to Jason Way.

Mrs Pilcher advised Members that although she recognised that the developers have engaged with residents and resolved certain issues concerning the height and development of the bungalows, she expressed concerns that the road width proposed had not been addressed and does not accommodate wide vehicles such as refuse, delivery and emergency services to enter and exit the site safely.

Mrs Pilcher expressed further concerns with the access of garages at number 218 and 220 and felt that they would be severely restricted.

Mrs Pilcher also felt that there would be poor visibility at the site entrance for residents leaving their properties and that the lack of car parking for properties in Brockhurst Road would be affected which would ultimately reduce existing amenity space.

The Agent, Mr Harris, was invited to address the Board.

Members were advised that the developers had engaged in extensive consultation with residents and consultee agencies and had subsequently amended original plans from 2 storey houses to chalet bungalows. Mr Harris advised that the new plans submitted would not create any harmful impact on the properties to the east in Hastings Avenue.

Further to a question from a Member regarding vehicles entering and exiting the site, and the provision of emergency vehicles being able to gain access within 45 metres of the development, Mr Harris advised dialogue with a Highways Engineer had taken place regarding the proposed point of access to the development and confirmed that the access was considered safe and an 8.1m delivery vehicle could access the site.

Mr Harris also confirmed that 2 allocated parking spaces would be provided to the front elevation of each dwelling.

It was proposed and agreed that consideration of the application be deferred to allow a site visit to be made with a request for the Fire Service to be in attendance.

**RESOLVED:** That application 13/00067/FULL – Land to the rear of 206-216 Brockhurst Road, Gosport be deferred pending a site visit.

**14                    13/00009/FULL – ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE/REAR  
EXTENSION AND FRONT PORCH (AS AMENDED BY PLANS  
RECEIVED 02.04.13)  
51 WESTERN WAY, GOSPORT**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 13/00009/FULL.

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

The Agent, Mr Tutton, was invited to address the Board whereby he advised that the dwelling sat on the north side of Western Way and that the property was a large detached two storey dwelling with a separation distance of 2.2metres between number 53 and 51 Western Way.

Members were advised that the proposed works to number 51 Western Way would not have a harmful impact on surrounding properties in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy.

Mr Tutton further advised that amended plans had been submitted to increase the area that can accommodate the parking of vehicles.

**RESOLVED:** That application 13/0009/FULL – 51 Western Way, Gosport be approved for the following reason:

1. That having regard to the provisions of Section 38 96) 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 neighbouring properties, would not be detrimental to highway or pedestrian safety and, as such, complies with Policies R/DP1 and R/T11 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review.

**15                    ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business

The meeting concluded at: 19:31 pm

CHAIRMAN