

**A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD  
WAS HELD ON 7 APRIL 2015 AT 6PM**

The Mayor (Councillor Gill)(ex-officio); Chairman of the P & O Board (Councillor Hook) (P), Councillors Allen (P), Bateman, Carter (P), Dickson (P), Ms Diffey, Farr (P), Hicks (P), Hazel (P), Mrs Hook (P), Jessop (P), Langdon (P), and Wright (P).

It was reported that in accordance with Standing Order 2.3.6 Councillors Hook and Hylands had been nominated to replace Councillors Bateman and Mrs Diffey respectively for this meeting.

**91. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting were submitted on behalf of Councillors Mrs Diffey and Bateman.

**92. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- Councillor Gill advised that in respect of item 2, 3 and 4 of the grey pages of the report of the Borough Solicitor & Deputy Chief Executive he had met with the deputies prior to the meeting. He also advised he was the ward Councillor for these applications however; he was not entitled to vote as he was an ex-officio Member of the Board.
- Councillor Wright and Hicks declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 5 of the grey pages of the report of the Borough Solicitor & Deputy Chief Executive.
- Councillor Carter advised that in respect of item number 6 of the grey pages of the report of the Borough Solicitor & Deputy Chief Executive his property was shown on the location plan of Land North of Manor Way & West of Bayntum Drive/Redmill Drive at HMS Daedalus Lee-on-the-Solent and requested this be noted. However as his property was located a distance from the proposal site he had no interest in the application.
- Councillor Dickson declared a personal interest in respect of item number 7 of the grey pages of the report of the Borough Solicitor & Deputy Chief Executive and advised that he would leave the room and take no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

**93. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the Regulatory Board meeting held on 24 February 2015, be approved and signed by the Chairman as a true and correct record.

**94. DEPUTATIONS**

Deputations had been received on the following item:

- Item 1 of the grey pages- 14/000619/FULL – Leesland C of E Controlled Junior School
- Item 2 of the grey pages- 15/00029/FULL – Land Adjacent 2 Grays Close
- Item 3 of the grey pages- 15/00030/FULL – Land Adjacent 75 St Helens Road
- Item 4 of the grey pages- 15/00031/FULL – Land Adjacent 45 Gomer Lane
- Item 5 of the grey pages- 15/00053/OUT – 7 Monckton Road
- Item 7 of the grey pages- 14/00469/FULL – 108 Queens Road
- Item 9 of the grey pages- 14/00606/VOC – St Georges Barracks (South) Mumby Road

**95. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

No public questions had been received.

## PART II

### 96. REPORT OF THE BOROUGH SOLICITOR & DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The Borough Solicitor & Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report on applications received for planning consent setting out the recommendation.

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

### 97. 14/00619/FULL – ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY DAY NURSERY BUILDING AND ERECTION OF ACOUSTIC FENCE (as amplified by plan received 30.01.15, emails received 02.02.15, 06/02.15 and 11.02.15 and information received 13.03.15) LEESLAND C OF E CONTROLLED JUNIOR SCHOOL, GOSPORT

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and the Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 14/00619/FULL

Mr Sandal was invited to address the Board.

Members were advised that since the publication of the report, four additional letters of objections had been received three of which had raised the following new issues:

- Disagreement with additional information provided, the proposed parking did not meet the Parking SPD and the parking remained inadequate;
- Rumours that plans were in place to increase the number of classes within the school;
- Use of rear service road could result in damage to adjacent dwelling.

The Head of Development Control advised that the parking issues had been considered and discussed within paragraph 4 of the Principal Issues section of the Officers report. She also advised that in the event that planning permission was required for new classes, any application would be considered on their own merits. In conclusion, Members were advised that any damage to private property would be a private legal matter and/or a matter for the Police.

Mr Sandal thanked Members for the opportunity to raise his objection to the planning application. He advised that whilst in principle residents of Whitworth Close did not object to the nursery building he felt, that the unit would result in additional traffic congestion and parking pressures along Whitworth Close.

Mr Sandal advised Members that the surrounding area to the School was currently overtaxed by the level of traffic flow going to and from the school. Mr Sandal further advised that he felt working parents would be the main users of the nursery and would use the fastest mode of transport available which would add to the traffic problems.

Mr Sandal expressed his concern in relation to the narrow entrance to Whitworth Close and reported that as of last week an emergency service vehicle had trouble exiting the road.

In conclusion, Mr Sandal advised Members that the security and safety to children should be considered when determining the application.

Councillor Chegwyn was invited to address the Board whereby he thanked Members for the opportunity to speak on this application as Ward Councillor.

He advised Members that whilst he had no objection to the provision of the nursery, his concerns purely focused on parking issues and access to Whitworth Close which he felt had become more congested since the opening of the nursery.

He further advised that there was already an issue with cars that illegally parked opposite Buildbase which obstructed a narrow road and restricted visibility. In respect to parking spaces available inside the school grounds he advised that this space was quite full throughout the day and that staff/volunteers from the 2 schools used Whitworth Close as an overflow along with all of the other school traffic.

A Member advised that there were currently 26 children at the nursery with 2 children being driven.

Following discussions it was proposed and seconded that a site visit be undertaken to determine the traffic problems. A vote was taken and subsequently lost. Members felt that they were familiar with the area and that a site visit would not be necessary.

Members of the Board recognised that there were ongoing difficulties in regards to transport at all schools however felt, that nursery facilities were required and that schools should promote healthy initiatives to encourage a green environment.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 14/00619/FULL – Leesland C Of E Controlled Junior School, Gordon Road, be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**98. 15/00029/FULL – ERECTION OF 1NO. THREE BEDROOM DETACHED DWELLING (as amended by Ecological Report received 05/03/15) LAND ADJACENT 2 GRAYS CLOSE GOSPORT**

**Councillor Gill advised that he had met the deputies before the meeting although he was not entitled to vote as he is an ex-officio Member of the Board.**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and the Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 15/00029/FULL.

Mrs McLaren was invited to address the Board.

Members were advised by the Planning Officer that there were two updates to the report. Firstly, a further representation of objection had been received taking the total to 33 objections in addition to the 204 signature petition. It was advised by the Planning Officer that the issues raised were addressed in the Officer report.

Secondly, a consultation response had been received from Southern Water who had objected to the application as there was a public sewer which ran through the site that would require diverting. It was further advised that the application was recommended for refusal and therefore, as the relocation of the sewer could be achieved in principle and details secured via planning condition; it was not proposed to add an additional reason for refusal. Therefore, Members were advised that the Officer recommendation remained the same.

Mrs McLaren advised that she lived at 2 Grays close and would be directly affected by the proposed new property. She advised that she was representing the local community who were objecting to the planning application submitted on environmental health and safety grounds she further felt that the felling of seven healthy trees on the three plots of land carried out on the day the application was submitted without consulting residents, was unacceptable.

Members were advised by Mrs McLaren that Gomer was an open estate with few green spaces and mature trees, giving character to the area and being a prized asset for the Town of Gosport as it was the main road leading to Stokes Bay.

Mrs McLaren advised that properties were generally more expensive and that this was accepted due to the presence of greenery and open spaces. She further advised that amenity areas were for the benefit of the local residents and a valued asset as per the reaction from people who had objected, and not merely amenity land as described by Bilton Land Ltd.

Mrs McLaren advised Members that all three new houses would be obstructing the view and natural light of the adjacent properties for example; 2 Grays Close was the only property to have three side windows. Her dining room view would be a brick wall and the light to all three windows would be totally obscured by the new building.

Members were advised by Mrs McLaren that the house at 75 St Helens Road was turned 90 degrees and was the only house to individually overlook the land adjacent to it; originally designed that way by Bilton Homes some 50 years ago. As a result, it was felt that these new properties would go entirely against the original plans for the estate.

In respect to Health & Safety the proposed building on the corner plot adjacent to 2 Grays Close showed the boundary encompassing the current foot and cycle path. Mrs McLaren advised that the path was used on a daily basis by the high volume of students from Bay House School/Gomer Infant and Junior Schools during the school terms and by families going to Stokes Bay at weekends and during the summer. It was felt that the proposed building so close to the road, would reduce the size of the path, reduce the visibility and create an unnecessary safety risk for anyone using the pathway. A bus stop was also situated just opposite St Helen's road junction and it was advised that when buses were stationary, the visibility into St Helens Road for drivers coming from Bay House direction would be considerably reduced as the corner would be closed off by the new property.

Members were advised by Mrs McLaren that Grays Close was a single access road and that two more houses and cars would make access difficult should an emergency occur.

Mrs McLaren asked that the Committee take into account the views of the local residents when making their final decision. 204 people had signed the petition objecting to the 3 planning applications, 32 had written letters, and some were also showing their objection by their presence at the meeting.

Mrs McLaren advised that she had brought a few photos to show the location and the changes already made by the felling of the trees.

Furthermore, Mrs McLaren advised that there was going to be a new development on the site at Haslar Hospital with a population of over 1000. Alver Village had just been built, Daedalus and previously Cherque Farm & Priddy's Hard. Plenty of new residences had been built, on an already overcrowded island. She advised that she felt Gosport was a dormitory overflow for Portsmouth, but that it was not getting the extra infrastructure, or leisure facilities, and that the density was already well above the national average.

Members were further advised by Mrs McLaren that the presence of amenity grassland and trees were becoming a deciding factor when planning on building new estates so why take 3 areas of green spaces which were already established. Mrs McLaren advised a well-established estate should at least deserve the same right and thanked the Board for listening.

In conclusion, Mrs McLaren felt that if every piece of green land was built on, what legacy would be left for future generations as not everyone wanted to live in an overcrowded urban area.

Councillor Mrs Forder was invited to address the Board whereby she thanked Members for the opportunity to speak on this application as Ward Councillor. She advised Members that the proposed site for this building was too narrow and would be squashed between the pavement and number 2 Grays Close.

Councillor Mrs Forder advised that there was simply not enough space to accommodate additional parking given that the road was unsuitable for any on street parking.

Members were advised that the Estate was built in 1960, it had a distinct character and that green open space set the tone of the area. Councillor Mrs Forder felt that if planning permission was to be approved it would conflict with the policies in the 2011-2029 Local Plan.

Councillor Mrs Forder felt that the removal of 7 trees had showed no consideration to any of the residents in the Estate.

Following discussions, Members agreed with the reasons for refusal set out within the Report of the Borough Solicitor and the Deputy Chief Executive.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 15/00029/FULL- 2 Grays Close be refused for the following reason(s):-

1. The proposal would introduce built form to an area of open grassed space, located at the entrance to the estate from Gomer Lane, which plays a key role in establishing the distinctive character of the area. This would fail to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness resulting in significant harm to the character of the surrounding area through not respecting the distinctive built and natural environment. This is in conflict with Saved Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Local Plan Review 2006, Policy LP10 of the emerging Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 (Publication version July 2014), the Gosport Borough Council Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document February 2014 and the NPPF.

2. The proposal would not provide adequate off-street parking provision resulting in vehicles that utilise the proposed driveway unacceptably projecting onto the footpath and an expected need for unacceptable on-street parking close to the junction of Grays Close and St Helens Road. No acceptable justification has been provided for this under provision. This is in conflict with Saved Policy R/T11 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review 2006, Policy LP23 of the emerging Local Plan 2011-2029 (Publication Review July 2014) and the Gosport Borough Council Parking: Supplementary Planning Document February 2014.

3. The proposal does not make adequate provision to secure improvements to highway and transport infrastructure and outdoor playing space. This is contrary to Saved Policy R/DP3 of the Local Plan 2006, Policy LP2 of the emerging Local Plan 2011-2029 and Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy: A New Approach to Calculating Transport Contributions in Hampshire September 2007, Saved Policies R/DP3 and R/OS8 and Appendix O of the Local Plan 2006 and Policies LP2 and LP34 of the emerging Local Plan 2011-2029.

**99. 15/00030/FULL – ERECTION OF 1NO. 2 BEDROOM DWELLING (as amended by Ecological Report received 05/03/15)  
LAND ADJACENT 75 ST HELENS ROAD, GOSPORT**

**Councillor Gill advised that he had met the deputies before the meeting although he was not entitled to vote as he is an ex-officio Member of the Board.**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and the Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 15/00030/FULL.

Mrs Hurst was invited to address Board.

Members were advised that since the publication of the report, that there were two further updates.

Firstly, the Planning office had received one further representation of objection taking it to 33 objections in addition to the 204 signature petition. The issues raised were addressed in the Officer report.

Secondly, a consultation response had been received from Southern Water who had objected to the application as there was a public sewer which ran through the site that would require diverting. It was further advised that the application was recommended for refusal and therefore, as the relocation of the sewer could be achieved in principle and details secured via planning condition; it was not proposed to add an additional reason for refusal. Therefore, Members were advised that the Officer recommendation remained the same.

Mrs Hurst advised Members that she had lived at number 75 St Helens Road for 49 years and raised concerns that the proposed building of a bungalow directly adjacent to her property would unacceptably impact upon her privacy and obstruct her views.

Members were advised that 75 St Helens Road was a unique property in the road with windows on each side of the property facing the green open space. It was felt by Mrs Hurst that the proposed application would result in the change of character to the area.

Mrs Hurst advised that the proposed garage would be attached to her property which would result in her being unable to maintain her wall.

Mrs Hurst raised concerns with the entrance to Grays Close and felt that this was very narrow with parking currently very limited. She further felt that the view of the junction would be restricted and that refuse and emergency vehicles would not be able to access the road.

Councillor Mrs Forder was invited to address the Board as Ward Councillor. She advised that number 75 St Helens Road was the first house that you saw when coming into the road and that the property was designed as an entrance to the estate.

Members were advised by Mrs Forder that the proposed bungalow would completely block the existing view and light of number 75 St Helens Road which was specifically designed to enjoy the green open space.

Following discussions Members agreed with the reasons for refusal set out within the Report of the Borough Solicitor and the Deputy Chief Executive.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 15/00030/FULL- be refused for the following reason(s):-

1. The proposal would introduce built form to an area of open grassed space, located close to the entrance to the estate from Gomer Lane, which plays a key role in establishing the distinctive character of the area. This would fail to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness resulting in significant harm to the character of the surrounding area through not respecting the distinctive built and natural environment. This is in conflict with Saved Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Local Plan Review 2006, Policy LP10 of the emerging Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 (Publication version July 2014), the Gosport Borough Council Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document February 2014 and the NPPF.

2. The proposal, by reason of its proximity to 75 St Helens Road, would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook for the occupiers of 75 St Helens Road whose primary indoor sitting area is served solely by two ground-floor windows on its eastern elevation. This would be contrary to Saved Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2006, Policy LP10 of the emerging Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 (Publication Version July 2014) and the intentions of the Gosport Borough Council Design Guidance: Supplementary Planning Document: February 2014 (pg.41 and 42).

3. The proposal does not make adequate provision to secure improvements to highway and transport infrastructure and outdoor playing space. This is contrary to Saved Policy R/DP3 of the Local Plan 2006, Policy LP2 of the emerging Local Plan 2011-2029 and Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy: A New Approach to Calculating Transport Contributions in Hampshire September 2007, Saved Policies R/DP3 and R/OS8 and Appendix O of the Local Plan 2006 and Policies LP2 and LP34 of the emerging Local Plan 2011-2029.

**100.                    15/00031/FULL – ERECTION OF 1NO. 3 BEDROOM DETACHED DWELLING  
                              (as amended by Ecological Report received 05/03/15)  
                              LAND ADJACENT 45 GOMER LANE, GOSPORT**

**Councillor Gill advised that he had met the deputies before the meeting although he was not entitled to vote as he is an ex-officio Member of the Board.**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and the Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 15/00031/FULL.

Members were advised that since the publication of the report, one further representation of objection had been received taking it to a total of 33 objections in addition to the 204 signature petition. The issues raised were addressed in the Officer report; therefore, the Officer recommendation remained unchanged.

Councillor Mrs Forder was invited to address the Board whereby she reiterated that she was representing the local community objecting to all 3 of the applications submitted. She advised that she had no further comments to add other than those already provided in her deputation previously made on application 15/00029 FULL.

Following discussions, Members agreed with the reasons for refusal set out within the Report of the Borough Solicitor and the Deputy Chief Executive

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 15/00031/FULL- be refused for the following reason(s):-

1. The proposal would introduce built form to an area of open grassed space, located at the entrance to the estate from Gomer Lane, which plays a key role in establishing the distinctive character of the area. This would fail to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness resulting in significant harm to the character of the surrounding area through not respecting the distinctive built and natural environment. This is in conflict with Saved Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Local Plan Review 2006, Policy LP10 of the emerging Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 (Publication version July 2014), the Gosport Borough Council Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document February 2014 and the NPPF.

2. The proposal does not make adequate provision to secure improvements to highway and transport infrastructure and outdoor playing space. This is contrary to Saved Policy R/DP3 of the Local Plan 2006, Policy LP2 of the emerging Local Plan 2011-2029 and Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy: A New Approach to Calculating Transport Contributions in Hampshire September 2007, Saved Policies R/DP3 and R/OS8 and Appendix O of the Local Plan 2006 and Policies LP2 and LP34 of the emerging Local Plan 2011-2029.

**101.                    15/00053/OUT – DEMOLITION OF BUNGALOW AND ERECTION OF 2NO.  
FOUR BEDROOM DWELLINGS  
7 MONCKTON ROAD, GOSPORT**

**Councillor Wright and Hicks declared a personal interest in respect of this item.**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and the Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 15/00053/OUT.

Mr Batt was invited to address the Board.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Mr Batt advised Members that 75 Monckton Road had been derelict for many years. He advised Members that he believed the application submitted was of a sensitive design which would fit in with neighbouring properties and not be out of character to the surrounding area.

Mr Batt advised that in response to the objections in the Officer's report he was willing to obtain a habitat and ecology report but felt the existing habitat would change once the site was brought back into use.

Mr Batt referred Members to photographs of similar properties in Ashburton Road, Jellicoe Avenue, and Vectis Road and described Monckton Road as having a diversity of character. He further added that he believed that there were adequate provisions for on-street parking.

A Member sought clarification to the reason why Mr Batt was not willing to enter into a Section 106 Agreement. Mr Batt advised that he was only willing to enter into a section 106 Agreement if the application was approved. He referred Members to recently issued guidance from Hampshire County Council which had prompted his decision and advised that he would prefer the matter to remain open for determination by the Inspector at the Appeal stage should the application be refused.

Mr Batt further advised Members that this application was a redevelopment of an existing site and not a new development.

Further to a Members question, Mr Batt stated that he believed that no other semi-detached buildings were currently sited in Monckton Road.

Following discussions, Members agreed with the reasons for refusal set out within the Report of the Borough Solicitor and the Deputy Chief Executive and considered that the applicant had not demonstrated that the two dwellings proposed could be accommodated on the site in an acceptable manner.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 15/00053/FULL- be refused for the following reason(s):-

1. The proposal has failed to demonstrate that two semi-detached dwellings could be accommodated on the application site that would promote or reinforce local distinctiveness and respect the distinctive built environment. Therefore, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character of the surrounding area in conflict with Saved Policy R/DP1 of the Gosport Local Plan Review 2006, Policy LP10 of the emerging Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 (Publication version July 2014), the Gosport Borough Council Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document February 2014 and the NPPF.

2. The proposal does not make adequate provision for improvements to highway and transport infrastructure and outdoor playing space. This is contrary to Saved Policy R/DP3 of the Local Plan 2006, Policy LP2 of the emerging Local Plan 2011-2029 and Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy: A New Approach to Calculating Transport Contributions in Hampshire September 2007, Saved Policies R/DP3 and R/OS8 and Appendix O of the Local Plan 2006 and Policies LP2 and LP34 of the emerging Local Plan 2011-2029.

3. The proposal does not make adequate provision to mitigate the impact upon internationally designated habitat sites. This is contrary to Policy LP42 of the emerging Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 (Publication Version July 2014) and the Solent Special Protection Areas Gosport Bird Disturbance Mitigation Protocol 2014.

4. Inadequate information has been submitted to demonstrate that there would be an acceptable impact upon any protected species that may be present on the application site. Given the sites location within relative proximity to an internationally designated site (Portsmouth Harbour SPA and RAMSAR) the lack of a survey is in conflict with Saved Policy ENV5 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan Review 2006 and Policies LP42 and LP44 of the emerging Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 (Publication Version July 2014) and Section 68(3) of Chapter 2 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010

**102. 14/00369/VOC - VARIATION OF CONDITIONS 2, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 AND 31 OF PLANNING PERMISSION REFERENCE 13/00431/FULL TO ALLOW REVISED CAR PARKING LAYOUT AND INSTALLATION OF SOLAR PV PANELS (as amplified by specification for archaeological evaluation received 17.3.15 and plans received 25.03.15) LAND NORTH OF MANOR WAY & WEST OF BAYNTUN DRIVE/REDMILL DRIVE AT HMS DAEDALUS LEE-ON-THE-SOLENT HAMPSHIRE**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and the Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 14/00369/VOC.



Members were advised that there was an update in the legislation quoted in condition 30 to reflect the latest consolidation of the General Permitted Development Order. The Planning Officer clarified to Members that the application was seeking to vary a number of conditions, which would only result in two amendments to the proposal that Members approved in March 2014.

It was advised that as the applicants had commenced work in advance of discharging some planning conditions, the previous approval could not be amended and a new permission was required. Therefore, whilst the application sought to vary 19 conditions, most of these were to update plan numbers.

Members were further advised that there were only two actual changes to the previous approval which were the relocation of three visitor parking spaces from one part of the site to another to improve highway visibility within the site and secondly to provide solar panels on the dwellings.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 14/00369/VOC be approved subject to the variation of the Section 106 Agreement relating to affordable housing; an employment and skills plan; open space provision and management of and mitigation against recreational disturbance and subject to amended condition 30 and the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**103.                    14/00469/FULL - INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO CREATE 4 NO. RESIDENTIAL UNITS WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING AND REFUSE AND CYCLE STORAGE (as amplified by plans received 06.10.14 and 28.01.15)  
108 QUEENS ROAD GOSPORT HAMPSHIRE PO12 1LH**

**Councillor Dickson declared a personal interest in respect of this item; he left the meeting room and took no part in the discussion or the voting thereon.**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and the Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 14/00469/FULL.

Members were advised that there was an update in the legislation quoted in condition 9 to reflect the latest consolidation of the General Permitted Development Order.

Mr Moseley was invited to address the Board. He advised Members that he had purchased the property 2 years ago with planning consent but felt that the approved planning consent would see the bulk of the site demolished. He advised that he wanted to retain the integrity of the building.

Mr Moseley advised Members that the property had a unique character and charm and his intention was to preserve and develop. He advised Members that the application had been redesigned to accommodate 4 units instead of the 6, which would bring a vacant building back to life, enhance the area and that the property would fit in with the surrounding area.

Further to a question from a Member, it was confirmed that the proposed balconies would be installed on the first floor level.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 14/00469/FULL be approved subject to a Section 106 agreement relating to the payment of a commuted sum towards the provision and/or improvement of outdoor playing space; the payment of a commuted sum towards measures to mitigate recreational disturbance and subject to amended condition 9 and the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**104.                    15/00065/FULL - ERECTION OF NEW BUILDING, INCLUDING TEN STOREY TOWER, TO PROVIDE 28 NO. ONE BEDROOM AND 20 NO. TWO BEDROOM RETIREMENT APARTMENTS, WITH ASSOCIATED COMMUNAL FACILITIES, ACCESS, CAR PARKING, ELECTRIC BUGGY, CYCLE AND REFUSE STORAGE AND FLOOD DEFENCES (as amplified by Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey received 11.03.15)  
LAND ADJACENT TO HARBOUR ROAD GOSPORT**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and the Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 15/00065/FULL.

Members were advised that dialogue was ongoing with the District Valuation Service regarding the viability of the scheme relative to the required planning obligations and that the principle of the scheme had been approved under the previous application and that this proposal was for minor changes to the siting and layout of the building and the location of the access.

Members recognised that this was a prestigious development for the Borough of Gosport.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 15/00065/FULL be approved subject to a Section 106 agreement relating to the payment of a commuted sum towards outdoor playing space subject to viability; The payment of a commuted sum towards measures to mitigate the impact of increased recreational activity on Special Protection Areas; the provision of affordable housing at the site or the payment of a commuted sum in lieu of that provision, subject to viability and subject to the payment of a commuted sum towards transport infrastructure, services and facilities, subject to viability and subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

- 105.                    14/00606/VOC- AMENDMENT TO APPROVED OPENING TIMES OF VEHICLE AND PEDESTRIAN GATES TO THE SITE, INCLUDING PERMANENT CLOSURE OF NORTH AND SOUTH VEHICLE AND PEDESTRIAN GATES WITH CONTROLLED RESIDENT ACCESS ONLY (REMOVAL OF CONDITION 5 OF APPLICATION K.15660/31) AND AMENDMENT TO ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS APPROVED UNDER APPLICATION K.15660/5 (NORTH GATE) (CONSERVATION AREA)**  
**St George Barracks (South) Mumby Road Gosport Hampshire**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and the Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 14/00606/VOC

Members were advised that there were no updates.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 14/00606/VOC be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**106.                    ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Members were advised of the Planning Inspectorate's decision regarding the Planning Appeal relating to 35 Privett Place.

The Inspector shared the view of the Council that the application did not meet the Supplementary Planning Document and was poor design, however, concluded that it was preferable to have a flat roof extension next to the flat roof extension on the adjacent property as opposed to a hipped roof on this occasion. The Inspector therefore allowed the appeal.

The meeting concluded at 20:05 PM