

**A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD  
WAS HELD ON 2 JUNE 2015 AT 6PM  
Subject to approval**

The Mayor (Councillor Farr) (ex-officio); Councillor Hook (P), Councillors Allen, Bateman (P), Carter (P), Dickson (P), Ms Diffey (P), Hicks (P), Hazel, Mrs Hook (P), Jessop (P), Langdon (P), Mrs Wright (P) and Wright (P)

It was reported that in accordance with Standing Order 2.3.6 Councillor Hook had been nominated to replace Councillor Allen for this meeting.

**7. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting were submitted on behalf of the Mayor and Councillor Allen.

**8. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

**9. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the Regulatory Board meeting held on 7 April 2015, be approved and signed by the Chairman as a true and correct record.

**10. DEPUTATIONS**

A deputation had been received on the following item:

- Item 1 of the grey pages- 15/00081/FULL – 66 The Avenue, Gosport

**11. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

No public questions had been received.

**PART II**

**12. 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 decision be taken on each application for planning consent as detailed below:

**13. 15/00081/FULL – ERECTION OF TWO STOREY FRONT AND REAR EXTENSIONS AND SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND REAR EXTENSIONS  
66 THE AVENUE, GOSPORT**

Consideration was given to the report of the Borough Solicitor and the Deputy Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to planning application 15/00081/FULL.

Mr & Mrs Wood were invited to address the Board.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Mrs Wood advised the Board that she lived at the neighbouring property 64 The Avenue. She advised Members that in principle she did not have any objections to the proposal but raised concerns in respect of the design of the building which she felt would result in a significant loss of light and privacy to her property.

Mrs Wood advised that contrary to the Officers report, she felt that the proposed rear two storey extension would not fill in an existing recessed area on the rear elevation and that the forward extensions proposed would not be in line with the building line along The Avenue.

Mrs Wood advised Members that she felt the application would dramatically change the existing property causing a significant impact to neighbouring properties. In conclusion, Mrs Wood asked Members to consider a site visit to the property.

A Member sought clarification in respect of the scale and mass of the proposal in relation to the building line. The Planning Officer advised that the proposed extensions were to an existing dwelling that would continue to respect the wider alignment of properties along The Avenue.

It was further advised by the Planning Officer that other properties in The Avenue had forward extensions, or garages, and that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the surrounding area. It was also clarified that there was existing screening between the neighbouring properties.

Members were advised that Mr Ayles, in the absence of his client, would be making a deputation.

Mr Ayles was invited to address the Board whereby he read a statement on behalf of his clients.

He advised Members that his clients had lived in the property since 1964 and that the proposed application would provide the space required for a growing family.

Mr Ayles advised Members that the proposals had been designed in accordance with the required Local Planning Policies.

Mr Ayles advised that his clients felt that the scale, height and mass of both the front and rear extensions were proportionate to the existing dwelling and those within the surrounding area and felt that the proposal would not have any detrimental impact on neighbouring properties.

The Board were advised by Mr Ayles that there were distinctly two elements to the proposals, the front extension and the rear. He advised that his clients felt that the proposed works to the rear of the property were modest and largely single storey apart from an area of two storey infill to the south west corner.

Mr Ayles advised that the proposed works at the northern end of the front elevation of the property projected 0.75 metres forward and 0.9 metres to the side with lowered eaves to the north elevation. He further advised that the existing garage projected 4.2 metres forward of number 64.

In conclusion, Mr Ayles advised the Board that the proposed first floor extension would have no impact upon the amenity of number 64 in terms of outlook, light reduction or overlooking as there were no windows proposed.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 15/00081/FULL – 66 The Avenue, Gosport, be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**14. 15/00124/FULL – ERECTION OF BUILDERS MERCHANTS (SUI GENERIS) WITH ASSOCIATED EXTERNAL STORAGE, ACCESS, CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING  
UNIT A 154 FAREHAM 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 15/00124/FULL.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

Following a Member's question in respect to the implementation of a barrier to prevent vehicular access, the Planning Officer advised that the proposed barrier would ensure that the overall vehicle movements through the exit to the A32 would not increase.

A Member raised concerns with the heavy traffic flow currently experienced along Fareham Road and sought clarification in relation to the Section 106 Agreement relating to a strip of land adjacent to the A32 being available for permanent transfer to Hampshire County Council to facilitate the widening of the A32 for being available for the next 10 years. The Planning Officer advised Members that 10 years was a reasonable timeframe to secure the land and was proportionate to what was required to make the proposal acceptable.

In respect to a Member's question regarding the impact of flood lighting, the Planning Officer confirmed that a construction management plan would be required.

A Member sought clarification in relation to securing a Travel Plan and it was advised by the Planning Officer that it was considered that a Travel Plan was not required in this instance due to the modest number of employees and traffic management measures proposed.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 15/00124/FULL – Unit A 154 Fareham Road, Gosport be approved subject to a Section 106 agreement for the next ten years to make, upon request, a strip of land adjacent to the A32 (as shown on approved plan no. 10130 PL001) available for permanent transfer to Hampshire County Council (as the Highways Authority) to facilitate the widening of the A32 and subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**15. 15/00110/FULL – ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY STORAGE BUILDING/EXTENSION (as amplified by plan received 13.05.15) HUHTAMAKI (UK) LTD, GRANGE 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 15/00110/FULL.

Members were advised that there were no updates.

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 15/00110/FULL-Huhtamaki(UK) Ltd be approved subject to the conditions of the report of the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive.

**16. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business

The meeting concluded at 6.27PM

CHAIRMAN