

**A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD
WAS HELD ON 22 JULY 2020**

Councillor Hook

Councillors Bateman, Beavis (Substituting for Mrs Jones), Carter, Casey, Chegwyn (Substituting for Foster-Reed), Mrs Cully (Substituting for Farr), Earle, Hammond, Herridge, Mrs Hook, Miss Kelly, Murphy, Scard and Westerby

1. APOLOGIES FOR NON-ATTENDANCE

Apologies for non attendance were received from Councillors Farr, Mrs Jones, Mrs Batty and Foster-Reed.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Carter declared that he was the County Councillor for the ward in which the Addenbrooke proposal was located and that he had held extensive discussions with County Council Officers about the proposal. He advised that he would take no part in the voting thereon.

Councillor Chegwyn advised that he was a County Councillor but had not been involved in discussions regarding the proposal and as a result would remain in the meeting.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration declared a personal interest in 13 Clayhall Road

3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 3 JUNE 2020

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on the on 3rd June 2020 be signed as a true and correct record.

4. DEPUTATIONS - STANDING ORDER 3.4

Deputation were received on the following items:

- Addenbrooke House
- Land adjacent to Brookers Lane
- 1 Oxford Road

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS - STANDING ORDER 3.5

There were none.

6. REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING AND REGENERATION

19/00166/FULL - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND ERECTION OF A PART 3 AND PART 4 STOREY BUILDING TO FORM 60NO. EXTRA CARE UNITS IN A MIX OF 1 AND 2 BEDROOMS AND ASSOCIATED COMMUNITY FACILITIES, PARKING, REFUSE STORAGE, LANDSCAPING, DRAINAGE AND HIGHWAYS WORKS (as amended by supporting information and plans received 24.05.19, 26.06.19, 02.08.19, 29.05.20.and 08.07.20)

Addenbrooke House Willis Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 1NA

Councillor Carter left the meeting and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

Consideration was given to a report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 19/00166/FULL.

The Board was advised that there were two updates to the application. The Board was advised that since the publication of the agenda, Natural England had advised that they were satisfied with the proposed mitigation measures in relation to recreational disturbance nitrates and other impacts on the SPA .

The Board was also advised that there was an additional update to condition 3 that there was an additional requirement for working hours to be provided.

The Board was advised that there was a deputation from the applicant. This was read by the Borough Solicitor as follows:

The site is wholly owned by Hampshire County Council and has been identified for redevelopment to deliver much needed extra care accommodation in relation to the County Council's Older Persons' Extra Care Programme.

The scheme will be 100% affordable and occupants will be nominated by Gosport Borough Council from a waiting list held by them and the County Council of people with housing and care needs.

Whilst the scheme will be open to over 55s, the over 75 population is a good indication of overall levels of need given that the average age of occupants of such facilities is over 75. The over 75 population across Gosport Borough was 7,500 in 2015, and this is due to increase by 86% by 2035. To calculate need, the County Council has adopted an average demand of 20 units of extra care per 1000 of the over 75 population. This points to a demand of 150 extra care units in 2015 rising to a need of 276 units in 2035.

The current supply of Extra Care units in Gosport Borough, to which the County Council can nominate to, stands at 50 (one facility at Juniper Court). These figures are indicative of an under supply across the whole County and is not a criticism of Gosport Borough, but this scheme will provide much needed, modern extra care accommodation to help address this under supply.

The applicant has undertaken extensive discussions with Officers regarding the design of the proposals and the scheme has been redesigned since the bid scheme so that the larger elements have been reoriented to be on the southern and eastern elevations, away from the existing sheltered accommodation to the north and west in Alec Rose House, Slocum House and Ramillies House.

The building has been designed with a mix of features which add visual interest to the building and street scene. The proposed materials are a light brick for the majority of the building with a contrasting darker plinth to the full height of the ground floor on some elevations. The frontage to The Anchorage has substantial setbacks to break up the elevation and further recesses, brick projections and down pipes are proposed on both road frontages which further break up the building. Other design features include the use of materials, window positions, recessed brick panels and Juliette balconies which add further visual interest.

Regulatory Board
22 July 2020

A significant amount of work has been undertaken to address the issue of nitrates in the Solent, which has directly involved Hampshire County Council. Natural England advises that proposals for new residential development should achieve nitrogen neutrality to avoid harm to designated sites. This includes a 20% precautionary buffer for robustness.

The applicant has provided a scheme of mitigation measures relating to water saving measures in an existing care facility managed by Hampshire County Council (HCC), known as Hawthorne Court. This care facility discharges into the same water treatment works as the application site.

The mitigation report sets out the existing water usage within both Addenbrooke House and Hawthorne Court and the level of water usage that the proposals would generate. The proposed mitigation measures in both properties would reduce the level of water usage and subsequent discharge of nitrates to a level that exceeds the Natural England guidance, including Natural England's 20% precautionary buffer. The solution is therefore extremely robust and more than offsets nitrate levels by providing a betterment to the existing situation. The proposals include regular monitoring and these measures will be secured in perpetuity for both properties within the Section 106 legal agreement. Natural England has no objections to the scheme, which supersedes the consultation response contained in the committee report.

There are no technical objections to the scheme or any objections from local residents and Members are therefore respectfully requested to approve the application in line with officer's recommendation.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that there the building would be designed to meet current building regulations including any energy saving measures, sound proofing and insulation.

In answer to a Members question, the Board was advised that there was no figure listed for the amount of jobs the proposal would create, but advised that the skills plan would cover the number of construction jobs.

The Board was advised that the proposal would contribute to housing numbers within the Borough.

In answer to a Members question the Board was advised that the proposals included a layby on Willis Road which would be used for the servicing of the proposal and that there would be a requirement for turning in Willis Road to access the layby and that tracking plans had been provided by the applicant to show that the lay by is useable and accessible and that acceptance of this had been confirmed by Hampshire County Council Highways.

Concern was expressed that the traffic management plan should be followed to protect neighbouring residents.

It was also confirmed that the conditions of the application included a landscape scheme and that a desire for native species could be noted.

Members welcomed the proposal and recognised the importance of development of the site and suggested that direct pedestrian access to the supermarket should be provided.

It was also recognised that the existing trees did have a value, but accepted that the landscaping would need amending as part of the proposal.

The Board unanimously agreed the proposal

RESOLVED: That planning application 19/00166/FULL be approved subject to the conditions in the planning officer's report.

**19/00240/VOC VARIATION OF CONDITIONS 2 (APPROVED PLANS), 5 (NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES) AND 6 (LOCATION OF PLANT AND EQUIPMENT) OF PLANNING PERMISSION 18/00237/FULL - CHANGE OF USE FROM CAR SALES TO CAR WASH, ERECTION OF SIDE EXTENSION, ERECTION OF CANOPIES TO FRONT OF EXISTING BUILDING AND ERECTION OF ACOUSTIC BARRIER - TO AMEND SIZE AND SITING OF CANOPY, SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND ACOUSTIC MITIGATION MEASURES (as amended by plans received 18.6.2019 and 1.6.2020)
Finsbury Cars Privett Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 2SU**

Consideration was given to a report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 19/00240/VOC.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that condition in relation to the closure of access was carried forward but the timing on it was not due to the current situation. The original condition had set a condition that required details of the footway closure to be submitted and agreed and then implemented. The details had been received and agreed by the Highway Authority and a requirement made to Hampshire County Council for a license to carry out the work but because of recent events it had been difficult to meet timings with regard to the implementation of inspections which is why the timing element has been amended to secure the same works considered in the previous applications.

The Board was also advised that the site was formally a filling station with drainage to capture petrol spillage and that the system was still in place and functional. The applicant also confirmed that they had the relevant licenses in place to dispose of waste water, as a result no condition on this was required. There was a condition requiring the consideration of disposal of other waste materials used by the business.

In answer to a further question the Board was advised that the planning officer was content that the while canopies are larger than originally proposed and in a different location they are equally acceptable as an alternative to what was previously proposed.

The Board was also advised that the business was required to have a commercial waste collection, and it was the responsibility of the contractor employed to remove the waste. The Council was able to ensure, when approving facilities that provision was made to have refuse and recycled storage facilities on site.

It was acknowledge that two of the incidences where rubbish had been left on the site occurred when the site had been closed and that it was unlikely that the rubbish on site was left by the business, but it was important to ensure provision was made for disposal of waste.

It was confirmed that there was 3 letters of objection to the current proposal, two of which were prior to the changes of the plant enclosure which addressed noise issues.

The recommendation was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That planning application 19/00240/VOC be approved subject to the conditions in the planning officer's report.

**19/00516/OUT - CROSS BOUNDARY OUTLINE APPLICATION, WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT FOR ACCESS, FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF UP TO 99 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS, LANDSCAPING, OPEN SPACE AND ASSOCIATED WORKS, WITH ACCESS FROM BROOKERS LANE [Gosport Borough Council to only determine part of the application relating to part of access in Gosport Borough] (as amplified by additional information received 03.03.20 and 14.05.20)
Land Adjacent Brookers Lane Gosport Hampshire**

Consideration was given to a report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 19/00516/OUT.

The Board was advised that there were a number of updates to the report.

One letter of support had been withdrawn and an additional letter of objection had been received raising concerns about the proximity of their recently constructed access to the proposal. The Board was advised that planning officers had contact the Local Highway Authority who had confirmed that the dropped kerb did not affect the acceptability of the proposal.

Members were advised that the drawings numbered 101 and 001 in the Local Highway Authority consultee comments were the same drawing.

An informative is recommended to clarify that the five displaced public car parking spaces referred to in condition 6 should be located in the area highlighted by image 2.1 of the applicant's transport statement.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration provided an update to the Board as follows:

This is an extremely unusual proposal for the Council to consider.

To be absolutely clear on the procedural perspective, this Council is only able to formally determine the element of the proposal that falls within its own administrative boundary, being the proposed access to the proposed development in this case. In some cases, where a proposed development does straddle an administrative boundary, the Councils can decide between them to pass responsibility for determining the proposal as a whole to one or the other. The published report explains the above and then proceeds to focus on the impacts from the use and the proposed construction of the development located within GBC.

Mindful that the application proposal is for the development of 99 residential dwellings, in determining the element of the proposed development within Gosport Borough, a wider view could also be taken in terms of considering the principle of the development that the proposed access is intended to serve. The Council has commented before and repeatedly reinforced its position on possible residential development in this location and within the Strategic Gap generally and it could be considered reasonable that if the Council does not support the principle of development in the adjoining Borough it follows that it could also consider the proposed access to it unacceptable, in principle.

Under the circumstances, I thought it appropriate to ensure that all interested parties were aware of this broader perspective and also the views expressed by the Council's Head of Planning Policy, relevant extracts of which are set out below. These comments are displayed in full on the Council's website and in my view are a material planning consideration in the determination of the application in relation to which Members are able to apportion whatever weight they feel appropriate:-

Relevant Extracts of Comments from the Head of Planning Policy received 5 February 2020.

Part 2 - The principle of the access serving up to 99 dwellings within Fareham Borough

In order for GBC to determine the element of the proposed development within Gosport Borough it is necessary to consider the principle of the development the access is intended to serve. It is considered reasonable that if the Council does not support the principle of development in the adjoining Borough it follows that the proposed access to it is also not acceptable, in principle.

The reasons that the development is not acceptable is based on the following fundamental positions previously set out by Gosport Borough Council:

A) The proposed development is contrary to Fareham Borough Council's adopted Local Plan (Parts 1 and 2) for a number of reasons including that the development is outside the settlement boundary and is located within the Strategic Gap.

B) That no weight can be given to the Regulation 18 versions of the Draft Fareham Local Plan 2036 (DFLP) given the strength of objection to the proposed allocation HA2, of which this application site forms the south section. Consequently the issues arising from the outstanding objections to HA2 need to be considered as part of the forthcoming Examination in Public into the DFLP and in combination with other proposals within the existing Strategic Gap.

Importantly, as the application site is not identified as an allocation in the adopted Local Plan and is subject to a significant objection at the Regulation 18 stage of the forthcoming Local Plan, no certainty can be given to the arrangements set out in the application consequently this Council considers that the objection to the whole allocation is applicable when determining this application including the possibility of links to Newgate Lane from this application site.

These fundamental objections in principle are set out in detail below:

Principle A) The proposal is contrary to the adopted Fareham Local Plan on a number of key matters:

Outside of the urban area/settlement boundary

The site comprises agricultural land and is located outside defined settlements within Fareham Borough. CS14 of the adopted Fareham Local Plan (Part 1 Core Strategy) clearly states that built development on land outside the defined settlement will be strictly controlled to protect the countryside from development which would affect its landscape character, appearance and function.

It is clear that this proposal will affect the landscape character, appearance and function of this area outside the existing defined settlement.

In terms of landscape and character Fareham Borough Council's own latest evidence, Fareham Landscape Assessment (2017) regarding the 'Woodcot area' which includes the land covered by the proposed Newgate Lane allocation, states,

'This is a cohesive area of undeveloped landscape which performs an important role in respect of the primary purposes of the Strategic Gap i.e. in defining the edges, separate identity and settings of Fareham and Gosport, preventing their coalescence. Even minor encroachment beyond existing settlement boundaries could have an adverse effect on these functions and the overall integrity of the landscape and Strategic Gap. It is recommended that the Gap boundaries remain unchanged.'

Consequently this is also relevant for defining the settlement boundary in this location. In the light of the above the planning application is contrary to Policy CS14: Development Outside of Settlements.

Policy DSP6 of Part 2 of the Local Plan also presumes against new residential development outside of the defined urban boundary. The only exceptions relate to very small scale levels of development of one or two dwellings as infill. This planning application is of a significant scale (99 dwellings) and therefore is contrary to Policy DSP6: New Residential Development Outside of the Defined Urban Settlement Boundary

Policy DSP40 relating to housing allocations, of which this site is not included, recognises that in certain circumstances where it can be demonstrated that the Council does not have a five year supply of housing, additional sites outside of the urban area boundary may be permitted where they meet all of the criteria set out.

Consequently whilst acknowledging that Fareham Borough may not currently have a five year land supply it is clear that this particular proposal does not meet all the criteria set out in Policy DSP40.

Firstly with regard to criterion ii) it states that the proposal should be sustainably located adjacent to, and well related to, the existing urban settlement boundaries and can be well integrated with the neighbouring settlement. This proposal is not adjacent or well related to any development within the Fareham Local Plan. It is detached from any other settlements within Fareham Borough.

Whilst recognising it is attached to Gosport Borough's urban area boundary it is not explicitly stated that this policy relates to settlements outside of Fareham Borough's jurisdiction and therefore it can only be taken to refer to settlements covered by the Fareham Local Plan and within its jurisdiction.

Whilst this may appear to be a matter of technical definition it is clear that if this was the intention of the Policy it should have been stated within the text and as part of the duty to cooperate discussions.

Consequently it is reasonable to conclude that the settlement boundaries referred to in Policy DSP40 relate to those within Fareham Borough only and consequently given that this proposal is not adjacent these settlements it is therefore contrary to criterion ii)

Criterion iii) requires that proposals are sensitively designed to reflect the character of neighbouring settlement and to minimise the impact on Strategic Gaps. It is clear that this proposed development would impact on the long standing objectives of the strategic gap between Fareham, Gosport, Lee-on-the-Solent and Stubbington and significantly diminish its function as previously mentioned with regard to Policy CS14 and further highlighted below with regard to the Strategic Gap policy (CS22).

Criterion v requires that the site would not have any unacceptable environmental, amenity and traffic implications.

There is significant concern that this planning proposal must be seen in the context of the larger proposed HA2 allocation, the number of existing speculative applications within the Strategic Gap and the potential Strategic Growth Area as outlined in the Supplement version of the latest Regulation 18 consultation.

As this site together with all the other sites have not been subject to an in-combination assessment it is impossible to fully understand the environmental, amenity and traffic implications regarding this proposal. It is also important to stress that evidence that does exist has not been examined in public by a Local Plan Inspector in order to ascertain the environmental, amenity and traffic implications regarding this proposal and other related proposals in the existing Strategic Gap. This is imperative given the particular issues associated with the Gosport Peninsula including limited transport choices, significant out commuting and congestion, and air pollution issues. This proposal should not be brought forward in isolation in advance of an in-combination assessment of the other sites in the strategic gap and the wider peninsula to ascertain impacts on traffic, air quality and other environmental considerations. Consequently it needs to be considered as part of a Local Plan Examination in Public.

Many of these issues are included in more detail under Principle B regarding GBC's outstanding objection to the HA2 allocation. However there is significant concern that this application site will be linked via a vehicular access to the northern part of the allocation site with direct access onto Newgate Lane East. This would negate the benefits of the proposed Newgate Lane improvements which have been implemented to address existing accessibility issues to, and from, the Gosport Peninsula rather than facilitate new development.

Whilst recognising that the plans do not currently show a link to the northern part of this allocation, as there is no adopted policy in place these arrangements could easily be

altered. Such amendments would be completely outside the control of Gosport Borough Council despite the fact that the Gosport community would be most affected by a detrimental impact on the effectiveness of Newgate Lane. Consequently as there is no adopted policy position in place this makes these concerns a material consideration to this particular planning application.

In the light of the point raised above the proposal is therefore contrary to criteria ii), iii) and v) of Policy DSP40: Housing Allocation.

Policy DSP7 relates to affordable housing exception sites. This proposal includes 100% affordable housing and criterion ii) states that such development outside settlement boundaries should be of a small scale. 99 dwellings is not considered small scale. The policy also refers to being well related to existing urban settlement boundaries (criterion ii) and minimising adverse impact on the countryside and if relevant, strategic gaps (criterion iii). As stated above this is not considered the case in this instance. The proposal is therefore contrary to criteria ii) and iii) of Policy DSP7: Affordable Housing Exception Sites.

Within the Strategic Gap

As introduced above the planning application is contrary to the existing Fareham Local Plan with regard to its policy concerning the Strategic Gap.

This proposal is within the existing strategic gap as defined by the Fareham Local Plan. The Strategic Gap separates the settlements of Fareham, Gosport, Stubbington and Lee-on-the-Solent and the planning application is therefore contrary to the Fareham Core Strategy.

Policy CS22, "Development in Strategic Gaps" states that, 'development proposals will not be permitted either individually or cumulatively where it significantly affects the integrity of the gap and the physical and visual separation of the settlements'.

The Policy recognises that maintaining separation will prevent coalescence of the settlements in this densely settled part of South Hampshire. The justification text states that gaps between settlements help define and maintain the separate identity of individual settlements and have strong local support. It adds that Strategic Gaps do not necessarily have intrinsic landscape value but are important in maintaining the settlement pattern, keeping individual settlements separate and providing opportunities for green infrastructure/green corridors. It acknowledges that continuing pressure for high levels of development mean that maintaining gaps continues to be justified.

The current boundary has been supported by a Planning Inspector as recently as May 2015. In his report into the Examination in Public for the Fareham Local Plan Part 2, the Inspector refers to FBC's evidence regarding the review of Strategic Gaps and states,

'although the review did not specifically take into account the route of the Stubbington bypass and the Newgate Lane improvements, there is no reason to conclude that these proposals would justify altering the boundary of the gap in those locations. Having visited the area I agree with the Council that the gap between Fareham and Stubbington is justified in order to retain visual separation and that the proposed road improvements would not justify a revision to the boundary. The Council's approach is sound.'

This proposal by its sheer scale and location will undoubtedly harm the integrity of the gap and will diminish the physical and visual separation of the settlements. It is clearly contrary to Policy CS22

Prioritisation for brownfield land within the defined urban area boundary

The proposal is also contrary to Policy CS6- the Development Strategy, which states that development will prioritise the re-use of previously developed land within the defined urban area boundaries. This site is a greenfield site outside of the urban area. This proposal is therefore contrary to the Council's long term development strategy. Similarly CS11- Development in Portchester, Stubbington and Hillhead, and Titchfield states that small scale development will be permitted within their respective settlement boundaries. This proposal is not small scale nor within the settlement boundary of Stubbington.

Principle B) No status should be given to the current Regulation 18 versions of the emerging Draft Fareham Local Plan 2036 when determining this planning application given the significant objections which remain to the HA2 allocation

The applicant places significant emphasis that this site is identified as an allocation in the emerging Draft Fareham Local Plan 2036 (DFLP), in which this site has been identified as part of a proposed allocation known as HA2 in FBC's first and subsequent Regulation 18 Consultation documents.

However this Council considers that no weight should be given to these Regulation 18 documents in determining the planning application given the early stage in preparation and the strength of opposition from organisations such as Gosport Borough Council and Hampshire County Council relating to the HA2 allocation.

In this regard it is considered necessary to outline Gosport Borough Council objections to this proposed allocation as it is considered material when determining this application. Some elements of the objection are similar to those highlighted above regarding the current Local Plan but necessary to re-emphasise as these parts relate to the reasons why no weight should be given to the emerging DFLP2036

The Council's key concerns to the HA2 allocation are as follows:

- That this Council strongly objects to the proposed residential allocation at Newgate Lane (HA2) for the reasons summarised below:
 - The proposal would physically and visually diminish the long-established Strategic Gap between Fareham, Gosport, Lee-on-the-Solent and Stubbington. This is contrary to;
 - the objectives of the long-established sub-regional policy in South Hampshire to protect important gaps between settlements.
 - FBC's own evidence, submitted at its own Local Plan Examination in Public as recently as 2015 which defends the gap at this particular location.
 - the Planning Inspector findings in 2015
 - FBC's own Landscape Assessment (2017)
 - its own Sustainability Appraisal which highlights that that Newgate Lane allocation is less sustainably located than other allocations in the DFLP.
 - The proposal has the potential to negate the benefits being provided by the new improvements to Newgate Lane with a negative impact on traffic flow and increased congestion to the detriment of Gosport residents and the local economy including accessibility to the Solent Enterprise Zone at Daedalus;

- The proposal has the potential to significantly harm the amenities of local Gosport residents with the introduction of new access points to existing residential areas, which due to the scale of the proposal would potentially lead to a significant increase of traffic on residential roads;
- The proposal, as described, is very car dependent with no provision for public transport. This would exacerbate the amount of trips using Newgate Lane;
- Any additional traffic on Newgate Lane is likely to have an impact on the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) at the north end of Newgate Lane and Gosport Road and this may be difficult to mitigate given the scale of the allocation and limited public transport choice;
- There is insufficient information on supporting infrastructure required including education, medical and community facilities;
- There is no provision in the policy to protect the amenities of existing residents in the vicinity.

[NB- Each of the these reasons are then set out in detail in the original submission- some of which emphasise points made in relation to Principle A where they are relevant to the proposed HA2 allocation- Please see original submission for further details]

Conclusion

It is recognised that the case of prematurity when considering a proposal in advance of a Local Plan being adopted is less significant than in the past due to the provisions of the Five Year Housing Supply and the Housing Delivery Test. However it is considered that this application should not be permitted in advance of the forthcoming Local Plan 2036 as this site together with the remainder of the proposed HA2 allocation, other potential development areas in the Strategic Gap and speculative developments that have not yet been determined (or could potentially be subject to appeal) are of such significance in terms of scale and impact on the entire Gosport Peninsula. Consequently it is not considered that it would represent the principles of 'good growth', as advocated by Fareham Borough Council, to permit this development without understanding the in-combination impacts and that this should be addressed as part of the Local Plan process.

If HA2 remains in the DFLP, Gosport Borough Council would like the opportunity to appear at FBCs Local Plan 'Examination in Public' to address its fundamental concerns regarding the various residential proposals that are significantly encroaching on the long-established strategic gap between the four settlements.

Therefore all the matters outlined above: environmental and landscape implications traffic congestion, air pollution and other identified issues need to be considered as a whole as part of a wider development strategy including as part of ongoing work by the Partnership for South Hampshire.

The development of so many sites on a piecemeal basis has significant implications for transport to, and from, the Peninsula resulting in increased congestion with limited transport choices as well as implications for air quality including Fareham's existing Air Quality Management Areas.

The proposal for 99 dwellings should be refused in principle as it is contrary to the Fareham Borough adopted Local Plan and that no weight should be given to the proposed allocation in the emerging Draft Fareham Local Plan 2036 given the strength of opposition to this

Regulatory Board
22 July 2020

allocation including by Gosport Borough Council and Hampshire County Council. GBC's outstanding objection relates to the need to protect the effectiveness of the Newgate Lane transport corridor to, and from, the Gosport Peninsula and the principle of safeguarding the function of the Strategic Gap itself to prevent coalescence and maintain the visual separation between settlements. There are also outstanding concerns regarding the impact of traffic on the adjoining Gosport residential areas and the capacity of local community facilities to accommodate this development.

A deputation was received from Mr Wilkinson Chairman on behalf of the Peel Common and Lee on Solent Residents Associations and read out by the Borough Solicitor as follows.

To residents of Gosport it seems incredulous that its elected Councillors would be guided to approve an application that will subject its own voting support to increased traffic misery.

Traffic measure monitoring was not adequate. It was based on the developers limited assessment and pin points Brookers Lane Road as the source of vehicle impact, based on traffic moving east on Brookers Lane Road towards Tukes Avenue and Carisbrooke Road.

The planning authorities and developer have not fully accounted for the present day commuters Peak Traffic journeys through the Peel Common Estate.

- The Peel Common roundabout is now the hub of all journeys. It gives an improved exit out of Gosport. It provides faster easier access to Fareham, the Enterprise Zone and journeys West. The new Stubbington bypass will cement even more the current route of peak time traffic.

The evening peak traffic access route to the 99 homes will by default be The Drive. The evening rush hour traffic is normally stacked up on the B3334 (Rowner Road) starting at The Drive turn in point. Due to stationary traffic The Drive will be the route taken by new vehicles and it will most certainly take the full brunt of the increase in vehicle movements.

- The Drive has 2 schools along its route and though the traffic density is greatest at the school run time, out of school hours activities do occur. There are also 8 driveways connected to this road servicing approximately 100 properties.

- The static traffic causing road congestion on Peel common is not taken into consideration. A count of the cars parked along the short stretch of The Drive close to the peak traffic time, numbered 39. A count of the cars on the short stretch of Brookers Lane Road numbered 27. At times it is difficult to drive around The Curve and through The Parkway with the number of parked cars and commercial vehicles.

- Other considerations ignored are enforcement of safeguarding options. Extra vehicles require extra effort on enforcement of traffic regulations. The Drive suffers greatly from Rat Run drivers who wish to avoid the Carisbrooke traffic lights whilst on a journey to Bridgemary. There is also the continuing flouting of the No Right Turn when leaving The Drive.

- The acceptance of the Brookers Lane Road access has been agreed by Gosport and Hampshire planners using what can only be called a blind eye agreement that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring communities or the Peel Common Residents.

- Bargate Homes preferred option was to use the Newgate Lane East road for access but were denied this preference by LHA on the grounds of the (debateable) need to prevent direct access onto this road.

The traffic assessment on Brookers Lane Road concluded that there would be a minimal traffic impact.

Quote:– 1 additional vehicle every 5 minutes.

The figure was accepted in principle by both planning authorities, LHA and Gosport. This is a totally unrealistic irrational figure and fits in well with the irrational decision to open up the Brookers Lane

Regulatory Board
22 July 2020

Road to through traffic. It also begs the question, with such a small impact why in the first place deny the use of the access for the 99 proposed homes from Newgate Lane East road?

- The board must also accept that if this application is granted it will provide access to more developments in the strategic gap. This invalidates most of the developers supporting papers addressing the impact of just 99 homes. At some stage, with another planned 376 homes to be built, sensible access routes will have to feature in the planning of future dwellings. Even the uncompromising LHA must be aware that you cannot filter another 475 house holding vehicles through the Peel Common estate.
- It is inevitable the figure in practice will be almost 600 new homes, and if approved is likely to condemn many of the citizens of the peninsula to significant traffic nightmare and financial penalty.
- It is our opinion that the access route for the building of the controversial plans for new houses is a compromise pushed along by a clever and often devious developer. Planning authorities have been outmanoeuvred and have been forced to accept the unacceptable.

The Peel Common and Lee on the Solent Residents Associations respectfully submit that the board refuse the application to use the Brookers Lane Road as the means of access to the proposed 99 new homes.

A deputation was received was received from the Trevor Moody, supporting the proposal, read out by the Borough Solicitor as follows:

Good evening Members. My name is Trevor Moody from WYG and I represent Bargate Homes as their planning consultant. Thank you for allowing us to make this written deputation in support of this cross-boundary application.

Bargate Homes is a local housing developer which was acquired by VIVID last year. VIVID is the largest housing association in Hampshire, and it has an objective to deliver 17,000 homes in the next 10 years. Bargate Homes is a small but important part of that, and under VIVID's ownership it can deliver the application scheme regardless of housing market conditions.

Together Bargate Homes and VIVID share a sense of duty to give back to the communities in which they develop and genuinely leave a positive legacy for future generations.

Over the last year, we have worked with officers and key stakeholders, including the local community, to develop carefully considered proposals for up to 99 affordable dwellings and open space. There is a pressing need for more affordable homes in both Gosport and Fareham boroughs with over 1,000 households in each borough on the housing waiting list.

This proposal will deliver not only affordable and social rented accommodation but also shared ownership homes thereby helping to create a balanced community and making a significant positive contribution to affordable housing needs in the local area.

As set out in your Officer's Report, because the vast majority of the site is located within Fareham Borough, the issues before you for consideration this evening are limited to those associated with the construction and future use of the site access within Gosport Borough. At your Officer's request, the description of development was amended to make this explicit

by adding the wording “Gosport Borough Council to only determine part of the application relating to part of access in Gosport Borough”.

We have undertaken extensive consultation with the Local Highway Authority and amended the access design and off-site highway works in response to their comments. The Highway Authority has carefully considered the proposals and are satisfied that the access is safe and has raised no objection.

The site access takes the form of an extension of Brookers Lane into the proposed site and has been designed to comply with the Manual for Streets and Hampshire County Council design standards. An independent Road Safety Audit has been carried out, with all matters raised addressed in the final design. The design has been the subject to detailed discussion with various specialist officers at the Local Highway Authority and represents an agreed form.

With regards to the existing Prohibition of Driving TRO at Brookers Lane, this will need to be amended to allow motorised vehicles to use an area where driving is currently prohibited.

However, the proposed alterations to the footway and cycleway in this area have been carefully assessed by the Local Highway Authority who have stated that “The Prohibition of Driving TRO was implemented to ensure provision of a high quality pedestrian and cycle link from Brookers Lane, across Newgate Lane East to Woodcote Lane. The previous site access comments have been satisfactorily addressed as set out above, and it is considered that safe and convenient travel by foot and bicycle will be provided.”

The applicant is agreeable to entering into a S106 Agreement to ensure completion of the required amendment to the Prohibition of Driving TRO prior to commencement of development.

The Local Highway Authority has considered the traffic flows and impacts on the wider highway network and has not raised any objection to the proposals on this basis.

It is noted that 58 letters of support have been received commenting, in particular, on the need for affordable housing in the area and the sustainable location of the site. The wider proposals will also provide a package of off-site highway improvements including the widening and upgrading of pedestrian and cycle links to schools and facilities, as well as financial contributions to local schools. The construction of 99 homes will create jobs in the construction and associated industries and will result in an increase in household expenditure thus boosting the local economy in a time of need, when other developments may have been delayed are no longer proceeding.

The Officer’s Report, supplemented by the update paper circulated earlier today, has set out that, notwithstanding these benefits, Gosport Borough Council has objected to the planning application for the residential development itself, to be determined by Fareham Borough

In answer to a Member’s question the Board was advised that that the letters of support were referred to in the report of the planning officer. It was confirmed that the majority of the letters were from Gosport and Fareham residents.

Regulatory Board
22 July 2020

It was confirmed that any highway and education contributions would go to the County Council and that some of the facilities would be in the Borough and managed by the County Council. It was confirmed that matters relating to the Community Infrastructure Levy would be related to the housing floor space and therefore located within Fareham Borough.

It was further clarified that the majority of the letters of support were a tick box return generated by a PR company to generate support for the application and that officers were aware that the letters had been sent to both Fareham and Gosport Council's.

In answer to a Member's question the Board was advised that the proposal was for the Highway to be adopted and that would need to be agreed with Hampshire County Council as the Highway authority.

In answer to a Member's question, the Planning Officer confirmed that very few of the letters of support acknowledged the access. Members reiterated that this was the matter for consideration, not the proposal for houses. The 47 proformas submitted did not concern the access.

It was also confirmed that the letter of support that was withdrawn was one of the proformas.

A Member advised that there was a leaflet provided by the applicant that stated that the proposal was on a site allocated for housing in the emerging local plan, not in the strategic gap it was designated in in their current local plan, where building properties was not acceptable. Members expressed concern that such an immature local plan was being used as the basis of the application.

The Board was advised that as Fareham Borough Council would be the decision maker on the houses, it would be for them to decide how much weight to give to emerging local plan and that although it was legislated that they give great weight to their existing plan, it was for them to determine the weight given to the new one.

Councillor Philpott, Ward Councillor for Peel Common addressed the Board as follows:

Thank you for allowing me to address the meeting.

This is an unusual planning application. In any other circumstances it would be part of one single application and the only reason it isn't is because the two applications (P/19/1260 and 19/00516) straddle the borough boundary.

The report makes reference to this Council's standing objection to P/19/1260, so it would be useful to contextualise what it is you are being asked to consider.

In October 2017 Fareham Borough Council published their initial Draft Local Plan which included Housing Allocation 2 (known as HA2). When the Draft Local Plan re-emerged in June last year following the "tearing up" of the first, HA2 remained included and unchanged.

HA2 is a swathe of land east of Newgate Lane East on our western boundary. It stretches from Meadow Walk in the north to Brookers Field in the south and is part of the Strategic

Gap. These two applications represent the first of a number of applications we can expect on HA2. Fareham Council's emerging Draft Local Plan envisages that 475 houses will eventually be built on HA2 with vehicular access for probably all of them through residential roads in my Bridgemary County Division.

It is worth reminding ourselves how we arrived at the position we are in today, ie being asked to facilitate the development of a Fareham housing estate.

On 6 December 2017 this Board met to consider its position on Fareham's Draft Local Plan of which HA2 was a central concern. The Board recommended,

"That this Council objects to the proposed residential allocation at Newgate Lane (because) the proposal has the potential to significantly harm the amenities of local Gosport residents with the introduction of new access points to existing residential areas, which due to the scale of the proposal would potentially lead to a significant increase of traffic on residential roads."

When planning application P/19/1260 to Fareham Council came forward for 99 residential dwellings in the Strategic Gap, this Board was asked for its comments. On 26 February 2020 this Board voted to "raise objection in the strongest possible terms".

The Board agreed with the Planning Officer that the application for 99 dwellings was contrary to a number of Fareham's planning policies – in particular Policy CS22, protecting Strategic Gaps.

The Planning Officer's report before you today explains that approximately 730 square metres of what he describes as "the application site" is within the Borough of Gosport. In paragraph 1 he says,

"Part of the site falls within the urban area boundary and part falls within the Strategic Gap as defined by the Gosport Borough Local Plan".

Fareham is not the only council to have a policy on Strategic Gaps. Gosport Borough Council's Local Plan Policy LP3 says,

"THE CHARACTER AND FUNCTION OF THE SETTLEMENT GAPS BETWEEN GOSPORT/FAREHAM AND LEE-ON-THE-SOLENT/STUBBINGTON WILL BE PRESERVED."

As the function of this proposed access is to facilitate housing development, and because land under consideration is in the Strategic Gap, this application is, therefore, contrary to Policy LP3 (10).

I contend that it is not possible to see these two applications (P/19/1260 and 19/00516) in isolation. And I am not alone in that opinion.

In the first paragraph of his report to you the Planning Officer appears to regard this as one single application site:

"The majority of the application site is located within the boundary of Fareham Borough Council with an area of approximately 730 square metres falling within the Borough of Gosport."

The Applicants – Bargate Homes and VIVID – agree. In their glossy brochure sent to all Gosport councillors they say,

"The key benefits include:

- *100% affordable housing scheme with a total of 99 homes*
- *Mixture of sizes and tenures*
- *A new play area"*

And they go on to describe it as a "cross-boundary application". So, clearly Bargate Homes also see this as a single application site.

In his email to Gosport Planners dated 29 April 2020 Hampshire County Council's Principal Transport Engineer wrote:

"The applicant has submitted two planning applications. The Highway Authority will consider the site as a whole".

So, Hampshire Highways also agree that this is one single application site.

The overwhelming majority of public responses - including the questionnaires from Bargate Homes that appear to be offering respondents a brand new house if they tick the right box – speak only of the housing. These questionnaires have been accepted by our Planning Officer as letters in support for the application before you this evening. So clearly they also regard the application site and the proposals as one single application.

In their response Hampshire Constabulary wrote about

“the proposed development will bring more people to this end of Brookers Lane”.

Remember, Hampshire Constabulary were responding to the planning application before you this evening, but obviously aware of the other aspect of this application, they too consider this to be one single application site.

In responding to Gosport Planning Officers and to this planning application Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service said,

“HFRS understands that the project involves development of 99 dwellings and associated works”.

So, Hampshire Fire and Rescue join the others in believing this to be one single application site.

All these respondents – statutory and public – see these two planning applications as indivisible, including the Applicant! In fact just about everybody does.

The application for access is not an application for a road to nowhere. It is an application for access to a housing estate on the Strategic Gap to which your Committee has already lodged an objection. If you oppose the housing then you must also oppose the access.

At the meeting on 26 February 2020 this Board heard that HA2 is part of Fareham Council’s emerging Draft Local Plan. In their glossy literature the Applicant seeks to make a lot out of this. This Draft Local Plan is only at the very early consultation stage and, as such, no weight should be given to it. This is an important point because in February it was reported to this Board that

“the proposal for 99 houses should not be brought forward in isolation in advance of an in-combination assessment of other sites in the Strategic Gap,” and that *“it needs to be considered as part of a Local Plan Examination in Public.”*

What is being proposed seeks to exploit existing facilities and services within the Borough of Gosport. The Applicant is quite open about that. And for that matter, so is Fareham Borough Council in its Draft Local Plan documents. Yet, not once has the Applicant approached Gosport’s Planning Officers to discuss any kind of contribution to this Council. Even though the housing would be in Fareham, the overwhelming majority of services they would use are in Gosport, so this application must be considered to be contrary to Policy LP32.

Equally, Gosport’s Local Plan refers to developments of more than 50 dwellings and provision of open space. The provision of off-site open space is that a contribution is secured through Section 106 Agreement. Our Local Plan says that the contribution should reflect the impact the development has on existing green infrastructure – all of which, so far as the application site is concerned, is in the Borough of Gosport. I contend, therefore, that this application seeks to facilitate development without contribution, or even an offer of a contribution, so is therefore contrary to Policy LP34.

The Applicant has said that there is no issue with nitrates associated with this application. I would suggest that this debate has yet to run its course and that the Developer will need to demonstrate that their proposals return the internationally protected habitats of the Solent to a favourable condition. From this perspective it is arguable that this application may not meet the requirements of Policy LP42.

In their deliberations members may wish to question whether a pinch-point access to 99 houses in what the Police describe as a “leaky” cul-de-sac is acceptable and whether the narrow access solution being offered satisfies Policies LP22 and LP23.

IN SUMMARY

1. This application is contrary to Policy LP3 on Strategic Gaps, as well as being at odds with PfSH’s Spatial Position Statement that seeks to maintain countryside Gaps between settlements.
2. It is premature to consider either the access or the housing at this time because HA2 is part of Fareham’s emerging Local Plan which is still at Regulation 18 consultation stage. These matters should be considered as part of the Local Plan Examination in Public. If you take this view it would be consistent with the recommendations approved by this Board in February.
3. This application is contrary to Policy LP32 which says, “NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS WILL NEED TO CONTRIBUTE TOWARDS PROVIDING HIGH QUALITY AND ACCESSIBLE COMMUNITY, CULTURAL AND BUILT LEISURE FACILITIES.” It should not be a matter of where the development is, but whom it impacts.
4. Similarly, the application would also be contrary to Policy LP34 because the existing green infrastructure impacted is in the Borough of Gosport.

Finally, I request members ask themselves whether these two applications are divisible, or like the Applicant, the statutory consultees and the public respondents, they believe them to be two sides of the same coin.

Members welcomed the deputations and felt that it was not Gosport Borough Council’s duty to provide access to a Fareham development, and that it should be resolved within the Borough of Fareham.

Members accepted there was a need for affordable homes but felt that it was inappropriate for them to be delivered in the strategic gap.

Members thanked the planning officers for their work and acknowledged that it had generated a large level of interest they also highlighted that it had generated a large amount of enquiries from members of the public and none of them had been in favour of the proposal.

Members reiterated that the proposal was for properties on the strategic gap and that the gap had a vital function that should be protected and that the proposed changes to the highway would bring damage to the strategic gap and the use of it.

It was formally proposed that the application be rejected based on the breaches of the Gosport Local Plan but also breaches of the Fareham Borough Council Local Plan including CS14, DSP6, DSP40 and CS22.

Members reiterated that strategic gaps were in place to allow people to retain their own identity and to ensure that settlements did not collide. Gosport Council had previously objected to the HA2 proposals and also to the building of properties in the strategic gap.

Members recognised that when they propose to reject a proposal it should be done on Gosport's Policies and that it was Fareham Borough Council's responsibility to determine applications based on theirs.

Members reiterated their objection as it was contrary to Gosport Policies LP3, preservation of the strategic gap, LP32 the need to contribute to high quality facilities and LP34 the green impact on Gosport and that any objection should be made on these grounds.

Members welcomed the update from the Head of Planning and Regeneration

Members reiterated that the proposal should be considered as a whole and acknowledged that all Members of the Board supported the provision of affordable homes, but not within the strategic gap.

Members felt that a single entry point to such developments would create rat runs and congestion, as well as pollution.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration advised the Board that procedurally the Board were only determining the part of the application in Gosport, which was the access and that as a result the Board were not able to consider the impacts of the separate housing proposal as that was within Fareham Borough Council land. It was accepted that it was difficult to divorce the access from the principle of the access it was proposed to serve and therefore the Council could consider the principle of the access.

Gosport Borough Council were considering the material planning considerations around the construction of the access, Fareham Borough Council would consider the element of the proposal that proposed the housing and that it was acknowledged that the Council had already responded to Fareham Borough Council on the proposed development within the strategic gap but because consideration was only being given to the element proposed in Gosport, Fareham Borough Council Policies should not be considered.

It was summarised that the principle of the proposed development was unacceptable, as set out in previous consultation responses to Fareham Borough Council and this is considered to be an overriding material consideration, not overcome by the potential reasons for approving the construction and use of the access, in isolation.

Members acknowledged that it was an unusual application and that it was difficult to be asked to consider this after already opposing development in the strategic gap.

It was confirmed that the Fareham Borough Council policies of the proposed reasons for refusal were to be removed and that the refusal was for reasons LP3, LP32, LP34, LP23 and LP22 of the Gosport Borough Council Local Plan.

Members were advised to consider whether the policies were relevant to the access as it was felt that their proposal to reject the application was on a wider matter than the policies covered.

Members felt that in line with previous objections to the proposed development that objections should be made in the strongest possible way, following planning officer's guidance.

It was agreed that the wording of the proposed rejection be amended to remove reference to the policies of the Gosport Borough Council Local Plan and that this was in itself unusual.

The Board was also advised that from a legal perspective, that as a planning authority applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless there were material considerations that would indicate otherwise and that this was an example of that being relevant.

It was proposed and seconded that the proposal be refused for the following reason:

That the principle of the proposed development was unacceptable, as set out in previous consultation responses to Fareham Borough Council and this is considered to be an overriding material consideration, not overcome by the potential reasons for approving the construction and use of the access, in isolation.

This was unanimously agreed by the Board

RESOLVED: That planning application 19/00516/OUT be refused for the following reason: The principle of the proposed development is unacceptable as set out in previous consultation responses on the Regulation 18: Draft Fareham Local Plan 2036 (08.12.17); Issues and Options (25.07.19); Supplement (28.02.20) and planning application ref P/19/1260 (27.02.20), to Fareham Borough Council and this is considered to be an overriding material consideration not overcome by the potential reasons for approving the construction and use of the access in isolation.

**20/00104/FULL - ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY REAR CONSERVATORY
1 Oxford Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 3LP**

Consideration was given to a report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 20/00104/FULL

The Board was updated that the description of the development needed amending as the conservatory detailed sat away from the common boundary not adjacent to it as described.

A deputation was received from Miss Hamilton and Mr Jones and read out by the Borough Solicitor as follows:

Firstly we would like to state that there are many details in this report which are incorrect. These are:-

The Site and the Proposal

- a. In paragraph 1, the garden is not enclosed by 1.8 meter high fencing. A site visit was made to establish the height so we don't know why this is incorrect. The first 5.6 metres of the fence is 1.68 metres high, it then becomes 1.4 metres high for the rest of the garden.
- b. In paragraph 2 the existing conservatory is not adjacent to the common boundary as stated. It is actually built to the south side of the rear garden. This can clearly be seen on the plans.
- c. States the height of the new conservatory flat roof is 2.5 metres, on the submitted plans it is 2.55 metres.
- d. The roof lantern dimensions were not on the submitted plans. This new information, that we were not able to consider, now takes the maximum roof height to 3.2 meters.

Principal Issues

- a. Paragraph 3 states the combined extension and conservatory would be 2.5 metres further along the common boundary. This is wrong because at present there is nothing at all built on the common boundary.
- b. To compare the height of the existing conservatory and new extension when the existing conservatory is nowhere near our common boundary is ridiculous.

Response to Public Advertisement

- a. In our objection letter we also raised issues of overlooking and mass, these haven't been included in this report.

Prior to the building of this extension and conservatory and as mentioned in our original objection, Mr and Mrs Richards are also building a very large development along another 5.8 metres of the same common boundary, making 11 metres of buildings on the 13 metres of our south facing boundary, blocking in most of the garden with a huge mass, seriously changing the appearance of the area and enjoyment of our property considering our garden is only approximately 4 metres wide.

So in fact we will have gone from no building on the common boundary at all, to 11 metres of buildings.

The new height of the proposed extension will cause more overshadowing than expected and the proposed conservatory will be a significant mass a few feet from our backdoor and main sitting area, blocking light into the kitchen and dining room particularly in the shorter daylight months.

We have enjoyed 25 years of all year sunshine across our common boundary.

We fail to see how any credible decision can be reached with so much information factually incorrect.

In answer to a Member's question the Board was advised that the objection was from 3 Oxford Road, the neighbouring property.

The Board was advised that the planning officer confirmed the height of the boundary fence was 1.8 metres and that the plans submitted were to scale and partially dimensioned and acceptable. The proposal was for an extension across the width of the existing property with the conservatory proposed for the end of it, along the common boundary, giving it an L shape. The Board was advised that the depth of the extension was broadly the same depth as the conservatory on the neighbouring property and that the proposed conservatory would sit beyond that.

The Board was advised that there was no outbuilding in the proposal and that it was believed that the applicant had aspirations to build one in the future, however there was no indication what that was at this time. If it was proposed that the building be attached to the main building then it would require planning permission.

Members expressed concern that although the proposal was not deemed to have significant impact on the neighbours, it would have an impact and that it should be considered that the loss of light be an impact on the amenity of the neighbours.

Members felt that a site visit to view the proposed site would be appropriate but were unsure if this could be achieved in the current environment. The Borough Solicitor confirmed that it would be acceptable should a site visit be the wish of the Members.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred for a site visit.

RESOVED: That planning application 20/00104/FULL be deferred for a site visit.

**20/00159/FULL - ERECTION OF SIDE PORCH AND INSTALLATION OF FIRST FLOOR REAR ROOF TERRACE INCLUDING BALUSTRADE (RESUBMISSION OF 19/00371/FULL)
23 The Parkway Gosport Hampshire PO13 0PT**

Consideration was given to a report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration requesting that consideration be given to planning application 20/00159/FULL.

The Board unanimously agreed the recommendation.

RESOLVED: That planning application 20/00159/FULL be approved subject to the conditions in the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration.

**20/00211/FULL - ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION
(CONSERVATION AREA)**

13 Clayhall Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 2BB

The Head of Planning and Regeneration left the meeting.

Consideration was given to a report requesting that consideration be given to planning application 20/00211/FULL.

The Board unanimously agreed the recommendation

RESOVLED: That planning application 20/00211/FULL be approved, subject to the conditions in the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration.

7. ANY OTHER ITEMS

The Board was advised that in when the Councils response to the planning application in Fareham for houses located adjacent to Newgate Lane, which the Council commented on in February, there was a discussion by the Board about the Direction the National Planning Casework unit then had in place with regard to two other applications in Fareham. At the time the Board agreed that it would be appropriate for the planning officers to alert the National Planning Casework unit to the existence of the application being considered on the basis of similar strategic issues applying to it.

The other two planning applications were now under appeal on the basis of non-determination and as such the National Planning Casework Unit have advised the Council that the Directions that they had issued no longer applied. The Secretary of State would still have call in powers but under different legislation as it was now an appeal rather than an application.

The National Planning Casework Unit has advised that in relation to the application still under consideration for the houses, because the previous Directions had lapsed it was not their intention to issue any further Direction unless they received a specific request to do so.

Officers were seeking the views of the Board as to whether they wished for a formal request to be made by officers on behalf of GBC.

Members unanimously agreed to support officers in making a formal request to the National Planning Casework Unit that a Direction be issued in respect of the current planning application.

The Chairman placed on record her thanks to all of the officers for their support at the meeting.

Regulatory Board
22 July 2020

CHAIRMAN

Concluded at 8.22 pm