

Public Document Pack

Regulatory Board
1 December 2021

A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD WAS HELD ON 1 DECEMBER 2021

Councillor Burgess

Councillors Casey, Earle, Hammond, Mrs Jones, Mrs Morgan and Westerby

90. APOLOGIES FOR NON-ATTENDANCE

An apology for non attendance was received from Councillor Mrs Hook.

91. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mrs Westerby advised that she had been involved in calling in item 2.

92. MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 6 OCTOBER 2021 AND 2 NOVEMBER 2021

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meetings held on 6 October 2021 and 2 November 2021 be signed as true and correct records.

93. DEPUTATIONS - STANDING ORDER 3.4

Deputations were received on the following items

21/00076/FULL – Haslar Marina
21/00481/TPO – 19 Queens Road

94. PUBLIC QUESTIONS - STANDING ORDER 3.5

There were none.

95. REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

**21/0076/FULL ERECTION OF AN OPEN AIR BAR AND RESTAURANT WITH MARQUEE ON NEW PONTOONS (as amplified by as amplified by Construction Management Statement and Shadow HRA received 17 May 2021)
Haslar Marina Haslar Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 1NU**

Consideration was given to a report of the Development Manager recommending that planning application 21/0076/FULL be approved.

A deputation was received from Councillor Mrs Cully as Councillor for Town Ward

She advised that she had received communication from several residents who were concerned about the proposal and the impact would have on the Watergate.

The new proposal would cause additional noise with longer opening hours and more disturbance particularly if the wind was in an unfavourable direction.

Councillor Mrs Cully advised that she agreed with the inclusion of a lighting and noise management plan and expressed concern that there was no parking included as part of it which would present parking issues in the surrounding area and would infringe on the reserved spaces for Seward Tower and Harbour Tower

The Board was advised that suppliers often used the single gate located close to the Timespace for deliveries and that these deliveries along with boat owners and would use the visitors spaces, which in turn would mean that there were no visitors spaces available.

It was suggested that deliveries be restricted from using the access at the Timespace and be rediverted along to the larger access at the bottom of Haslar Bridge and that this be included in the service plan to ease the concerns of residents.

The Board was advised that the flats created a microclimate and that as a result noise from it magnified. This would be the third hospitality site in the marina and it was felt that this was excessive.

Councillor Meenaghan was invited to address the Board as Ward Councillor. She advised the Board that she was contacted by residents who had expressed concerns about the noise the site would create. The proposal would mainly be used by those using the marina and felt that support should be provided for the economy outside the marina.

The Board was advised that the proposal was for use between April and October and that heaters and blankets would be provided. Concern was expressed that the heating would be using a generator and fossil fuels which went against proposals to better address climate change.

It was felt that the tent would be an eyesore on what was a pleasant promenade and as the marquee deteriorated through exposure to wind and sunshine it would be a blot on the landscape.

In answer to a Member's question, the Board was advised that it was possible to condition the use of the side gate for the delivery of food.

A Member also queried whether it would be possible to condition that no external heating be used on the site. The Board was advised that planning permission would not be required to install heaters.

In answer to additional question, the Board was advised that the facilities, including sanitary block were located 20 metres from the site.

Members hoped that the owners would make an effort to ensure the tent remained in good condition.

Members questioned whether an additional facility would be located at what had previously been Trinity's, and was advised that there was supporting information to advise that the applicant was considering the use of the former Lightship, but that it did not form part of the application being considered.

The Board was advised that the Lightship already had existing permission to operate as a restaurant and could be occupied as such at any time.

The Board was also advised that there were separate applications under consideration relating to the existing office building being replaced with a restaurant and bar.

Members reiterated concern about the noise and light pollution the proposal would generate and felt that insisting on using the larger gate would cause issue for those living in Rampart Row.

RESOLVED: That application 21/0076/FULL be approved, subject to the conditions in the report of the Development Manager.

21/00481/TPO CROWN THIN BY 20% AND CROWN LIFT OF UP TO 5 METRES TO 1NO. HORSE CHESTNUT TREE, POLLARDING OF 4NO. POPLAR TREES BACK TO PREVIOUS POLLARDING POINTS (APPROXIMATELY 10 METRES), CROWN THIN BY 20% AND REDUCTION OF OVERHANGING BRANCHES BY 3 METRES TO 1NO. HOLM OAK, 1NO. HORSE CHESTNUT AND 1NO. HOLLY TREE AND CROWN REDUCE AND RESHAPE BY 3 METRES TO 1NO. ASH TREE (TPO G.7) (CONSERVATION AREA)

Consideration was given to a report of the Development Manager requesting that consideration be given to application 21/00481/TPO.

Mr Marshall was invited to address the Board.

He advised that he lived opposite the site and had done so for 30 years.

The trees were mature and rare in an urban setting and were beautiful and were part of the reason he had chosen to live there.

He advised that he had seen the tree be lopped previously and that both the house and trees had significant history. The site had formed part of the large Burton House site and were the only significant houses remaining.

He advised the Board that the trees were only visible from Google Earth, and were no inconvenience. There was some overhanging to the road but no impacts on the gardens either side. The properties to the south may suffer by not being shaded but there would be no impact on the properties to the north.

He felt the trees should be protected as there had already been the loss of a significant number of mature specimens and advised that urban trees were a privilege, and these were nonstandard trees not just oak trees in a forest or field.

Mr Marshall advised that he believed he was the only objector but advised they were well loved. They had been distressing lopped before and he felt that this term was not appropriate as it signified great damage to them. The trees had not recovered from being lopped and felt that urban trees should be left in their natural state as they were beautiful.

Mr Chetwynd was invited to address the Board and provided the Board with pictures of the trees.

He advised the he had purchased the property in December 2020 and that part of the appeal of it was the trees which he was committed to preserving.

He advised that he was not applying to fell any of the trees, but conduct much needed maintenance. He understood that the previous owners had conducted maintenance 15 years prior, but none had been undertaken since.

The tree in picture one was consumed with ivy which was choking the tree and adding significant weight, increasing its risk of falling, which would be in close proximity to neighbours properties.

The branches of the tree in the second photograph showed that they had grown so much they were now enveloping the power cables into the property. This made access to them very difficult and only possible by cherry picker and therefor risked damaging supply

Picture 3 showed the trees with a lot of dead wood stuck in branches posing a risk to the applicants and neighbouring properties and those walking by.

Picture 4 showed that there had been significant damage to the large trunks of dead wood that remained trapped in the trees and were also at risk of falling and causing damage.

The historical property was at risk as the branches extended so they were in contact either the roof of the property. This was shown in picture 5 and showed the risk of damage to the roof in poor weather.

The 6th photograph showed a large trunk that had recently fallen causing damage to a car on the driveway, on a route used by the applicant and the neighbours, it was 8-9ft and required 3 people to move it and it was fortunate that no one had passed underneath at the time.

He reiterated that he was not looking to fell trees but to preserve them and the buildings, protect the buildings and the future health of the trees.

In answer to a Members question the Board was advised that a tree surgeon had been consulted and had advised on the work required.

Members felt the application was a sensible approve.

RESOLVED: That application 21/00481/TPO be approved subject to the conditions in the report of the Development Manager.

96. ANY OTHER ITEMS

There were none.

CHAIRMAN

Concluded at 6.36 pm