

Public Document Pack

Regulatory Board
6 September 2023

A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD WAS HELD ON 6 SEPTEMBER 2023

The Mayor, and Councillor Chegwyn (ex-officio)

Councillors Bradley, Bradley, Casey, Earle, Gledhill, Hammond and Scard

17. APOLOGIES FOR NON-ATTENDANCE

There were none.

18. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

19. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 26 JULY 2023.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 26 July 2023 be signed as a true and correct record.

20. DEPUTATIONS - STANDING ORDER 3.4

Deputations were received on item 21/00516/FULL

21. PUBLIC QUESTIONS - STANDING ORDER 3.5

There were none.

22. PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON DRAFT GOSPORT LINES CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLAN (INCLUDING THE RECOMMENDATION THAT TRINITY GREEN AND WALPOLE PARK BE DESIGNATED A CONSERVATION AREA); AND REVIEW OF PRIDDY'S HARD AND ROYAL CLARENCE YARD CONSERVATION AREAS

Consideration was given to a report of the Principal Conservation and Design Officer seeking approval to undertake public consultation on the draft 'Gosport Lines Conservation Area appraisal and Management Plan'

The Board was advised that it was a statutory duty to identify areas that may be considered to be Conservation Areas and the proposal for consideration for consultation was Trinity Green and Walpole Park, which would sit beside the existing St George's Barrack area.

Members felt there was no reason not to consult on the proposal and thanked officers for their work.

RESOLVED: That

A public consultation on the following be undertaken:

- i) the potential designation of a new Conservation Area covering Trinity Green and Walpole Park;
- ii) a review of the Royal Clarence Yard Conservation Area;
- iii) a review of the Priddy's Hard Conservation Area;
- iv) a draft 'Gosport Lines' Conservation Areas Appraisal and Management Plan covering the existing St George's Barracks North and South Conservation Areas and the proposed Trinity Green and Walpole Park Conservation Area;
- v) a draft Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan for the Royal Clarence Yard Conservation Area; and,
- vi) a draft Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan for the Priddy's Hard Conservation Area.

23. REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Manager detailing planning application 21/00516/FULL

The Board was updated that paragraph 4 of the Principal Issues of the report detailed that the car parking spaces were compliant in size, however it was noted that while the majority met, or exceeded the dimensions within the parking SPD, the end space adjacent to the side wall of No. 189 should ideally be 165mm wider. In this instance it was not considered that the deficiency would prejudice users of the space and was acceptable.

The recommendation remained to grant conditional permission.

The Board was advised that the application related to the erection of a part single and part two-storey building to form 5 one bedroom flats. The existing hoarding on the corner of Forton Road and Alma Street was to be retained being outside of the applicant's ownership. 5 car parking spaces were proposed with 2 accessed from Alma Street and the remainder from Reeds Place. A small area of amenity space was provided, along with refuse and cycle storage.

Julie Mundy was invited to address the Board. She advised that she resided at number 189 Forton Road, a three storey property, next to the application site.

She advised that she was asking the elected members to represent her to stop the development going ahead. She advised that she was sick with concern about the impact the proposal would have on her own property and felt the proposal was unfair because of the impact on her area, her town and her property.

She advised that her house was over 100 years old and that the excavation for the foundations would impact on her property foundations and could cause damage, flood and freezing to her vulnerable foundations.

She advised that the planning department has told her the issues raised were her issues, whereas she felt that the issues were those of the developer and the Council not private legal issues as advised.

The proposal was claustrophobic not only to her property but to those on Alma Street and this has not been considered as part of the application and felt the planning department only advocated the developer and did not consider the harmful impact.

She advised that the proposal would shadow her garden blocking light and would create a security risk from access to her garden and impact the privacy on her balcony where her grandchildren played.

The natural light from the property was from her rear windows which would be impacted and render her property worthless from the negative impact.

A Member sought clarification with regard to the loss of light at the property and it was confirmed that the property had no windows to either side and that the windows at the front of the house were covered because of the close proximity of pedestrians to the windows. The balcony formed the majority of the outside space and this would be impacted.

The Board was advised that the property was not directly north south facing.

The Board was advised that the current occupants had resided in the property for six years and that it had previously been a bakery and a dairy.

Mr Tutton was invited to address the Board. He advised he was the agent for the application and support the Officer's favourable recommendation.

He advised that the plot had been vacant for some time and that the proposal would improve it and increase civic pride. It was served by the number 11 bus and local shops and medical facilities so was located on a sustainable site. The Board was advised that the Borough Council was required to have a five year plan of housing stock and that the last declaration made by Gosport Borough Council was that there was only 3.7 years with a particular need for smaller units. It was a good use of the land and suitable for higher density high quality living.

The site had been identified as mixed use and there were 5 parking spaces, one per unit. The Board was advised that the Local Highway authority had not objected to the proposal.

He felt the officer's recommendation was the correct one and the application should be granted.

Members sought clarification that the measurements from the highway were to the edge of the first parking space, or to the centre. It was confirmed that the 10m distance was to the centre of the first space.

A Member advised that he had measured the space and that it would be tight to get into the spaces from Alma Street and that it was only 8.75m to the edge of the space and advised that the double yellow lines were already abused in the road and the proposal would make the situation worse.

A Member questioned the agent as to where the visitor parking would be, and whether they had measured and viewed the parking and were advised that there was one space and that they had not personally measured the spaces and that highways consultants had been responsible for the measurements.

Members felt that the visitor parking was not suitable and that two provisions considered were not suitable, the on street parking was limited to an hour and the nearby Whites Place car park was always full, day and night.

The Board was advised by planning officers that the building control partnership had advised that the proposal was adequate in terms of separation distance for foundations and that the party wall act and civil action would be the process should any issues arise.

The Board was advised that the 5 parking spaces were one per flat and that the provision for visitor's spaces could be either on street or in the local public car park.

A Member advised that there were equivalent to 20 spaces for 32 properties in the neighboring street, nowhere near enough for current demand and that this proposal would add additional pressure to already limited spaces.

Members felt it was unreasonable to use the 1 hour parking and that Whites Place was considered too far a distance and was also well used.

Members were advised that the proximity of the visitor parking to the site deemed the proposal acceptable.

Whilst not against any development on the site Members felt that the area was overcrowded as it was and that the proposal would make things worse and was too much in too small a space. Members recognised that the site was untidy and needed improvement but felt the proposal was cramped an unacceptable.

Members expressed significant concern at the lack of visitor parking and the impact that it would have on the local area and felt the proposal was too much development.

It was proposed and seconded that the proposal would, by reason of its failure to make provision for adequate visitor parking lead to an increased pressure for parking in an area with limited capacity to the detriment of the amenities of existing residents contrary to Policy LP23 of the Gosport Local Plan 2011-2029 and the aims and objectives of the Parking SPD.

This was agreed.

RESOLVED: That the proposal would, by reason of its failure to make provision for adequate visitor parking lead to an increased pressure for parking in an area with limited capacity to the detriment of the amenities of existing residents contrary to Policy LP23 of the Gosport Local Plan 2011-2029 and the aims and objectives of the Parking SPD.

24. ANY OTHER ITEMS

There were none.

CHAIRMAN

Concluded at 6.55 pm

Regulatory Board
6 September 2023

This page is intentionally left blank