

Public Document Pack

Regulatory Board
14 February 2024

A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD WAS HELD ON 14 FEBRUARY 2024

The Mayor

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

40. APOLOGIES FOR NON-ATTENDANCE

An apology for non attendance was received from Councillor Chegwyn.

41. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

42. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 6 DECEMBER 2023

The minutes of the meeting on 6th December 2023 were signed as a true and correct record.

43. DEPUTATIONS - STANDING ORDER 3.4

Deputations were received on agenda items

7/1 – 22 Anglesey Road

7/2 – 117 Bridgemary Road

7/3 – Bay House School

7/4 – Bay House School

7/5 – 31 Crescent Road

44. PUBLIC QUESTIONS - STANDING ORDER 3.5

There were none.

45. DESIGNATION OF TRINITY GREEN AND WALPOLE PARK CONSERVATION AREA; DESIGNATION OF THE EXISTING 'ANGLESEY' AND 'ALVERSTOKE' CONSERVATION AREAS AS ONE CONSERVATION AREA; AND, ADOPTION OF CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISALS AND MANAGEMENT PLANS FOR: GOSPORT LINES; ROYAL CLARENCE YARD; PRIDDY'S HARD; AND, ANGLESEY AND ALVERSTOKE

Consideration was given to a report of the Principal Conservation and Design Officer detailing a proposal to designate 'Trinity Green and Walpole Park' as a Conservation Area, as set out in Appendix A.

Members congratulated officers on the work, and welcomed the proposals.

RESOLVED:

Regulatory Board
14 February 2024

- A. That the Board agrees to formally designate 'Trinity Green and Walpole Park' as a Conservation Area, as set out in Appendix A.
- B. That the Board agrees to formally designate the existing 'Anglesey' and 'Alverstoke' Conservation Areas as one Conservation Area with the suggested amendments to boundaries, as set out in Appendix B.
- C. The Board agree to amend the boundary of the Priddy's Hard Conservation Area, as set out in Appendix C.
- D. That the Board resolve to adopt the Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans for the 'Gosport Lines' Conservation Areas; the 'Royal Clarence Yard' Conservation Area; the 'Priddy's Hard' Conservation Area; and, the 'Anglesey and Alverstoke' Conservation Area to support Policy LP12 of the adopted Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011 to 2029 and as a material consideration when determining planning applications, as set out in Appendix D.

46. REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Consideration was given to a report of the Development Manager detailing the applications received.

23/00361/FULL - ERECTION OF OUTBUILDING TO REAR GARDEN FOR USE AS RESIDENTIAL ANNEXE (RETROSPECTIVE)

The Camber 22 Anglesey Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 2EQ

Members had undertaken a site visit to the property and viewed it from both the applicants side and from the neighboring garden.

Mr. Galloway was invited to address the Board. He advised that he did not intend to repeat what he had said previously, but he did want to advise that when he met the Development Manger previously he had advised that the height would be critical on a retrospective planning application. He also advised that he believed that the accurate height of the building would be measured but he had never seen the results.

He believed that the planning department had been evasive about the overall height of the building, advising subsequently that it was not possible to determine the height of the building which he found ludicrous and suggested this was one thing the Development Management team could have and should have determined last May and at many points since. It was believed that the team did not want this height to be public as it would irrevocably undermine the recommendation for approval.

He believed that the proposal was 48cm above the permitted height of 2.5m. This was very specific perimeter stated in the planning portal and the Town and Country Planning Act, (General Permitted Development).

This Statutory Legislation states in Schedule 2, Part 1 what is, and what is not permitted for a class E building and specifically in section E.1 that:

Development is not permitted by class E if

e) the height of the building would exceed 2.5 metres in the case of a building within 2 metres of the boundary of the curtilage of the dwelling house,

h) it would include the constriction or provision of a verandah balcony or raised platform.

On this subject the situation at the Regulatory Board meeting on the 6th December 2023 became totally unrealistic when the Development Manager in response to a question about both the height and the proximity to the boundary stated that he would still recommend acceptance of the retrospective application for this building.

The neighbours both felt that the planning department was determined to fly in the face of Statutory Legislation, an Act of Parliament, making a complete mockery of the order in 2015.

Statute law also known as legislation, plays a crucial role in the UK legal system and is important because it provides a clear written framework for governing a society.

It would appear the Council is in danger of setting a disastrous precedent but allowing all in sundry to erect whatever building they want, on their property and then allow them to apply retrospectively in the hope that the Council will ignore the law of the land and grant acceptance, which cannot in any circumstances be considered to be a commendable way of governing society.

We object most strongly to the application and ask the Regulatory Board not to grant permission.

He advised that he had consulted a professional planning consultant who advised that building control would need to give approval at each stage and that the associated regulations should be considered. The building was being slept in, and this required a different level of regulations to be met, particularly around drainage, sleeping accommodation and the distances from adjoining properties. This was to ensure it was habitable and safe. There was also concern over the combustibility of the building.

Members were advised of the difference between what was acceptable as permitted development that did not require a planning application and anything outside of this that would require a formal planning application. That was what was being considered.

The Board was also advised that applications seeking retrospective planning permission were allowed. In addition, the Board was advised that there were two separate processes, the planning permission process and the Building Regulations approval process. Factors like the suitability of the materials used were functions of the Building Control process.

There appeared to be a degree of misunderstanding by Mr Galloway about what was acceptable under permitted development and what required planning permission.

In answer to a Members question the Board was advised that the building control inspection was still pending, awaiting the outcome of the planning application.

It was reiterated to the Board that just because an application exceeded the height of what was acceptable under GPDO, this did not mean that the application was not acceptable at all. It simply meant that a planning application was required for it, which would be considered on its own merits.

Regulatory Board
14 February 2024

The Board were advised any regulations for GDPO were not relevant to the application being considered, as it was for a full planning application.

Beverley Strawson was invited to address the Board. She advised that she was the applicant for the proposal and that

Our plans were always transparent, the cabin was to be used for occasional overnight stays for my parents for respite due to their poor health, officers inspected the development at different stages and were happy with the progression and completion

Consultation was sought, the fee paid for advice regarding our plans to demolish the old constructions and construct, what we call Grandma's Cabin, we were advised that it was permissible under permitted development and if circumstances changed we would have to apply for change of use.

Our plan were always transparent, the cabin was to be used for occasional overnight stays for my parents for respite due to their poor health, officers inspected the development at different stages and were happy with the progression and completion I would like to bring to your attention that the previous buildings were taller and on the boundary of our property, this is evidenced in the picture circulated, please note the height of the roof and the comparison of the new cabin which is clearly noticeable by the position of our neighbours solar panels. The old constructions were there for approximately 12 years with no complaints from our neighbours, we have also taken a photograph of the rear of the building showing that it is hardly visible and lower than Mr Galloway's garage.

The usage of the cabin is very sporadic, it was not used from August to November, it was used for 3 nights over Christmas and 1 night in January, thankfully my parents are well at the moment and we have no other nights planned in the near future, but having this facility available relieves so much pressure on all involved.

As you are aware we are Hampshire foster carers who care for children/ young adults with additional needs, this is the reason we are unable to house my parents within the main home, as both downstairs bedrooms are bespoke for the care which we provide. To conclude, we have decided to apply for full planning permission after consultation with the planning officers to put a stop to the constant complaints raised by our neighbours, sadly I feel the real reason for the complaints is our noisy autistic, nonverbal foster daughter as I have been asked on more than one occasion when was she leaving and told they were fed up with the noise.

The Board was advised that the photo shown of parking within the area was of Christmas day with more than usual visitors.

Members felt that the building in place was smaller than what had previously been present and that they were sure should a change from the approved use take place, neighbours would notify and inform.

Members accepted that this was a neighbour issue and whichever decision was taken, someone would be unhappy with the outcome.

RESOLVED: That planning application 23/00361/FULL be approved, subject to the conditions in the report of the Development Manager.

**23/00380/FULL - ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION
(RETROSPECTIVE) (RESUBMISSION OF 23/00181/FULL)
117 Bridgemary Road Gosport Hampshire PO13 0UT**

Members of the Board had visited the site and viewed the property from the applicants side and from the neighbouring garden.

Mr Henderson was invited to address the Board. He advised that he had trusted that the planning process would protect him from unscrupulous decisions but he felt that he was being let down by an evasive construction on the surrounding environment that impacted on others. The original proposal overshadowed the rear of the property, shadowing his garden and decrease the sunlight to the garden. The additional proposal denied more sunlight and diminished its value. It delays the sun to the garden impacting on the landscape and disturbing the tranquil life, as well as impacting on mental and physical health.

He advised that he had notified the planning office of the deviation from the plans and had they acted sooner it could have been stopped or corrected but this didn't happen and it was allowed to be completed. He had therefore complained and as a result a retrospective application had been undertaken which was now being considered. Concern was expressed that other applications would have ignored the plans but not have been realised, and that the planning system did not protect the vulnerable and needed to stop allowing people to exceed plans. The property had been empty for a year.

The Board was advised that retrospective applications could be made, but is not a recommended approach, and there would always be a risk that it could be refused. It was reiterated that each application would be considered on its merits.

A Member asked if the neighbour had seen a whole year with the impact, however the Board was advised that the structure was completed in the autumn, but the neighbour could not delay objecting as they had done so within the limited statutory period.

Mr Gibbs was invited to address the Board as the applicant. He advised that he had been placed in an unfortunate position. He advised that he had used a reputable builder for the structure and that and that the difference in the structure was unfortunate. He advised that he had considered selling the property but that he had found nowhere better so would be staying. He had not intended to cause difficulty as they had had their own property impacted by a neighbouring property

Councillor Maynard was invited to address the Board. He addressed them as follows:
Members of the Regulatory Board, you have heard the outline of the original presentation of Michael and Rita's case, you have visited both properties and seen for yourselves how this extension, that exceeded the original Planning Permissions, has reduced the amenity of

access to light in certain parts of their charming garden. Even though it is incredibly difficult for him, Michael has spoken to you all about how it has had a negative impact on his and Rita's plans for their future and the life style that they have enjoyed and appreciated over a 50 year period. Michael and Rita are decent people who accept legitimate authority and accept at face value the validity of information given to them. They expect that what they perceive as contractual agreements will be adhered to by all parties involved.

- Michael and Rita reluctantly agreed not to object to the Plans for an extension to the rear of the property, 117 Bridgemary Road, in the spirit of neighbourly give and take. It was explained to Michael that the Plans placed the height of the extension just above the height of the dividing fence (NB: approximately one foot lower than its actual height). Michael calculated the impact of loss of sun light to the area of the garden adjacent to the back door. Even though it would deprive them of a certain amount of sun light through shading, it would still allow the morning sun to reach the area close to the rear of the property in the cosy niche where they enjoyed having their breakfast and a cup of tea.
- The increased height changed all of this, with the sun light's delayed arrival, in that area, to around 14:00hrs. As you will have seen from the visit, when you arrived at 14:15, the sun had only just reached the point where it shone on the original area that it would have reached during the early part of the morning.
- Michael and Rita have already invested a considerable sum of money on the lay out of the paved area, where they place their garden furniture.
- They also spent money on removing a line of conifers, grubbing up roots, and installing a new dividing fence. This in in line with the importance that they place on maximising the sunshine in their garden.
- They have also spent a considerable amount of money on exotic garden shrubs, some of these you may have seen in large pots in the front garden ready for planting. The planting plan has been halted because they need to reassess the impact of reduced sun light where the best places are for the shrubs to be planted - sun loving, shade loving.
- There will be considerably more expense placed upon Michael and Rita's budget because they will need to extend and alter the paved area to accommodate seating further out in their back garden.
- I contend that this loss of amenity, prior investment now wasted, with considerably planting. The planting plan has been halted because they need to reassess the impact of reduced sun light where the best places are for the shrubs to be planted - sun loving, shade loving.

There will be considerably more expense placed upon Michael and Rita's budget because they will need to extend and alter the paved area to accommodate seating further out in their back garden.

I contend that this loss of amenity, prior investment now wasted, with considerably more expense to come rejigging their original plans is the consequence with the non-compliance of the original plan. Were questions asked, at the time, about the negative impact that this would have on their plans for the garden when noncompliance was raised? I would request that the Board factors this in to its deliberations.

Although it is guidance and not Regulation I would argue that the 25-degree Rule of Thumb, contained within the Building Research Establishment (BRE) Guidance, should be a consideration. Essentially, the initial consideration of windows opposite a new building or extension should measure the angle subtended (i.e. relative geometry) by the new development to the centre of the lowest window. If the angle exceeds 25 degrees then a

more detailed check is needed. By my estimation, the original design height would have been less than 25 degrees; whereas the increased height probably compromises this angle.

- Although Central Government are keen to make the planning process simpler to reduce delay, I have noted they have expressed real concerns about Planning Agreements being routinely ignored and that they feel that there should be a stronger line taken by Local Authorities (Housing Minister, 26 Jan, '22) - is this such a case?

- In closing, I would like to remind everyone that Michael and Rita are decent straightforward people who agreed not to object to the original Plans in the spirit of neighbourliness. Individuals have a perfect right to sell property that they own and there may be underlying reasons to which we are not privy regarding the imperative to sell; nevertheless I believe that Michael and Rita are a little frustrated to learn that having gone through all of this they now find that the next-door property has been placed on the market with Jeffries & Dibbens.

- So,

1. Michael and Rita have lost light to their garden, kitchen and dining areas. An amenity they have enjoyed for over 50 years.

2. They have wasted a certain amount of money regarding their original investment in garden infrastructure because:

It will need unpicking, to a certain degree, to be reshaped to accommodate a new shrub planting plan and adjusted paving area for seating. This will cost them a considerable amount of money and they may have difficulty matching the existing paving!

All of this would have been unnecessary if the original building plan had been adhered to.

They have what is for them a major investment in their forever home, where their plans for creating the ideal garden for their leisure have been spoiled.

The Board was reminded that planning applications were considered on their merits in terms of any impact from the design on the amenity of neighbouring residents and that the planning officer would make their recommendation based on the relevant legislation and guidance.

It was easier to see the revised height with the structure in situ and the report highlighted that the impact of overshadowing was not deemed significantly harmful enough to refuse the application.

A Board Member advised that the additional height did not seem to be significant, and that the extra impact was minimal. But they did question the reference to the 25 degree rule of light. The Board was advised that this was a rule of thumb and that Planning officers would use their professional judgement to determine any potential impact. There was also considered less of an impact on non-habitable rooms such as kitchens and bathrooms.

It was clarified that the height of the structure was 3m and that the additional 0.4 metres was for the lantern. The extension itself was similar in height to that proposed.

A Member expressed concern that there would be additional loss of light as the spring and summer months progressed. The workmanship on the structure seemed to be good and it was important that the guttering lined up. In addition, there was also a high fence that the structure was not much taller. Members noted the lantern wasn't visible from the roofline.

Members expressed their disappointment at another retrospective planning application, they felt that it was poor planning and were unhappy that drawings could be misinterpreted. It was acknowledged that without the lantern the structure could be permitted development.

RESOLVED: That application 23/00380/FULL be approved subject to the conditions in the report of the Development Manager.

**23/00188/FULL - DEMOLITION OF SIX BUILDINGS AND TWO TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS AND ERECTION OF THREE REPLACEMENT BUILDINGS. FORMATION OF NEW PEDESTRIAN ACCESS TO GOMER LANE, NEW VEHICULAR AND CYCLE PARKING ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AND CHANGES TO BOUNDARY TREATMENTS (Affects Listed Building and Conservation Area)
Bay House School Gomer Lane Gosport Hampshire PO12 2QP**

Laura Archer and Daniel Wiseman were invited to address the Board. They advised that they were representing the applicant and that Kier was the constructor.

The Board was advised that they were addressing them on both applications, the temporary replacement buildings, and the new construction.

Consultation had been undertaken with users, and neighbours about the proposals and there would be an addition in cycle storage spaces.

The proposal was an exciting opportunity to build purpose built units and these were much needed as opposed to the existing buildings which were unsuitable.

It was accepted that the temporary classrooms were not ideal, but they were necessary to allow the project to move forward.

In answer to a Members question, the Board was asked whether the contractors were planning on updating the local residents with work schedules as they had raised concerns about the impact of construction traffic. The Board were advised that local Councillors had been questioned about the proposal as answers had not been forthcoming, however, they were advised that Kier was a considerate contractor and that they were also used to dealing with such large scale projects.

The Board was advised that the timeframe for the work was 2 years and it would be sympathetic to the existing Bay House on site.

In answer to a Member's question, because the proposal was not for an additional use, but a replacement of an existing one, there was no need to provide additional car parking spaces, in addition research had been undertaken into the level of EV charging points required to support the network. The costs of the building were being provided by the department for education.

Some Members felt indifferent about the design, but advised that they understood about the proposals and their uses. In addition they were advised that window positioning would protect intrusion on the neighbouring cottage.

Members requested that contact details be provided to ensure that residents could contact the constructors if required. They were also advised that a contractors transport management plan would be agreed before construction.

RESOLVED: That application 23/00188/FULL be approved subject to the conditions in the report of the Development Manager.

**23/00197/FULL - SITING OF MOBILE CLASSROOMS ON THE EXISTING HARD SURFACED PLAYGROUND (Affects Listed Building and Conservation Area).
Bay House School Gomer Lane Gosport Hampshire PO12 2QP**

RESOLVED: That application 23/00197/FULL be approved subject to the conditions in the report of the Development Manager.

**23/00367/FULL - SUBDIVISION OF THE PLOT AND ERECTION OF ONE TWO-STOREY 3 BED DWELLING WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING.
RESUBMISSION OF 22/00207/FULL (Conservation Area)
31 Crescent Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 2DJ**

The Board was advised that at the point the agenda had been published, no response had been received from Natural England, a response had now been received and there was no objection. The Board was also advised that there was a typographical error in condition 9 of the report.

Mr Sherwen was invited to address the Board.

Firstly, the Planning Officers Report has significantly overstated the size of the lane in describing it as 5 m in width where exiting the proposed site, at this point it is actually 4.5 narrowing to 3.4m at the eastern end, the whole lane from the proposed development heading west is between 4 and 4.6 wide with the exception of a short section at the end he cemetery, the restricted width of the lane would be obvious on a site visit.

The Lane is a narrow lane which was not designed for modern cars and certainly not for commercial vehicles and wagons, a car can just about pass another parked car in most parts with care. It is for this reason that the applicant complained about the restricted access in his planning letter on the 22nd June 2022 under application 22/00207 and stated that he 'intended to push for no parking on the highway known as The Lane'. The residents of The Lane have a long established right to park in front of their houses, the lane is what it is, its narrow and not designed for modern traffic, someone wanting to build in their back garden should not have any rights granted over and above those of the existing residents

on The Lane, if access is not suitable and the applicant clearly thinks that it is not, then development should not be allowed to go ahead.

This development therefore represents a massive amenity impact on the current and future residents of The Lane which has not been addressed in the application or in the planning report, it is clearly in breach of LP23 and the Gosport Borough parking SPD which require that; Where on-street parking is required to meet a proportion of parking need, new development proposals should not prejudice these existing users. It also states one of the core objectives is 'To protect the amenity of existing residents and the needs of businesses and services, including the ability to park where necessary on the street in locations convenient to homes and premises'. Every adjoining resident has equal rights to access and parking in The Lane, the only issue with access has been in bringing down Heavy Goods Vehicles or large commercial vehicles for which the lane is clearly not suitable and so does require cars to be moved on occasion but this is the same for every resident.

The Officers Report highlighted the visibility restrictions exiting the plot and stated that "This issue is ameliorated by vehicles entering The Lane in forward gear and as such it is considered that this proposal has successfully overcome the previous reason for refusal this related to the safety of other highway users when manoeuvring to or from The Lane". This issue has clearly not been ameliorated or resolved. The access point has not been made safer by centralising it as was claimed in the Applicant's Planning Statement. I can't see how this can possibly be considered acceptable when the vehicle is exiting directly adjacent to a 2.4m high wall which borders the highway? Any car would be pulling out 'blind' with the front end over half way across the lane before the driver has any view at all in a westerly direction (in an average family car the driver's head is approximately 2.5m beyond the front bumper).

Had vision splay drawings been provided it would be glaringly obvious how poor this is? It defies belief that it can be considered acceptable in any situation for a vehicle to pull 2.5m out into a road, cycleway or footpath before they can see any oncoming traffic, pedestrians or cyclists, this is in clear contravention of the Gosport Borough SPD. A mirror on a wall certainly does not satisfy the requirement.

Additionally, without a turning head at the East end of The Lane every single commercial vehicle serving the proposed property or visitor will be unable to turn around so will need to reverse up to 100m back down The Lane whilst negotiating parked cars, pedestrians and cyclists and before backing out into St Marks road, this represents a huge increase in risk to pedestrians and cyclists using The Lane as a pedestrian and cycle way (which as mentioned before does not have a separate footpath).

In summary, the residents feel that once again this is an ill-conceived plan and many of the serious safety and amenity impact concerns raised have been dismissed rather than addressed.

In spite of the change in parking arrangements there is nothing in the application or 'Design and Access Statement to show that consideration has been given to traffic management for vehicles serving the property other than the two residents' cars accessing the plot or the risks other particularly larger vehicles pose to existing users of The Lane. The SPD requirement.

Appendix A part 2 clearly states that the applicant has to 'protect the amenity of existing residents including the ability to park where necessary on the street in locations convenient to homes and premises'.

it is very disappointing for all of the residents and users of The Lane that whilst several boxes may have been ticked, the important issues of road safety and amenity impact on The Lane which should have a high priority, appear to have been glossed over or improperly addressed and indeed surprising that such a poor plan can receive a recommendation for approval.

The Board was advised that parking met the SPD standards and that the low speeds in the locality were considered not to be that would create a danger.

It was confirmed that the only through traffic was pedestrians and cycles.

The Board was advised that with regard to Hampshire Fire and Rescue could access the proposed property from the cycle track so were satisfied.

Mr Grundy was invited to address the Board.

Firstly, as the applicant and the home owner of 31 Crescent Road, I would like to make it absolutely clear that I believe in leaving a place in a better state than I found it. I have always tried to enhance my home and surroundings whilst maintaining the Character and history and have received numerous compliments from locals and passers-by regarding the improvements. 31 Crescent Road is steeped in history and it is, in my opinion, essential to maintain that.

Initially, when considering a development proposal, a coach house style was our first thought. However, it is not possible due to the proximity of the public foul sewer. We then considered two, two bedroom properties which were refused. Upon reflection, and although we could have amended the plans, we decided that two houses would have overcrowded the area and decided that one house would be a far better enhancement. I am not a property developer trying to squeeze every last penny of profit and would expect the development to be to a standard that I would be happy to live in.

Contrary to one of the objections, which has to be deemed an opinion, the proposed development would be more in keeping with the conservation area than the properties already in The Rosery and the majority of the properties in The Lane and in my opinion would not only enhance that end of The Lane but complete it nicely. I really do not understand that someone would prefer to look at new garages, let alone the old ones.

The proposed materials would be traditional and high quality. As I understand the previous occupiers of 31 Crescent Road, rarely used the rear access to the garages. The residents of the Lane by their own admission, regularly used the area in front of these garages to turn around on, which I add is much smaller than is officially required by planning. The garages had to be demolished because they were un-safe and full of asbestos. I do understand that my plans have 'upset the apple cart' and I really don't like to upset people but things progress and whoever moved into 31 Crescent Road were almost certainly going to use the rear of it.

There have been, what appear to be coordinated objections regarding the manoeuvrability and parking in the lane and surprisingly from people that do not live in the lane or even use it. I suspect that the majority of the objections are down to convenience. It is also noted that further objections were made by a same previous objector, once highways had registered no objection to the proposal

Unfortunately, access to the end of the lane for myself and 28 Crescent Road is always obstructed by illegal blocking of the highway by residents whom have no parking spaces with their properties. Any mention and talk of manoeuvring difficulties in the Lane would be completely alleviated if the illegal parking didn't happen. There is a lot of available off road parking nearby.

I have seen that there has been an application to turn some verge into parking and that will help those without parking spaces.

Whatever happens the lane needs to be kept clear for access to the rears of 28 and 31 Crescent Road in the future.

The Lane itself has very light traffic and has control barriers at the end in question and is, in my opinion the safest highway in the area.

In summary;

A new house on the land makes absolute sense. We have taken into consideration the reasons for refusal of the previous proposal and have achieved the necessary requirements for satisfaction of the relevant policies. The planning officer has confirmed that the application does not contravene any of the council planning policies and there are no objections from the relevant authorities.

I kindly ask that the board go with the planning officer's recommendation in granting permission with the conditions that I fully understand and agree with.

Members were advised that a previous owner had utilised the garages on site for storage of cars and they had since been demolished and had been used for parking.

Currently the area was being utilised by drivers in The Lane as a turning point, but this had not been possible when the garages were there, nor would it be possible if the proposal was constructed. The proposed parking for the proposal was acceptable and met the Council's Supplementary Planning Document.

The Board was advised that there were low vehicle movements to the rear of the site, at a slow speed.

Hampshire Highways had adopted the road and had no objections to the proposal.

Member felt that a site visit was appropriate to allow Members to make a decision to better understand the site and the implications of the proposal.

RESOLVED: That application 22/00207/FULL be deferred for a site visit.

47. ANY OTHER ITEMS

Regulatory Board
14 February 2024

There were none.

CHAIRMAN

Concluded at 8.03 pm

This page is intentionally left blank