

**A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY BOARD
WAS HELD ON 27 MARCH 2024**

The Mayor

Councillors Earle, Bradley, Bradley, Casey, Hammond, Scard, Pepper and Mrs Huggins
(Substituting for Gledhill)

48. APOLOGIES FOR NON-ATTENDANCE

Apologies for non attendance was received from Councillor Gledhill and Councillor Chegwyn.

49. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Casey declared that the grey sheet applications 2, 3, 4 as they were in his as he was a director.

50. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 14 FEBRUARY 2024.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on the 14 February 2024 be signed as a true and correct record.

51. DEPUTATIONS - STANDING ORDER 3.4

Deputations were received on grey sheet item 1- 31 Crescent Road

52. PUBLIC QUESTIONS - STANDING ORDER 3.5

There were none.

**53. ADOPTION OF CONSERVATION AREAS APPRAISALS AND MANAGEMENT PLANS
FOR GOSPORT HIGH STREET AND STOKE ROAD**

Consideration was given to a report of the Principal Conservation and Design Officer requesting consideration be given to the adoption of the Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans for the Gosport High Street and Stoke Road Conservation Areas.

The Board was advised that there was no updates to the report and that these was the last of the appraisals that have been undertaken. The boundaries had been considered as part of the appraisal but there was not proposed to be any changes.

There was a duty to review Conservation Areas to ensure that they were preserved and enhances and the funding from the High Street Heritage Action Zone had helped to do this, as well as Historic England. There had been public consultations on the work undertaken.

Members welcomed the work that had been undertaken and recognised that it was an important history book through which people could learn and requested that thanks be recorded for the work of the Principal Conservation and Design Officer.

Regulatory Board
27 March 2024

Members reiterated their gratitude for the document and the work, and were interested to understand if there was a reason that Gosport had not introduced Conservation Areas immediately when provision was made for them in 1967.

There was no definitive answer, it was felt that there was perhaps some apprehension at the time, but also that a large amount of rebuilding took place post war following bomb damage. Eventually it was felt it was realised that there needed to be protection of heritage assets, and that this had perhaps not been considered in the post modernism of the 60s.

Members felt that what was old in 2024 was not necessarily old in 1967 and that there was a different attitude to heritage now.

RESOLVED: That the Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans for Gosport High Street and Stoke Road be approved and adopted.

54. 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 updated with the following information from the Planning Officer.

Following discussions between Member and Officers following the site visit an additional planning condition was proposed (no13).

13. a) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the boundary treatment fronting The Lane has been removed.
- b) Any replacement boundary treatment shall not exceed 600mm in height, and will be provided in accordance with details that shall have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.
- c) The approved boundary treatment(s) shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - In the interests of highway safety, and to comply with LP23 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 and the Parking Supplementary Planning Document 2014.

In answer to a Members question it was clarified that an application for the creation of 2 parking bays in The Lane was separate to this application.

Mr Sherwen was invited to address the Board.

Amenity Impact on Existing Residents

I am here primarily on behalf of the residents of the Lane, all of whom that were around last week I signed my deputation. In response to the question of historical access and recent use of the Workshops/Garages. These were granted planning permission back in the late 1960's, at the time planning was sought The Lane was only 3.5m in width behind 31 Crescent Road and this extended for approximately a third of the length of the road.

The garages were obviously built with the knowledge that The Lane would provide at best restricted access due to the narrowness and residents who actually live on The Lane and were already using it for their vehicles. We have established that it is likely several decades since the garages have been in regular use.

Regulatory Board
27 March 2024

So access to the rear of 31 crescent road has always been limited and only worked by cooperation and a bit of give and take with the neighbours on The Lane. This access is exactly the same for the residents on The Lane accessing their own properties.

It's worth mentioning that it is not just residents that park in The Lane, it's all the trade vehicles serving local properties, its visitors, its carers coming 4 times a day to one property, it's also customers using the nearby Hotel and restaurant, The residents do not control who uses the Lane, there are no parking restrictions, the parking is not illegal as suggested by the applicant, at times it is busy and congested but that is unavoidable on such a narrow lane. The residents are simply parking in the vicinity of their own homes as the property owners have done for the best part of a century. The Parking 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'. The Planning department should ensure that this requirement is enforced.

I've been asked to mention the application for two parking bays on The Lane which will not resolve this issue, car ownership on the Lane is averaging 1 per household but with 4 of the properties being 3 and 4 bedroom and some young teenagers in residence and changes in ownership, this number is only likely to get much higher. At this stage this parking bay is still speculative, the ownership has not changed hands, other legal issues need to be resolved, so there is still a long process to be gone through in completing the additional parking, if indeed it goes ahead at all.

The planning officer Trevor stated that the issue with cars pulling out of the plot without any view to the west was ameliorated by the slow speed of the moving vehicles. One issue with this is that the most likely victims of a collision are the cycles and scooters using the lane and I can assure you that 9 these do not travel at low speed up and down the Lane, particularly children going to and from school, the access is clearly dangerous and it could easily have been made safer with a central access point as stated in the planning statement. Another hazard is the fact that with no turning head visitors or OS' delivery vehicles in particular are likely to be reversing up the Lane so in addition to vehicles coming out of the proposed plot the approaching vehicles will also have restricted visibility. There is nowhere in Hampshire Highways Technical document TG3 or in the Gosport SPD on parking or the Local plan section LP23 that allows vehicles to turn onto roads with no visibility and nothing to suggest that this can become acceptable if vehicles are travelling at low speed, the proposed development contravenes all 3 of these documents in many ways. The Gosport supplementary planning document is very clear, particularly with regard to footpaths and cycle ways.

The Lane is a narrow lane which was not designed for modern cars and certainly not for commercial 1q vehicles and wagons, a car can just about pass another parked car in most parts with care. So the 'Unrestricted full access' which Mr Grundy expects to be able to build in his garden does not exist.

Any attempt to restrict parking on The Lane will have a huge amenity impact on the residents' use of their own properties and The Lane as well as that of any future residents. Furthermore it will have a 02 huge impact on the already congested surrounding roads.

'Access and Visibility to Parking Places - Gosport SPD

4.14 Sufficient space must be provided to ensure vehicles can easily and safely enter and leave parking spaces and be parked without overhanging the footway or road.

4.15 There should also be adequate visibility between the parking space, footway and road to enable visibility between drivers and other highway users - particularly vulnerable users on the footway.

4.16 The access to driveways and other parking places should not be bordered by boundary treatments or landscaping which unduly restricts inter-visibility between vehicles and users of an adjacent footway or road.

If existing residents are unable to park adjacent to their properties it will prevent charging electric vehicles and therefore will inhibit electric vehicle ownership, this affects four out of the existing eight

Regulatory Board
27 March 2024

properties, one of which already uses an EV charger. In spite of the planning requirement for an EV charger on the proposed property, this will result in an overall significant environmental net loss. The Hampshire Fire and Rescue access still does not comply with building regulations, as the proposal will result in tenders having to reverse back around 70 metres along the footpath/cycleway from the proposed plot.

Mr Grundy, the applicant, was invited to address the Board.

Firstly, thank you for taking the time to visit The Lane on Monday.

I apologise in advance if I am repeating points and comments that I made at the last meeting.

Following on from the last meeting of 14th February, I would like to address some comments made during the debate as well as the main objections to the proposal.

It was mentioned that by granting permission for the development, would it set a precedent for building in gardens? I would like to say that virtually all but a few exceptions of the properties in The Lane and Anglesey Arms Road have already had properties built at the rear of other properties. Given the size of the plot and the proposed house, I feel any concerns have been addressed and considered as so in Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the planning officers report.

It was also mentioned that why would we need the rear access parking when we have off road parking to the front of 31 Crescent Road?

We have only had the off-road parking to the front for two years. We carried out the works to accommodate our large family and it has also enhanced greatly the appearance of the property and freed up parking on Crescent Road.

The Lane was originally shown as Back Road (photocopy 1) on the very first deeds of the property of 31 Crescent Road and has served as a rear access since 1892 before the cottages were residences.

The lane was originally 18ft wide at the site location which was reduced to 15ft (4.58m) in 1981. I have some correspondence (photocopy2) between the previous owner – Capt. Lawrence Portet and Gosport Borough Council and Gosport Borough deemed The Lane to be wide enough at 15ft. There is also a letter (photocopy 3) to a resident in The Lane stating that The Highway Authority have the responsibility to maintain public rights to utilise the full extent of the highway

Anyone parking at the rear of 31 Crescent Road or in the driveway of the proposed property can very easily manoeuvre a vehicle there. It would be even easier with the proposed property than it is now and there would be no physical boundary.

The actual vehicular traffic in the lane is close to zero. Any cyclists must dismount when entering or exiting the lane, to negotiate the staggered barriers at the end.

Although heavy vehicles would never need to access that end of the land after the construction of the proposed property, we have had 32 Tonne grab lorries there on numerous occasions, with ease. Although, we have had to get Mr Sherwen to move the vehicle of Rosery Cottage for us

Streetscene Waste and Cleansing have no objections and are already emptying waste bins at the location. A refuse lorry is a considerable size and already reverses down the Lane.

The rightful amenity of other residents would not be affected. The residents of Rosary Cottage and Cedar Cottage have only been able to park in the highway unencumbered since the previous owner of 31 Crescent Road became infirm and eventually passed away. There are no rightful parking spaces for Rosary Cottage or Cedar Cottage in The Lane. Parking by these residents, illegally obstructs the highway.

Regulatory Board
27 March 2024

There is a planning application in the system 23/00450/Full for change of use from a grass verge to 2 x parking spaces for Rosery Cottage and Cedar Cottage. This looks like a positive proposal and that will help the residents of the two properties mentioned by having allocated parking that they do have now.

I absolutely would not want to degrade the conservation area. The proposed property's appearance would be similar to the new properties that occupy the site of the old school in Crescent Road that have recently been accepted and built.

I value our surroundings and love living there. I certainly would not want to build a house at the detriment of the surrounding area. Anyone that I have spoken to in the local community think this proposal will enhance the area and finish the end of The Lane nicely with minimal impact. It would provide someone a nice place to live.

In summary,

The proposal has overcome all of the refusal points of the previous application

The proposal is considered acceptable in relation to all of the relevant planning policies

The lane has been proven to function as access to previously developed land for a great number of years

The planning officer recommends that permission be granted

And I kindly ask, please would you grant permission.

In answer to a Members question the Board was advised that the additional condition determined that the wall with the enclosed door needed to be removed and that any replacement boundary could be no higher than 600mm.

It was clarified that the wall would be removed and that there were no restrictions on the Lane with regards to restricted parking or permitted parking, but that normal highway rules regarding parking illegally applied, the highway should not be obstructed.

The Board was advised that cyclists and pedestrians using the walk through would need to slow down at the barriers, but some Members felt that the users would not be used to the vehicular traffic, in opposition to LP23.

The Board acknowledged that the proposal was required to have 2 parking spaces and did, that Highways had no objection and that the design was in keeping with the surrounding area, with details such as sash windows. There had also been no objection from Hampshire Fire and Rescue.

RESOLVED: That application 22/00207/FULL be approved subject to the conditions in the report of the Development Manager and the inclusion of an additional condition 13

13. a) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the boundary treatment fronting The Lane has been removed.

b) Any replacement boundary treatment shall not exceed 600mm in height, and will be provided in accordance with details that shall have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

c) The approved boundary treatment(s) shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - In the interests of highway safety, and to comply with LP23 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 and the Parking Supplementary Planning Document 2014.

24/00030/FULL - EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO INCLUDE INSTALLATION OF INTERPRETATION BOARDS, REINSTATE DOOR TO NORTH ELEVATION AND EXTEND FOOTPATH TO ALLOW ACCESS TO EXTERNAL EXHIBITS (LISTED BUILDING IN CONSERVATION AREA)

Diving Museum No 2 Battery Stokes Bay Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 2QT

Councillor Casey left the room and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

The position of Stokes Bay Mobile Home Park relative to the site was clarified.

Members commended the diving museum for securing funding to enable the improvements to be undertaken and welcomed that the importance of heritage was being recognised.

RESOLVED: That application 24/00030/FULL be approved subject to the conditions in the report of the Development Manager.

24/00038/LBA - LISTED BUILDING APPLICATION - INTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO INCLUDE RAISING FLOOR TO EASTERN RANGE, REINSTATE WALL, CHANGES TO FIXTURES, FITTINGS & SERVICES, EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO INCLUDE INSTALLATION OF SIGNAGE & INTERPRETATION BOARDS, REINSTATE DOOR TO NORTH ELEVATION, ALTERATIONS & REPAIRS TO FENESTRATION, EXTEND FOOTPATH TO ALLOW ACCESS TO EXTERNAL EXHIBITS (CONSERVATION AREA)

Diving Museum No 2 Battery Stokes Bay Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 2QT

The Board was advised that this application covered elements such as raising floors for better access, and reinstating doors.

The Board was advised that there was an additional drawing added as a condition to add plan 1001/331 revision C1, this was regarding the replacement windows on the north side.

It was confirmed that charities paid for planning application but that no fee is payable for any Listed Building application.

RESOLVED: That application 24/00038/LBA be approved subjects to the conditions in the report of the Development Manager and the additional condition detailed.

24/00039/ADVT - INSTALLATION AND DISPLAY OF TWO EXTERNALLY ILLUMINATED SIGNS TO EAST AND SOUTH ELEVATION (LISTED BUILDING IN CONSERVATION AREA)

Diving Museum No 2 Battery Stokes Bay Road Gosport Hampshire PO12 2QT

The Board was advised that application was for two what could best be described 'Hollywood' style signs with a controlled illumination.

The Board was advised that there was an amendment to plan 1005/601, this was now revision P-4 and to 1005/065 this was now revision P-3.

The constructions of the sign would be made in a way that they could not be vandalised and it was clarified that the lettering would be black.

Members reiterated the importance of heritage in the Borough and recognised Gosport had the biggest collection of heritage museums outside of London.

Members questioned the objection from the Gosport Society as it was felt not relevant as the detail of the lettering was provided within the drawings. It was confirmed that only one set of letters would be illuminated and that the lighting would be subtle and controlled.

Regulatory Board
27 March 2024

RESOLVED: That application 24/00039/ADVT be approved subject to the conditions in the report of the Development Manager.

55. ANY OTHER ITEMS

The Chairman thanked the Officers and Councillors for their work over the Municipal Year.

CHAIRMAN

Concluded at 6.55 pm