

# Public Document Pack

## SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Date:** Wednesday, 22 March 2017  
**Time:** 2.30 pm  
**Venue:** Collingwood Room - Civic Offices

**6. Planning applications and Miscellaneous Matters including an update on Planning Appeals**

To consider a report by the Director of Planning and Development on development control matters, including information regarding new planning appeals and decisions.

**(9) UPDATE REPORT (Pages 1 - 2)**

P GRIMWOOD  
Chief Executive Officer  
Civic Offices  
[www.fareham.gov.uk](http://www.fareham.gov.uk)  
22 March 2017

**For further information please contact:  
Democratic Services, Civic Offices, Fareham, PO16 7AZ  
Tel:01329 236100  
[democraticservices@fareham.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@fareham.gov.uk)**

for Committee Meeting to be held on 22 March 2017

ZONE 3 - EASTERN WARDS

(4) **P/17/0040/FP** **HILL HEAD**

**29 CROFTON LANE HILL HEAD FAREHAM PO14 3LP**

Update on Boundary Issue - Following the completion of the Committee Report an amended set of plans were received regarding the boundary dispute. The amended plans appear to have addressed the concerns raised by the immediate neighbour to the north and west of the site.

---

(6) **P/17/0126/FP** **PORTCHESTER EAST**

**84 MERTON AVENUE PORTCHESTER FAREHAM HAMPSHIRE PO16 9NH**

The applicant has requested that the application is withdrawn.

---

**UPDATE REPORT - ITEM 7 – FAREHAM TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO 737  
– LAND NORTH OF WARSASH ROAD AND EAST OF BROOK LANE**

**FAREHAM TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO 738 – LAND NORTH OF  
WARSASH ROAD AND EAST OF BROOK LANE**

**FAREHAM TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO 739 – LAND NORTH OF 65 – 93  
WARSASH ROAD AND EAST OF CHAPLEFIELD NURSERIES**

Following a meeting on Wednesday 15 March with the Council's Principal Tree Officer a letter has been received summarising the discussions at that meeting, including a statement that the TPO is not necessary as all parties are working together and the trees are not under threat.

The Principal Tree Officer has responded stating TPO 739 has been made in the context of the land being countryside and potentially included in the call for sites for future housing delivery. The TPO is defensible, but like any TPO it is not sacrosanct should specific circumstances prevail that justify the loss of protected trees, one of which could be proposed development.

The consensus at the site meeting was that on that basis TPO 739 is reasonable and necessary; and both planning and tree officers will continue to work with the land owners and their agents in terms of any development proposals.

Officers do not consider this letter as a material objection to the confirmation of TPO 739.