

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Committee

(to be confirmed at the next meeting)

Date: Wednesday, 9 November 2022

Venue: Collingwood Room - Civic Offices

PRESENT:

Councillor N J Walker (Chairman)

Councillor I Bastable (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors: Miss J Burton, D G Foot, M J Ford, JP, Mrs C L A Hockley,
S Ingram, P Nother and Mrs S M Walker

**Also
Present:**



1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies of absence.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 5 October 2022 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

3. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no Chairman's announcements made at this meeting.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

5. DEPUTATIONS

The Committee received a deputation from the following in respect of the applications indicated and were thanked accordingly.

Name	Spokes person representing the persons listed	Subject	Supporting or Opposing the Application	Item No/ Application No/Page No	Dep Type
ZONE 1 – 3.30pm					
Mrs Hilary Megginson	Save Warsash	LAND WEST OF LOCKSWOOD ROAD WARSASH – OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED (EXCEPT FOR ACCESS), FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 62 DWELLINGS, ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING, AMENITY AREAS & ACCESS FROM LOCKSWOOD ROAD	Opposing	6(1) P/18/0590/OA PG 12	Written
Ms Katherine Richards (Agent)		-DITTO-	Supporting	-Ditto-	In Person (3 mins)

Mr R Megginson		LAND ADJACENT TO 125 GREENAWAY LANE – SUBMISSION OF DETAILS IN RELATION TO CONDITION 5 (CONSTRUCTION TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT PLAN) OF P/19/0402/OA (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED (EXCEPT FOR ACCESS) FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF UP TO 100 DWELLINGS, ACCESS FROM GREENAWAY LANE, LANDSCAPING, OPEN SPACE AND ASSOCIATED WORKS	Opposing	6(2) P/19/0402/DP/ B Pg 40	Written
Mrs Christine Callaghan		SWEETHILL FARM 260 BOTELY ROAD SO31 1BL – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND CONSTRUCTION OF FOUR DETACHED 4-BED DWELLINGS	Opposing	6(3) P/22/0608/FP Pg 48	In Person (3 mins)
Mr Vivian Holt	Burridge & Swanwick Residents Associaition	-DITTO-	-Ditto-	-Ditto-	In Person (3 mins)
Ms Louise Cutts (Agent)		-DITTO-	Supporting	-Ditto-	In Person (3 mins)
Mr Matthew Holmes (Agent)		377 HUNTS POND ROAD FAREHAM PO14 4PB – CONSTRUCTION OF TWO DETACHED DWELLINGS ON LAND TO THE REAR OF 377 HUNTS POND, WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING, ACCESS AND LANDSCAPING	Supporting	6(4) P/22/0913/FP Pg 82	In Person (3 mins)
ZONE 3 – 5.00pm					
Mr Marshall	The Fareham Society	LAND SOUTH OF 16 & 17 GLETHRONE CLOSE FAREHAM – OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR ERECTION OF NINE LIVE/WORK (RESEARCH/DEVELOPMENT/INDUSTRIAL/RESID	Opposing	6(6) P/22/0337/OA Pg 107	Written

		<p>ENTIAL – CLASS F(G), F.1(A) AND C3) HANGAR BUILDINGS FOR AVIATION SECTOR, OPEN SPACE, WITH MATTERS RELATING TO ACCESS, LAYOUT AND SCALE SOUGHT (APPEARANCE AND LANDSCAPING RESERVED)</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS INCLUDING AN UPDATE ON PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted a report by the Director of Planning and Regeneration on the development control matters, including information regarding new appeals and decisions.

(1) P/18/0590/OA - LAND WEST OF LOCKSWOOD ROAD SO31 1BX

The Committee received the deputations referred to in Minute 5 above.

The Committee’s attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained the following information: -

Representations:

An additional representation has been received however it does not raise any new issues.

Recommendation:

Amend condition 19 as follows:

*Full details of all necessary ecological mitigation and compensation measures (to be informed as necessary by an up-to-date reptile survey) shall be submitted for approval to the Local Planning Authority in the form of a Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy with each reserved matters application. Such details shall be in accordance with the outline ecological mitigation and compensation measures detailed within the approved: ~~Reptile Survey & Proposed Mitigation Ecosupport dated June 2018; Bat Surveys Ecosupport dated July 2018; Initial Ecological Appraisal Ecosupport dated 2019; Ecology Addendum Ecosupport dated November 202; Badgers and Bats in Trees Report dated 13th July 2021; Biodiversity Net Gain Report fpcr dated 19th January~~ **July 2022**. Any such approved measures shall thereafter be implemented in perpetuity, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

REASON: To provide ecological protection and compensation in accordance with Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981.

The Planning Office also provided the following verbal update: -

Condition 4 – amended document to read ITB1370-GA-005 Rev B.

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to grant outline planning permission, subject to: -

- i) The receipt of comments from Natural England in response to consultation on the Council's Appropriate Assessment
- ii) Delegate to the Head of Development Management to make any minor modifications to the proposed conditions or any subsequent minor changes arising after having had regard to those comments;
- iii) The applicant/owner first entering into a planning obligation pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on terms drafted by the Solicitor to the Council in respect of the following:
 - a) To secure the timely delivery of the areas of open space and the option for these spaces to be adopted by Fareham Borough Council,
 - b) To secure the provision of an Open Space Management and Enhancement Plan,
 - c) To secure the necessary open space commuted maintenance sums prior to adoption by the Council; or
 - d) In the event that the Council does not adopt the delivered open space, then the creation of a management company to maintain the open space in perpetuity including detail of how that management and maintenance of the open space in perpetuity,
 - e) To secure a financial contribution towards a locally equipped area of play;
 - f) To secure a financial contribution towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership (SRMP);
 - g) To secure 40% of the proposed units as on-site affordable housing; the type size, mix and tenure to be agreed to the satisfaction of Officers;
 - h) To secure pedestrian and cycle connectivity access to adjoining land for members of the public through the site in perpetuity and a financial contribution towards the maintenance and associated lighting of the pedestrian and cycle link;
 - i) To secure a financial contribution towards primary and secondary education provision;
 - j) To secure a financial contribution towards highway improvements;
 - k) To secure a travel Plan and related monitoring cost and bond;
 - l) To secure a sustainable travel contribution to be used towards offsite improvements;
 - m) To secure the provision of ecological buffers along the north, east and south boundaries;
 - n) To secure a financial contribution for the maintenance of trees; and
 - o) To secure the preparation and provision of the off-site reptile translocation area;
- iv) The amendments to Conditions 4 and 19 as set out in the Update Report and Officer's verbal update

Was voted on and CARRIED.
(Voting: 9 in favour; 0 against)

RESOLVED that, subject to: -

- i) The receipt of comments from Natural England in response to consultation on the Council's Appropriate Assessment
- ii) Delegate to the Head of Development Management to make any minor modifications to the proposed conditions or any subsequent minor changes arising after having had regard to those comments;
- iii) The applicant/owner first entering into a planning obligation pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on terms drafted by the Solicitor to the Council in respect of the following:
 - a) To secure the timely delivery of the areas of open space and the option for these spaces to be adopted by Fareham Borough Council,
 - b) To secure the provision of an Open Space Management and Enhancement Plan,
 - c) To secure the necessary open space commuted maintenance sums prior to adoption by the Council; or
 - d) In the event that the Council does not adopt the delivered open space, then the creation of a management company to maintain the open space in perpetuity including detail of how that management and maintenance of the open space in perpetuity,
 - e) To secure a financial contribution towards a locally equipped area of play;
 - f) To secure a financial contribution towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership (SRMP);
 - g) To secure 40% of the proposed units as on-site affordable housing; the type size, mix and tenure to be agreed to the satisfaction of Officers;
 - h) To secure pedestrian and cycle connectivity access to adjoining land for members of the public through the site in perpetuity and a financial contribution towards the maintenance and associated lighting of the pedestrian and cycle link;
 - i) To secure a financial contribution towards primary and secondary education provision;
 - j) To secure a financial contribution towards highway improvements;
 - k) To secure a travel Plan and related monitoring cost and bond;
 - l) To secure a sustainable travel contribution to be used towards offsite improvements;
 - m) To secure the provision of ecological buffers along the north, east and south boundaries;
 - n) To secure a financial contribution for the maintenance of trees; and
 - o) To secure the preparation and provision if the off-site reptile translocation area;

- iv) The amendments to Conditions 4 and 19 as set out in the Update Report and Officer's verbal update.
OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

**(2) P/19/0402/DP/B - LAND ADJACENT TO 125 GREENAWAY LANE
WARSASH SO31 9HT**

The Committee received the deputation referred to in Minute 5 above.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained the following information: -

Additional Representations

Further representations from a resident have been received which raise the following issues:

- *The ecologist's updated comments aren't available to view online*
- *The ecologist's comments are based on the understanding that there were previous structures located where the proposed car park will be positioned*
- *Concern re impact of parking on hedge*

Updated Ecology Response

I now understand that the car parking area is located on the existing track/areas already compacted, which lead to the old green houses and not located within the area of the old greenhouses. This knowledge will not change my previous comments.

Regarding the impact of the car parking on the hedge, from the photos provided and based on the Ecological Appraisal by Lindsay Carrington Ecological Services Limited (September 2020), this hedge is intensively managed and a species-poor (privet hedge). Considering that any parking of cars will be set back from the hedge by at least 1m, I do not consider there to be any direct or indirect impacts on this hedge.

Officer comment

Section 8.9 of the report is be amended as follows with the bold replacing the words with a line struck through them:

*The car parking is positioned on the location of an existing track and is **leading to** the location of old greenhouses where there is no existing notable habitat and the area is already compacted.*

Conclusion

The car parking area is compacted due to the location of the track with no existing notable habitat. The proposed car parking would not have any impact on the hedge which has limited ecological value.

The Committee noted that the deputation included a request that the decision be deferred to give more time for residents to read and comment on the updated ecology responses, which have not been published on the Planning Portal 5 clear working days before the meeting. Members were advised that they could if they wished agree to defer the application to allow more time for this.

A motion to (a) not defer determination of the application and (b) to accept the officer recommendation, subject to the conditions in the report, was proposed and seconded. This was voted on and CARRIED.
(Voting: 9 in favour; 0 against)

RESOLVED that, APPROVAL OF DETAILS in relation to Condition 5 be granted.

(3) P/22/0608/FP - SWEETHILL FARM 260 BOTLEY ROAD SO31 1BL

The Committee received the deputations referred to in Minute 5 above.

The Planning Officer provided a verbal update to the Committee which referred to a typo in 8.54 of the report which should read"....with the Council's adopted **residential** car parking standards....."

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to: -

- i) DELEGATION being given to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Solicitor to the Council to consider any comments received from Natural England relating to the consultation on the Appropriate Assessment and to make any minor modifications to the proposed conditions, addition of conditions, or any other subsequent minor changes arising as a result of Natural England's comments regarding the Appropriate Assessment; and

ii) The conditions in the report.
Was voted on and CARRIED.
(Voting: 7 in favour; 2 against)

RESOLVED that, subject to: -

- i) DELEGATION be given to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Solicitor to the Council to consider any comments received from Natural England relating to the consultation on the Appropriate Assessment and to make any minor modifications to the proposed conditions, addition of conditions, or any other subsequent minor changes arising as a result on Natural England's comments regarding the Appropriate Assessment; and

ii) The Conditions in the report.
PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

(4) P/22/0913/FP - 377 HUNTS POND ROAD FAREHAM PO14 4PB

The Committee received the deputation referred to in Minute 5 above.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained the following information: -

Following receipt of an amended landscape plan showing replacement planting along the northern boundary, conditions 2 and 9 have been reworded as follows;

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the following drawings/documents:

- i) Location and Block Plan 6133-WLA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-0012 Rev B*
- ii) Proposed Site Plan 6133-WLA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-0013 Rev B*
- iii) Proposed House Type Elevations 6133-WLA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-0111 Rev C*
- iv) House Type Plans 6133-WLA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-0110 Rev D*
- v) Street Scene 6133-WLA-A-0016 Rev A*
- vi) Site Section 6133-WLA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-0018*
- vii) Proposed Car Port 6133-WLA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-0031 Rev A*
- viii) Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (dated June 2022)*
- ix) Landscape Plan LANDP001 Rev 003*

REASON: To avoid any doubt over what has been permitted.

9. The landscaping scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Landscape Plan ref.LANDP001 Rev 003 and completed within the first planting season following the commencement of the development or as otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and shall be maintained in accordance with the agreed schedule. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years from first planting, are removed, die or, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced, within the next available planting season, with others of the same species, size and number originally approved.

REASON: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a standard of landscaping.

In addition, condition 5 has been amended to include a roof light which would serve the ensuite bathrooms. The condition would read as follows;

The roof light and first-floor windows, which would serve an ensuite bathroom, bathroom and a stairwell, proposed to be inserted into the north and south elevations of plots 1 and 2 shall be:

- a) Obscure-glazed; and*
- b) Of a non-opening design and construction to a height of 1.7 metres above internal finished floor level;*

and shall thereafter be retained in that condition at all times.

REASON: To prevent overlooking and to protect the privacy of the occupiers of the adjacent properties.

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to: -

- i) The conditions in the report;

- ii) The amended conditions 2, 5 and 9 as set out in the Update Report; and
- iii) The amendment of condition 6 to state that car ports shall be retained, without being enclosed or fitted with doors, at all times so they are available for the designated purpose.

Was voted on and CARRIED.

(Voting: 9 in favour; 0 against)

RESOLVED that, subject to: -

- i) The conditions in the report;
- ii) The amended conditions 2, 5 and 9 as set out in the Update Report; and
- iii) The amendment of condition 6 to state that car ports shall be retained, without being enclosed or fitted with doors, at all times so they are available for the designated purpose.

PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

(5) P/22/1277/FP - 31 ROSSAN AVENUE WARSASH SO31 9JQ

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to grant planning permission was voted on and CARRIED.

(Voting: 6 in favour; 3 against)

RESOLVED that PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

(6) P/22/0337/OA - LAND SOUTH OF 16/17 GLENTHORNE CLOSE PO14 2NP

The Committee received the deputation referred to in Minute 5 above.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained the following information: -

Representations:

The applicant has provided a further rebuttal to third party comments:

- *Glenthorne Close will remain a residential/light cul-de-sac even with the development;*
- *None of the users use large vans or have deliveries like normal businesses;*
- *The road doesn't require any changes as the traffic generated is minimal;*
- *The TRICS data does not take account of "live/work" units and nor does it account for customers flying into the Airport;*
- *The TRICS estimate, therefore, is a massive overestimate to the actual traffic;*

- *There is no agreement with Frontier Estates but the Care Home operator (Barchester Healthcare) and Highwood (the contractor) are both amenable to access through their site;*
- *Hardstanding will use a pervious surface and rain water harvesting system in underground tanks so there is no issue with water runoff.*

The applicant has also issued a rebuttal to reasons for refusal in the committee report and in response to the outstanding consultations. Whilst the applicant disagrees with the conclusions Officers have drawn, there are no new issues or material considerations raised other than those already in the application submission plus those summarised above and in the main agenda.

Consultations:

Environmental Health: Comments:

- *The applicant has submitted a noise statement but does not provide any assessment of the current noise climate or the noise levels likely to be introduced through the development.*
- *We would require a BS4142 type assessment in order to understand the impacts, and the mitigation proposed, where this is required, to ensure these are acceptable in preventing disturbance.*
- *In addition, the following matters should also be considered:*
 - *Permitted delivery times for the commercial elements of the proposal so as to prevent disturbance.*
 - *Operating hours for the commercial units.*
 - *Noise impacts on outdoor living areas (for the development and existing domestic properties).*
- *Currently and without further information it would seem likely that future occupiers of the application site and neighbouring residential premises may be impacted by the proposals.*

Planning Considerations:

Amenity of future occupants and neighbouring properties:

As set out in the main report (para 8.143 onwards, page 146) it is unclear that the proposal will provide for an acceptable living environment for the future residents of the development.

The submitted Noise Statement is not a technical report taking account of the existing noise climate at the site and it is not possible, therefore, to conclude on the likely implications on residential amenity of bringing a domestic use onto an active airport.

The applicants Noise Statement indicates that the residential first floor of the building will be constructed with triple glazing and high specification insulation to combat noise. The Statement also assumes that because the occupants will be engaged in aviation businesses that residents will not be concerned at noise because they choose to live there.

The noise issue is unlikely to just be the consequence of bringing a residential use into the active airport and having a residential use closer to moving aircraft at the airport. The noise issue would also arise as a result of the layout and the

proximity of each unit to its neighbour. The arrangement is such that the starting and moving of an aircraft at close quarters may have an unacceptable impact upon the amenity of other residents of the proposal as well as those adjoining the application site plus the other noise associated with a residential use being located on an active airport.

Policy DSP2 sets out that development should not, alone or cumulatively, have a significant adverse impact upon neighbouring development, adjoining land or the wider environment by virtue of noise. Advice in the NPPF is that decisions should aim to prevent "...new and existing development from...being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of...noise pollution." (para 174e).

Noise limits for commercial uses are determined based on the measured noise survey data in accordance with the relevant British Standard (BS4142) and the requirements of the Local Authority. As per the Environmental Health consultation comments; no such noise assessment has been undertaken.

In this case the application has adequate information submitted to enable the Planning Authority to conclude that the development would not have a significant adverse impact by virtue of noise for either the proposed residents or those of the adjoining area. An additional reason for refusal is added to the recommendation accordingly.

Affordable Housing:

Paragraph 8.169 (page 150) onwards in the main report sets out the development plan requirements for affordable housing from a development of this type.

The application submission sets out that, based on a standard developers profit of 17.5% of the Gross Development Value (GDV) the scheme shows a deficit – based on the applicants assumptions on land value, sales prices and build costs etc. The applicants Viability Report concludes, as a result, that in the absence of any surplus profit that the development cannot support any affordable housing provision whether on site or as an off site contribution.

Given the specialist nature of the proposed units, delivery as affordable housing would not be appropriate as Fareham Housing has indicated that, if viability allows, a contribution towards off site provision should be secured.

In terms of the viability inputs, there is agreement that the sales values for the proposed residential component of the scheme are fair and reasonable. With regard to the commercial element of the proposed units, the Council's consultant is of the view that the applicant has attributed a value that is too low to this part of the proposal. The Council's consultant also attributes a lower build costs for the units than those proposed by the applicant.

The Council's consultant has attributed a greater value to the CIL contribution and other mitigation such as nitrate credits than that of the applicant.

Within the applicant's submission, as set out above, the developer seeks 17.5% profit. The Council's review of the scheme suggests that 17.5% would

be reasonable for the residential component part but that 15% would be appropriate for the hangars.

There is a difference in the valuation of the land and its value with the applicant's report concluding that the land value is significantly higher than the conclusion of the Council's consultant.

When the Council's consultant adds their inputs to the industry standard viability model, the output shows a development surplus of over £1.6m. This is in marked contrast to the applicants viability report which indicates a significant deficit from the development of some two hundred and fifty eight thousand pounds. At this level of deficit the developer would need to take a commercial view as to whether or not a lower run of return should be accepted for the site to come forward on a viable basis and without any contribution towards the 2.7 affordable homes required by the development plan.

It is clear that there are a number of assumptions in the applicant's viability report that are challenged by the review of the submission by the Council's consultant. It is clear that if the assumptions and inputs are adjusted that the application would be in profit to the extent that some affordable housing contribution can be secured and the scheme would still remain viable.

As such, it is considered that the proposal can provide for a contribution towards offsite affordable housing as required by policy CS18 of the Core Strategy and the emerging policy HP5 of the Fareham Local Plan 2037. In the absence of such a contribution a further reason for refusal is added to the recommendation as set out below.

Recommendation:

The comments of Environmental Health and the Councils Viability Consultant have been received and are considered above.

As such parts i), ii) and iii) of the recommendation in part 9 of the main agenda are no longer required and the application is recommended for refusal as per the reasons in the agenda plus the following additional reasons:

12) Inadequate information has been submitted in order for the Local Planning Authority to conclude that the development would not have a significant adverse impact by virtue of noise for either the proposed residents or those of the adjoining area. The proposed development is therefore considered contrary to policy DSP2 of the Development Sites and Policies Plan and policy D2 of the emerging Fareham Local Plan 2037.

13) In the absence of a legal agreement to secure an off-site affordable housing contribution the scheme fails to assist the Borough in addressing its current housing need. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policy CS18 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy) and policy HP2 of the emerging Fareham Borough Local Plan 2037.

The Planning Officer also gave the Committee the following Verbal Update: -

He provided a further update to 8.101 of the report and confirmed that the applicant has requested that the application be deferred until the outcome of judicial review is decided. He also informed the Committee that since the agenda had been published, the applicant had applied to the Courts for an injunction to prevent the Committee from considering this application at this meeting. The outcome of the court hearing was released during the course of the meeting and the Court had refused to grant an injunction.

Members were advised that they could lawfully determine the application today, and it was for them to decide if they wished to defer the determination of the application pending the outcome of the judicial review application.

A motion to (a) not to defer the application and (b) to accept the officer recommendation for refusal was proposed and seconded. This was voted on and CARRIED.

(Voting: 9 in favour; 0 against)

RESOLVED that PLANNING PERMISSION be REFUSED.

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposal is not considered employment-led and would provide for inadequate levels of employment and would prejudice the future delivery of the wider Swordfish Business Park (of which the site is a part) which is allocated for large scale employment use. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policy CS12 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy) and policy E3 of the emerging Fareham Local Plan 2037.
2. The proposed access is not taken from Gosport Road and the development of the application site in an isolated fashion would prejudice the future delivery of the wider Swordfish Business Park (of which the site is a part) which is allocated for large scale employment use. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policy CS12 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy) and policy E3 of the emerging Fareham Local Plan 2037.
3. The proposed development represents new residential development outside the defined settlement boundary for which there is no overriding need or justification. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policy CS14 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy) and policy DS1 of the emerging Fareham Local Plan 2037.
4. The proposal would, by virtue of the access, scale and layout, fail to respond positively to or be respectful of the local character and nor would it integrate well with the surrounding settlement. Furthermore, the proposal is not considered to be deliverable in the short term. The proposal is contrary to policy CS17 of the Core Strategy, parts (ii), (iii) and (iv) of policy DSP40 of the Development Sites and Policies Plan and policies D1 and H2 of the emerging Fareham Local Plan 2037.

5. The proposal would adversely affect the existing and future potential general aviation operation of the airfield. The proposed development is therefore considered to be contrary to policy CS12 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy) and policy E3 of the emerging Fareham Local Plan 2037.
6. It is considered that the level of additional traffic activity and the type of commercial vehicles visiting the application site would have a harmful impact upon the character of Glenthorne Close as a residential close affecting the amenity and environment of the Glenthorne Close Residents. As such the proposal is considered to conflict with the requirements of policy DSP40 (v) of the Development Sites and policies Plan and policy D2 of the emerging Fareham Borough Local Plan 20237.
7. In adequate information has been submitted in order for the Local Planning Authority to conclude that the development would not have an unacceptable level of flood risk through appropriate management of surface water. The proposed development is therefore considered contrary to policy CS15 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy) and policy CC2 of the emerging Fareham Local Plan 2037.
8. The proposal would have likely adverse effects on the integrity of habitat sites in combination with other developments due to the additional generation of nutrients entering the water environment and the lack of appropriate and appropriately secured mitigation. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policy CS4 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy), policy DSP13 and criterion (v) of policy DSP40 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 2 (Development Sites and Policies) and policy NE4 of the emerging Fareham Local Plan 2037.
9. The proposal would have likely adverse effects on the integrity of habitat sites in combination with other developments due to the loss of part of a secondary support site habitat and the lack of appropriate and appropriately secured mitigation. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policy CS4 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy), policies DSP13, DSP14 and criterion (v) of policy DSP40 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 2 (Development Sites and Policies) and policy NE5 of the emerging Fareham Local Plan 2037.
10. Inadequate survey information has been submitted in order for the Local Planning Authority to conclude that the development would not have an adverse impact upon protected species. The proposed development is therefore considered contrary to policy CS4 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy), policy DSP13 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 2 (Development Sites and Policies) and policy NE1 of the emerging Fareham Local Plan 2037.
11. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure such, the proposal fails to appropriately secure mitigation of the likely adverse effects on the integrity of protected habitat sites which, in combination with other developments, would arise due to the impacts of recreational disturbance. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policy CS4 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy), policy DSP13 and criterion (v) of policy DSP40

of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 2 (Development Sites and Policies) and policy NE3 of the emerging Fareham Local Plan 2037.

12. Inadequate information has been submitted in order for the Local Planning Authority to conclude that the development would not have a significant adverse impact by virtue of noise for either the proposed residents or those of the adjoining area. The proposed development is therefore considered contrary to policy DSP2 of the Development Sites and Policies Plan and policy D2 of the emerging Fareham Local Plan 2037.
13. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure an off-site affordable housing contribution the scheme fails to assist the Borough in addressing its current housing need. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policy CS18 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy) and policy HP2 of the emerging Fareham Local Plan 2037.

Notes for Information:

Had it not been for the overriding reasons for refusal to the proposal, the Local Planning Authority would have sought to address point 11) above by inviting the applicant to enter into a legal agreement with Fareham Borough Council under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

(7) Planning Appeals

The Committee noted the information in the report.

(8) UPDATE REPORT

The Update Report was circulated prior to the meeting and considered along with the relevant agenda item.

(The meeting started at 3.30 pm
and ended at 7.27 pm).