

Written Deputations
Planning Committee – 12 February 2025

Deputation 1 –

Robert Marshall – On behalf of the Fareham Society – Agenda Item 6(2) – Land East of North Wallington.

Fareham Society Deputation on application P/23/1549/OA 29 dwellings land east of North Wallington Road

The Fareham Society objected to the application as initially submitted because the virtual footway and shared surface with shuttle working would not have provided a safe pedestrian route.

As now revised with a kerbed footpath proposed the issue of pedestrian safety is resolved. However, it does so at a cost and one that the Society considers is unacceptable. For the extensive length of kerbed footpath would create an urban feature in this attractive semi-rural road upper portion of North Wallington Road to the detriment of the sylvan character and appearance of this part of Wallington. The proposed additional street lights would add yet further harm.

It is also considered that reducing the width of the carriageway of North Wallington Road would be likely to harm the free flow of traffic and potentially lead to a conflict of traffic travelling in opposing directions. It is noted that passing bays have been provided but that still leaves one lengthy stretch of single carriageway road likely to cause confusion with drivers uncertain whether to cede right of way or not.

It is recognised, as stated in the Officer's Committee report, that the "tilted balance" applies. However, given the limited benefits of additional housing from this small-scale development the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of doing so.

Deputation 2 –

Katherine Bruce – Agenda Item 6(4) – 17 Kent Grove

Position: Objection

Response to Planning Report submitted 12/2/2025 with reference to the following paragraphs:

2.4: "...neighbouring properties have carried out loft conversions with large dormers to the rear and some to the front, along with rear extensions" misrepresents the difference from this application to existing development in the vicinity – currently all extensions are ground floor only, all loft conversions are over the original footprint only. **None** are a first-floor growth over an extension, impacting the current roofline run; this difference is the key to our objection.

3.2 judging the impact by overall footprint, not the roof footprint, underestimates impact of development beyond a loft conversion – see images submitted in objections

3.3 thank you for the addition of the non-opening window clause not shown in the published plans.

8.5 the neighbouring property has a loft conversion only, not a loft conversion AND first-floor development on the extension – misleading to say this is the same but rotated by 90 degrees.

8.10 the existing ground floor west facing windows are also screened by the canopy which will be removed so there is considerable privacy change.

8.13 the first-floor addition over the ground floor extension is directly south and adjacent so will have significant impact on the light for 13 and 15 Kent Grove conservatory and garden and it is unclear why this is not recognised

8.17 currently the property is 2 bedrooms – these rooms have not been lost and with a downstairs bathroom this property could be used as 5 bedroom – requiring minimum of 3 parking spaces not the 2 available.

In summary - we are not opposed to a loft conversion, but we are highly opposed to the first- floor development over the existing extension in **addition** to the loft conversion as this is what makes the scale out of keeping with the neighbourhood - setting **new** precedents.

Remove one upstairs bedroom and continuing using an existing bedroom downstairs would allow for a development in keeping with the neighbourhood scale and still allow a pleasant balcony, sea views and the desired 3-bedroom family home, thus enabling the developer good profit and living without undue imposition to all the neighbours in the block.

(Please note the main sewer for all properties in this block runs shallow under the existing extension and could be impacted by increased foundations).