Report to Planning Development Control Committee

Date: 10 August 2005

Report of: Chief Development Control Officer

Subject: PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

SUMMARY

This report recommends action on various planning applications and miscellaneous items

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendations are detailed individually at the end of the report on each planning application and miscellaneous items.
## Index List of Applications with Page Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAREHAM EAST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0857/FP</td>
<td></td>
<td>49 Old Turnpike, Fareham</td>
<td>Permission 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of Detached Dwelling and Garages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0876/FP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Fern Cottages, Wickham Road, Fareham</td>
<td>Permission 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of Two Storey Side Extension to form Two Flats.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0881/VC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pook Lane - The Old Stables, Fareham</td>
<td>Permission 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variation of Condition 6 of P/04/1096/VC(to permit Caravan to be sited within Hay Store for Ancillary use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAREHAM NORTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0926/FP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funtley Hill - Funtley Court, Fareham, - Land to Rear of</td>
<td>Permission 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of Building for B1 Business Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAREHAM SOUTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0883/FP</td>
<td></td>
<td>99 Gosport Road - Enfield House -, Fareham</td>
<td>Permission 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of Single Storey Rear Extensions, New Generator Compound &amp; Installation of3 Air Conditioning Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0884/LB</td>
<td></td>
<td>99 Gosport Road - Enfield House -, Fareham</td>
<td>Listed Building Consent 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of Single Storey Rear Extensions, New Generator Compound &amp; Installation of3 Air Conditioning Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0885/FP</td>
<td></td>
<td>39 Fairfield Avenue, Fareham</td>
<td>Permission 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of Two Storey Side/ Rear Extension to Form Dwelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0898/FP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Fayre Road, Fareham</td>
<td>Permission 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change Existing Flat Roof to Pitched Roof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Address/Details</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0941/FP</td>
<td>93 Redlands Lane - Former Elliotts Site, Fareham</td>
<td>Demolish Existing Buildings &amp; Erect 49no Flats &amp; 3No Houses with Associated Parking and Landscaping</td>
<td>Permission 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0945/TO</td>
<td>82-84 The Avenue, Fareham</td>
<td>Crown Lift to 4 Metres above Ground Level Various Trees Covered by FTPO543</td>
<td>Consent 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0894/FP</td>
<td>90 Old Street, Hill Head</td>
<td>Erection of Single Storey Side /Rear Extension</td>
<td>Permission 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0911/OA</td>
<td>10 Seamead, Stubbington, - Land to Rear of</td>
<td>Erection of Detached Dwelling (Outline Application)</td>
<td>Outline Permission 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0921/FP</td>
<td>57 Old Street - Land adjacent to, Hill Head</td>
<td>Erection of Single Detached Dwelling and Garages</td>
<td>Permission 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0832/TO</td>
<td>1 Danehurst Place, Locks Heath</td>
<td>Fell Horse Chestnut covered by F.T.P.O.158</td>
<td>Consent 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0858/VC</td>
<td>Coldeast Way - Coldeast Hospital, Sarisbury Green</td>
<td>Variation of Condition 1 of P/97/0053/OA (To Extend Time Limit for Development)</td>
<td>Permission 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0828/VC</td>
<td>190 West Street - Hillview Garage, Portchester</td>
<td>Variation of Condition 1 of P/02/0671/VC (To allow Continued Use of Forecourt for Car Sales for a further 3 yrs)</td>
<td>Permission 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0849/FP</td>
<td>9 Wicor Mill Lane, Portchester</td>
<td>Retention of Detached Single Garage</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0860/CU</td>
<td>East Street - Unit 6 Castle Trading Estate -, Portchester</td>
<td>Change of Use of Unit to Class B8 - Storage &amp; Distribution (Retrospective Application) and Enclose Canopy</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0900/FP</td>
<td>27 Bayley Avenue, Portchester, Fareham</td>
<td>Build up Hipped Roof to Barn Hip and Provision of Front and Rear Dormers</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0917/FP</td>
<td>1 Seaview Avenue, Portchester, Hants</td>
<td>Erection of Two Chalet Bungalows</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PORTCHESTER WEST</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0851/FP</td>
<td>300 Dore Avenue, Portchester</td>
<td>Demolition of Existing Dwelling and Erection of Eight Flats with Associated Parking and New Vehicular Access</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0940/FP</td>
<td>10 East Cams Close, Fareham</td>
<td>Provision of Front Dormer and New Pitched Roof to Existing Rear Dormer (alternative to P/04/1790/FP)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SARISBURY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0853/OA</td>
<td>Yew Tree Drive - Land at -, Whiteley</td>
<td>Erect New Surgery, Pharmacy &amp; Dental Surgery following Removal of Existing Surgery &amp;Shop (Outline Application)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0971/VC/O</td>
<td>35 Chapel Road, Sarisbury Green</td>
<td>Variation of Condition 12 of P/97/0130/OA (To Enable Conversion to Playroom)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STUBBINGTON</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0662/OA</td>
<td>125 Mays Lane, Stubbington</td>
<td>Erection of Thirty Dwellings with Access from Mays Lane and Summerleigh Walk (Outline Application)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TITCHFIELD

P/05/0790/VC  25 Purslane Gardens, Fareham
Vary Condition 3 of P/04/0637/FP to Change Window type to Flat Obscure Glazed &Fixed with High Level Openers
Permission  5

P/05/0959/FP  181 Segensworth Road, Park Gate
Demolition of Existing Bungalow and Erection of 2 Detached Houses
Refuse  6

TITCHFIELD COMMON

P/05/0864/FP  Hunts Pond Road - 11-15A -, Park Gate, - Land to Rear of - Erection of Detached Bungalow and Provision of Alternative Parking for No.11
Permission  7

P/05/0960/FP  19 Lyndale Road, Park Gate
Erection of Self Contained Elderly Persons Annexe
Permission  8

WARSASH

P/05/0838/FP  Warsash Road - 42-44 -, Warsash
Demolition of Existing Buildings and Erection of Forty-Nine Dwellings
Permission  9

P/05/0839/OA  9 Osborne Road, Warsash
Erection of Detached Bungalow with Attached Garage (Outline Application)
Outline Permission  10

P/05/0879/FP  Pitchpond Road - Wynsdale -, Warsash
Substitution of House Types on Plots 1,4,5,6,7,8,9 and 10
Permission  11

P/05/0916/FP  111a Brook Lane, Warsash
Erection of Single Storey Front Extension and Porch Canopy
Permission  12
ZONE 1 – WESTERN WARDS

Locks Heath
Park Gate
Sarisbury
Titchfield
Titchfield Common
Warsash
Site Description

This application relates to a Horse Chestnut situated in the rear garden of 1 Danehurst Place which is to the east of Raley Road.

Description of Proposal

Consent is sought to fell one Horse Chestnut.

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review – DG4

Representations

One letter has been received objecting on the following grounds:

- The horse chestnut might provide protection from the Scots Pines which are more dangerous

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer – No Objection

Comments

The arborist has been consulted and his comments are:

The crown of the Horse Chestnut is suppressed by a more dominant pine against which one of the three stems is rubbing. The original Pollard point is showing signs of decay with weak branch attachments at the point where the short trunk divides into three stems. On this basis there is no objection to the felling of the tree subject to a suitable replacement.

The issue raised with regards to other dangerous trees cannot be taken into account on this application. Officers have only considered the horse chestnut as applied for.

Officers are of the opinion that the works would not be detrimental to the visual amenities or character of the area.

RECOMMEND:
CONSENT: Works to be carried out to BS3998: 1989; Replacement Tree

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0832/TO

(2) P/05/0858/VC
ENGLISH PARTNERSHIPS

PARK GATE
Agent: C B RICHARD ELLIS

VARIATION OF CONDITION 1 OF
P/97/0053/OA (TO EXTEND TIME
LIMIT FOR DEVELOPMENT)

COLDEAST HOSPITAL -
COLDEAST WAY - SARISBURY
GREEN

OFFICERS REPORT - Kim Hayler Ext 2367

Site Description

• The Coldeast Hospital site is between the settlements of Locks Heath and Sarisbury Green;
• The site comprises extensive wooded grounds of a former mansion, within which numerous buildings of the former hospital are grouped about a network of drives;
• A spine road, known as Coldeast Way, provides the principle access from the A27, Bridge Road, and extends through the site to an access onto Brook Lane. This road splits the site into two areas, to the east and west of it;
• Coldeast Hospital closed in 1997, although some of the former hospital buildings in the north-western area continue to provide health services;
• The south-east part of the site is occupied by a community building currently used by scouts and the Lord Wilson School and associated playing field.

Description of Proposal

• Under P/97/0053/OA, outline permission for residential development of approximately 250 dwellings, involving development of developable areas at 29.65 dwellings per hectare was allowed on appeal in December 1998. Apart from means of access, all other matters were reserved for future determination.
• The outline consent was accompanied by legal agreements, which secured a number of aspects including community facilities for the new development. These include provision of:
  (i) Affordable housing;
  (ii) Open space to include a playing field, children’s play and informal open space;
(iii) Provision of the community hall for public use (including works to it to bring it up to sound condition);
(iv) A contribution towards education provision;
(v) Upgraded access onto the A27 Bridge Road and Brook Lane;
(vi) Contributions towards public transport infrastructure, traffic calming on Brook Lane, cycle routes and cycle parking.

- Reserved matters (P/03/1867/RM refers) was approved on 16 February 2004 for the erection of 234 dwellings with a range of house types and densities.
- A full application for 17 dwellings (P/03/1868/FP refers) was permitted at the same time as the reserved matters. The application included land excluded from the original application because it was safeguarded for health use. This site was declared surplus to health requirements.
- At appeal the Secretary of State required the submission of remaining reserved matters by 16 December 2003 and commencement of development either within seven years of his decision (16 December 2005) or two years of the final approval of reserved matter (16 February 2006).
- This application has been submitted on behalf of English Partnerships who became the freehold owners of the site on 15 April 2005 as part of the transfer of the NHS estate from the Secretary of State for Health. As a consequence of the previous delays in progressing the development of this site and the subsequent change in ownership, planning permission is sought to extend the period of time of the implementation of development.
- This application seeks to extend the time-limit for the commencement of development by a further two years.

**Policies**

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: Policies UB1, UB2, UB3, UB4, T4, T5, T6, T7, T12, H1, H4, H5, H7, H8, R2, E1, E3, E4, E12, E13, E15 and MP1.


**Relevant Planning History**

P/97/0053/OA Outline Application for Residential Development (at 29.65 dwellings per hectare) open space and access from Brook Lane and Bridge Road. Appeal Allowed 16th December 1998

P/02/1706/VC Application submitted seeking to extend the time-limits for the submission of reserved matters and commencement of development by a further two years - Application withdrawn.
P/03/0047/FP Alterations to existing access to site from the A27 allowing the retention of more trees than in the approved access proposals – Permission 7 March 2003

P/03/1867/RM Erection of 234 dwellings and bat house; reserved matters for siting, design, external appearance and landscaping. Approved 16.2.04
P/03/1868/FP Erection of 17 dwellings permission 24.2.04

Representations

The application has been publicised by notifying neighbours and site notices. No letters have been received.

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – no objection

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – no objection subject to conditions

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Countryside Officer) – The ecological surveys undertaken in connection with P/03/1867/RM will need to be updated prior to development commencing.

Director of the Environment (HCC County Surveyor) – No objection subject to the contribution of figures being increased. The transportation contributions it is concluded would make the development acceptable

Hampshire County Council Archaeological Officer – No objection

Environment Agency – No objection

English Nature – The variation of condition 1 is unlikely to have an impact on the protected species present and English Nature raises no objection to this application.

Strategic Housing Manager – In light of the impending policy changes of the new Affordable Housing SPD and the revised Affordable Housing Strategy, we would ask that a planning condition is imposed ensuring that the applicant complies with the above in order to deliver much needed affordable housing.

Comments

Main Issues

- Principle of development
- Density of development
- Affordable housing
- Infrastructure requirements
- Highways
Principle of development

The principle of residential development has been established on this site through its allocation in the adopted Local Plan and under P/97/0053/OA, the allowed appeal and P/03/1867/RM, the approved reserved matters.

Density of development

The appeal decision was allowed with a planning condition stipulating an overall density of 29.65 dwellings per hectare, but density was to vary within specified ranges in different areas of the site. It was recognised that lower density ranges were more appropriate for certain areas in order to retain the character of the woodland, open areas and historic parkland. These sensitive areas were to be developed at density ranges between 15-25 dwellings per hectare whereas other areas on the site were to be developed at 25-40 dwellings per hectare.

The overall density of the approved reserved matters application (P/03/1867/RM) was 30 dph. The net developable area excluded the areas of open space and wooded/tree areas.

Since the appeal decision, PPG3 has put a greater emphasis on the more efficient use of available land as well as the need for higher quality development. There is also an emphasis on increasing housing density and Circular 01/02 The Town and County Planning (Residential Density) (London and South East England) Direction 2002, requires Councils to consult the Secretary of State where it does not propose to refuse an application for houses or flats on a site of 1 hectare or more where residential development is less than 30 dwellings per hectare.

Officers sought Counsel advice on this matter some time ago and it was considered acceptable to consider a planning condition requiring the development to have an overall density of 30 dwellings per hectare rather than 29.65 in order to comply with the requirements of the Direction. Counsel opinion was that if the permission is amended in this way then it will not be necessary to refer the application to The Government Office for the South-East if resolved to permit.

Officers consider that there are sound planning reasons to keep the overall net density to 30 dph. PPG3 encourages higher densities but it further indicates higher densities are not to be achieved at the expense of the quality of the development or its relationship to its surroundings. In the appeal decision, the woodland character, open areas and historic garden were identified as key determining consideration in respect of density and these determining considerations are still applicable. Furthermore, the accessibility of the site to public transport and services are not considered sufficient to significantly increase density. Within the Council’s Local Practice Note on residential car parking, the site is identified as having low accessibility. Although any permission would be likely to result in public transport improvements, these again would not be considered sufficient to justify an increase in density above that recommended.
Affordable housing

In connection with the appeal decision, a S.106 agreement secured provision of 25% of the total housing on this site as affordable housing. This was to be secured by the transfer of land to an affordable housing provider. This was based on the affordable housing provider having to pay 50% of the open market value of the land and the owner providing services to the boundary of the land. Since the appeal decision, the Council has produced an Affordable Housing Strategy which indicates that the service land should be transferred to an affordable housing provider at nil cost.

In light of the foregoing officers are of the opinion that there is justification to change the financial arrangement for securing affordable housing. A Planning condition could thus require the submission of an affordable housing scheme which would require details of the quantity and type of affordable housing in each reserved matters application. The applicant has agreed to the principle of a condition, but specific confirmation in writing is being sought.

Infrastructure requirements

In connection with the appeal decision, the S.106 agreement also secured the provision of open space and amenity woodland, community hall, affordable housing, master plan to secure landscape, rehabilitation of woodland and phasing of development.

Officers consider planning policies have not changed in respect of these matters (except affordable housing) although a new agreement will be necessary given that the original agreement is tied to the appeal decision.

Similarly a new agreement securing off-site highway and public transport improvements is required because the original was tied to the appeal decision.

Highways

The previous appeal decision considered the impact of additional traffic generation on the highway network in the vicinity and the highway implications of a secondary highway access to the site off Brook Lane. In the appeal the Secretary of State agreed with the Planning Inspector that the proposal would not materially impact on highway safety or convenience, subject to satisfactory highway and transportation measures being funded and undertaken. Significant highway and transportation improvements are to be secured. The Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) has raised no objections to the proposal.
RECOMMEND:

Subject to the owner/applicant entering into a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on terms to the satisfaction of the Solicitor to the Council to secure open space and amenity woodland, community hall, master plan to secure landscaping rehabilitation of woodland, phasing of development, works to public highway, off-site highway improvements and education contribution.

PERMISSION: Extend time limits for commencement of development by two years; landscaping; density net 30 dwellings per hectare with specified density ranges; materials; levels; boundary treatments; tree protection measures; tree works in accordance with BS5837; highway specification and implementation; parking and turning; site compound and storage; construction hours; no mud on road; no on-site burning; affordable housing (including implementation details); contamination.

Further Information:

You are advised that the ecological surveys undertaken in connection with P/03/1867/RM will need to be updated prior to development commencing.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0858/VC, P/97/0053/OA, P/03/1867/RM, P/03/1868/FP

(3) P/05/0853/OA SARISBURY
as amplified by email dated 15 July 2005 and 21 July 2005
P.M.P. DEVELOPMENT Agent: STUDIO FOUR
ARCHITECTS LTD
ERECT NEW SURGERY, PHARMACY & DENTAL SURGERY FOLLOWING REMOVAL OF EXISTING SURGERY & SHOP (OUTLINE APPLICATION)

OFFICERS REPORT - Kim Hayler Ext 2367

Site Description
The application relates to a plot of land to the north of Yew Tree Drive, Whiteley;

The site area is approximately 0.232 hectare in area and is triangular in shape;

The site is bounded by Yew Tree Drive to the south and a group of protected trees to the north west and north; residential properties (Lipizzaner Fields) lie to the north beyond the trees;

The site is currently used as a temporary surgery, shop, pharmacy and gravel car park with approximately 20 parking spaces;

The site is generally level, with a slight rise to the trees on the north west boundary and a ditch to the north;

There is an existing marked footpath outside the site boundary to the north and an unmarked footpath to the north west;

Currently within the site, inside the north boundary, is a bridleway which stops in the northern apex of the site;

The site is designated as an allocated housing site within the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

**Description of Proposal**

Outline planning permission is sought, with access only to be considered for the construction of a new surgery, pharmacy and dental surgery. The building would also accommodate the following additional services:

(i) Provision to allow the practice to be a teaching practice;
(ii) Provision for 2 general dental practitioners;
(iii) Provision for district nursing, health visitors and midwives;
(iv) Pharmacy.

The application was originally submitted with siting to be considered.

Following discussions between officers and the applicants’ agent siting was subsequently withdrawn from the application. Officers believe that this element would be best considered as part of a detailed scheme for the site.

- Indicative plans and elevations have been received showing a building running east to west across the site, 22 metres from the neighbouring properties in Lipizzaner Fields and fronting Yew Tree Drive. Parking would be to the front of the building. The indicative elevations show the building essentially two storey in height with single storey elements on the eastern and western sides of the building;

- The existing bridleway would be combined with the footpath just outside of the site to the north and continued around the outside of the site to the west.
Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies DG1, DG3, DG4, DG5, H1, and T5

Relevant Planning History

P/02/1431/D4 Use of temporary buildings as convenience store and doctors surgery – Permission December 2002

P/04/1715/D4 Continued use of temporary buildings as convenience store and doctors surgery – Permission January 2005

Representations

Eleven letters supporting the proposal have been received raising the following issues:

- There is no objection to a surgery on the site, but to the current layout and size;
- The scale and position of the building would impact on the amenities of the properties to the north;
- The building should be turned 90 degrees onto the west side of the site to minimise overlooking.
- Access to car park - would like a condition imposed that site entrance was gated.
- Car park surface – would like the surface to be of a more permanent nature reducing noise and dust.

Consultations

Hampshire Constabulary – no objection

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – no objection

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – no objection subject to conditions

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Policy) – comments awaited

Southern Water Services – no objection

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – no objection

Hampshire County Council (Rights of Way Officer) – comments awaited

Comments

Main issues

- Assessment of need and justification for the development
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- Character and appearance of the area
- Amenities of the neighbouring properties

Assessment of need and justification for the development

Initially in 1998 the architects were commissioned directly by the G.P’s to examine the feasibility of a new surgery at the allocated Whiteley District Centre. This option was actively pursued for some time, but an affordable scheme could not be achieved and the site owners were unwilling to sell the land required.

Following this initial site option, two sites at Gull Coppice were evaluated. The ‘Island’ site was considered, but this was not suitable as the ground conditions were very poor and the landowners (Hampshire County Council) were insistent that the building be a flagship design. Both these factors made the building unaffordable for the G.P’s.

A second site at Gull Coppice was considered and also found to be unviable for the same reasons as the previous site.

Sites at ‘Solent II’ off Rookery Avenue were investigated. During the period 2002 – 2004 three different sites were suggested by the site owners and the possibility of siting the surgery with a day nursery and/or a nursing home were also evaluated (the pharmacy and dental surgery were to be incorporated as an integral part of any new surgery building).

Discussions were held with the relevant bodies involved, but the surgery element of the scheme had become a minor part and the G.P’s felt that the practice would end up on a site surrounded by light industrial units.

The existing temporary surgery in Yew Tree Drive has been on the site for 7 years. In view of the doctors’ unsuccessful attempts to find a site for their permanent surgery, Fareham Borough Council Executive agreed on 7 March 2005 to the sale of the site to the doctors subject to acceptable terms being agreed.

The G.P practice carried out a patient survey early in 2005 and the majority view was that the present location was ideal.

The current patient list has grown from 3769 in 2001 to 5,000. The population is expected to grow by 700 each year for the next 3 – 5 years. There are 4783 current patients living in the ‘PO’ postcode area (Whiteley and Segensworth) and 153 living in the ‘SO’ postcode area (Park Gate). Development on land North of Whiteley has planning permission in place which would impact on numbers significantly. The proposed practice has planned capacity for 9000 patients.

The practice at Whiteley accepts patients from the whole of Whiteley and crosses over the motorway to take patients from Segensworth and Park Gate. Three of the four GP surgeries in the western wards are working at full capacity, and consequently the Primary Care Trust (PCT) is looking at the practice at Whiteley to assist with the lack of capacity currently in the area.
The other surgery which serves Whiteley is currently working with a full list and not accepting new patient registrations except from immediate family members. New patients in Whiteley, Park Gate and Segensworth are only able to register with the GP’s at the existing temporary surgery.

Whiteley has grown from a population of approximately 500 to its current population of approximately 5000 in the past six years. Substantial residential development in this area means that the population is estimated to grow by 12% between 2001 – 2008. Currently the list size is growing at the rate of 300 per year.

The flexibility of the new surgery would allow for changes owing to the future requirements of primary care. The proposed facility would be able to respond to shifts of service from secondary to primary care and accommodating the strategic direction of Fareham and Gosport PCT.

With the new surgery providing services for the rapidly growing Whiteley population, the facility should be well placed to attract new staff and to retain existing staff. Furthermore, with both the Government’s and the public’s emphasis for modern and accessible facilities, Whiteley surgery should be able to retain its current patient base and would have the opportunity to expand in line with the anticipated growth in population.

The G.P’s have been seeking a suitable site for a surgery for 7 years. There is clearly an urgent need for a primary healthcare centre required for the current and future needs of Whiteley. The proposed surgery would overcome the difficulties that accompany the occupation of temporary accommodation on a permanent basis.

It is considered that since it can be demonstrated that there is a clear need for the facility and that there is no other site available then the proposal does constitute an overriding case for loss of an area designated for housing.

Character of the area

The existing temporary surgery, sited in the south western corner of the site would ideally need to continue to function during the construction period. For this reason there is limited scope for siting the building in order to facilitate this process. The shape of the site, the protected trees and the schedule of accommodation required are also important matters to be taken into account when siting the building.

The size of the building is set by the schedule of accommodation required for this type of use.

The illustrative plans demonstrate the two storey element being central to the building, reducing to single storey either side. The western end of the building has been designed to respect the protected trees along the boundary and the eastern end reduced in height in order to minimise the bulk and resultant visual impact within the street scene.
In the view of officers the tree screening around the site boundaries would mean that the site is largely self contained. For the reasons set out previously, all matter relating to siting and appearance are purely indicative at this time.

Amenities of the neighbouring properties

Residential properties are located beyond the northern boundary in Lipizzaner Fields. The indicative plans show the building sited 22 metres from these properties. In addition the indicative eaves of the building are shown reduced along the north elevation and the existing mature trees would provide screening.

Officers are satisfied that a building could be designed and positioned within the site that would not materially harm the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring residential properties.

Conclusion

On the basis of the supporting information provided officers believe that there are material considerations in this case which justify setting aside the present housing allocation of the site.

The site is largely self contained and is not readily viewed in association with existing built development. The site therefore has potential to support a building of greater scale with associated parking. Officers are satisfied that such a building could be designed and sited to safeguard the amenities of local residents and preserve the appearance of the area.

RECOMMEND:

Subject to:

(i) The comments of the Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Policy) and Hampshire County Council (Rights of Way Officer);

(ii) The application being referred to the Secretary of State as the proposal involves the loss of an allocated housing site and relates to land within the ownership of the Council. If the Secretary of State does not wish to intervene then:

PERMISSION: Reserved matters (siting, design, external appearance and landscaping); implementation of landscaping; levels; parking and cycle parking; construction hours; tree/hedgerow protection; arboricultural method statement; no mud on road; no burning on site; boundary treatment; hard surfacing; bin storage; to be used as surgery and dentist with ancillary pharmacy and for no other purpose; no openings specified elevation

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0853/OA
Site Description

This application relates to a detached dwelling on the north side of Chapel Road which is to the north of Bridge Road.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the variation of condition 12 of P/97/0130/OA to enable the conversion of the attached double garage to be converted to a room.

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review –DG3, DG5 and T5

Relevant Planning History

P/97/0130/OA Erection of Dwelling and Garage Outline permission 24-04-1997

P/97/0704/RM Erection of a Detached House and Double Garage Approved 05-09-1997

P/05/0459/FP Erection of Detached Garage Block with Storage Area in Roof Permission 20-05-2005

Representations

No letters of objection have been received

Consultations

Chief Planning & Transportation Officer (highways) – No objection

Comments

This application has been submitted to vary condition 12 of P/97/0130/OA to enable conversion of the garage to room.

The council’s highways department has been consulted and have raised no objection to the loss of the attached garage as there is sufficient parking space on site.
Officers consider the application to be acceptable with no detrimental impact on highway safety, the surrounding area or on any neighbouring properties. The application is also incompliance with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: Brickwork to match

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0971/VC

P/05/0790/VC TITCHFIELD
MR AND MRS P ASQUITH

VARY CONDITION 3 OF 25 PURSLANE GARDENS
P/04/0637/FP TO CHANGE WINDOW FAREHAM
TYPE TO FLAT OBSCURE GLAZED & FIXED WITH HIGH LEVEL OPENERS

OFFICERS REPORT - Emma Betteridge Ext 2677

Site Description

This application relates to a semi-detached dwelling on the west side of Purslane Gardens which is south of Segensworth Road.

Description of Proposal

Relief of condition 3 of P/04/0637/FP which states:-

None of the development hereby approved shall be brought into use until the first floor window as marked in blue on the approved plan on the western elevation of the two storey side extension hereby approved has been obscure glazed and fixed shut. This window shall subsequently be retained in that condition at all times.

REASON: To prevent overlooking and to protect the amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property in accordance with Policy DG5 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

The window to be inserted was in the form of an Oriel window partly fixed and obscure and partly opening. However on construction of an approved extension a standard flat opening clear glazed window was inserted.

Following an investigation by enforcement this application has been submitted for relief from the condition to change the window from the Oriel to a flat obscure glazed window with high level openers at 1.7 metres above internal floor level.

Policies
Fareham Borough Local Plan Review – DG5

Relevant Planning History

Representations

One letter has been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Invasion on privacy (overhearing of conversations)

Comments

The application site abuts a new residential development which is still under construction called Wild Flower Drive which is located behind 109-115 Segensworth Road and is located to the west of the application site.

A condition was placed on a previous approved application for the two storey side extension, which was for the oriel window within the west elevation to be partly fixed shut and obscure glazed to prevent overlooking of the neighbouring property to the west. This current application is to remove the clear glazed opening window and replace with a window fixed and obscure glazed up to 1.7 metres. This would overcome the problem of overlooking.

With regard to the overhearing of conversations this is not a material planning issue and can not be taken into account whilst determining this application.

Officers consider the application to be acceptable retaining all visual privacy to the neighbouring property therefore no detrimental impact would be created. The proposal is still incompliance with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review and the Approved Extension Design guide.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: Works to be undertaken within 1 month

Further Information

You are advised that the works may be in breach of current building regulations in relation to means of escape

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0790/VC, P/04/0637/FP,
Site Description

- The site is situated on the southern side of Segensworth Road and to the south of the industrial area known as Segensworth East.
- The site is currently occupied by a bungalow that has been unoccupied for some time and is in a bad state of disrepair;
- The site is enclosed by hedges. To the front of the existing bungalow is a large Chilean Pine (monkey puzzle tree) and to the rear an oak tree, both subject of a Tree Preservation Order.
- To the rear of the site lies the recent extension of the cul de sac known as Merecroft.
- The properties on either side of the proposed development are bungalows

Description of Proposal

- The applicants are seeking full planning permission for the erection of two detached houses following the demolition of the existing bungalow.
- The proposed dwellings are to be sited on the same footprint as a pair of semi-detached dwellings previously granted outline permission (P/03/1451/OA refers).

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies DG3, DG5, DG4, H2, R5 and T5

Relevant Planning History

P/05/0737/FP – Demolition of Existing Bungalow and Erection of Two Detached Houses – Refused 7 July 2005

P/03/1451/OA – Erection of a Pair of Semi-Detached Dwellings Following Demolition of Existing Bungalow – Permission 13 November 2003

P/03/0600/OA – Erection of Two Detached Dwellings Following Demolition of Existing Bungalow – Refused 6 June 2003
Representations

The application has been publicised by notifying neighbours and site notice. One letter has been received raising the following concern:

- Would like to see the two mature trees to be retained on site (Monkey Puzzle and Oak Tree)

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – No objection subject to conditions

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – objection raised as a result of the potential adverse effects on existing tree roots during the demolition and construction phases in relation to the two protected trees.

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – comments awaited

Comments

The site is located within the existing urban area and according to PPG3 definition is previously developed land (PDL). Policy H2 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review encourages the development of housing on under-used land within the urban area. The principle of residential development is therefore acceptable in this area and was established when the outline application (P/03/1451/OA refers) for two semi-detached dwellings was permitted.

Planning permission was refused on 7 July 2005 (P/05/0737/FP refers) for the erection of two detached dwellings on the site. The current application is the same as the previous application; although the applicant has now submitted a supporting statement with the application.

The proposal involves dividing the plot into two, resulting in plot sizes not dissimilar to others in the area. The properties either side of the site and along this section of Segensworth Road are predominantly bungalows and chalet bungalows with generous gaps between. Although the proposed dwellings would be sited on the same footprint as the previous outline application, the erection of two detached houses with a separation of just 1.5 metres between them would lead to a cramped form of development, out of character with the surrounding area. Officers therefore consider that by virtue of their height, width, design and close proximity to each other, the proposal would result in a cramped form of development out of character with the area and visual amenities of the area.

RECOMMEND:

Subject to the comments of the Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) and (Arborist) and Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer and any further reasons for refusal they may have.
**REFUSE:** Contrary to policy; cramped form of development; out of character.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** File P/05/0959/FP; P/05/0737/FP; P/03/1451/FP; P/03/0600/OA

(7) P/05/0864/FP TITCHFIELD COMMON
as amplified by plan received 22nd July 2005
ADMIRAL HOMES INVESTMENTS LTD LUKEN BECK PARTNERSHIP

ERECTION OF DETACHED BUNGALOW HUNTS POND ROAD - 11-15A -
AND PROVISION OF ALTERNATIVE PARK GATE
PARKING FOR NO.11 - LAND TO REAR OF -

OFFICERS REPORT - Kim Hayler Ext 2367

**Site Description**

The application site is located on the northeast side of Hunts Pond Road and lies behind No’s 11-15a Hunts Pond Road which comprises of a row of terraces. The site is bounded by the A27 to the north-east; the rear garden of No.9 Hunts Pond Road forms the north-west boundary whilst the rear garden of No.17 Hunts Pond Road forms the south-east.

**Description of Proposal**

- Detailed planning permission is sought for the erection of a detached bungalow with two bedrooms;
- The dwelling would measure 13.2 metres in width, 8.3 metres in depth with a maximum roof height of 5.2 metres;
- The site would be accessed between No’s 9-11 Hunts Pond Road and parking would be provided by a detached garage. An additional parking space is provided for No.11.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies – DG1; DG3; DG5; H2; R5 and T5

**Relevant Planning History**


**Representations**

Two letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:
- 25 -

- The site is inadequate as with most back land infilling
- Deprive rear garden area of light and reduce outlook
- Add traffic to an already over burdened road which is dangerous for the elderly and children
- 11m depth for plots is inadequate and inappropriate to expect people to live in such close proximity
- It is absurd that the planning inspector considered that as the existing parking arrangements are inadequate that it should be allowed
- The dwelling would result in additional traffic movements
- The access to the site for delivery vehicles is inadequate
- Impact on trees within neighbouring garden

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – no objections

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – no objections subject to conditions

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – no objections, however a statement will be required to ensure that the boundary hedge is adequately protected during construction.

Comments

The previous application (P/04/1093/OA refers) was refused as it was considered by officers that the proposal would have: resulted in backland development which would have left the existing dwellings with garden areas noticeably smaller than those prevailing in the area; the limited size of the frontage was inadequate to enable a vehicle to park, which would be detrimental to the safety and convenience of users of the highway. In addition there was an absence of a commuted payment towards public open space.

The subsequent Appeal was only dismissed on the basis of the absence of provision of a contribution towards public open space and the concern over the frontage parking. The Planning Inspector concluded that:

“to make more effective use of housing land it will be inevitable that backland development will play an important part. In this case, the inspector was unable to identify any particular characteristic of the area that would prelude development of this type as being unacceptable in its impact. It is considered that even if the dwelling is visible that would only continue the existing pattern of development in Southampton Road to the rear. In addition the inspector did not consider the 11 metre depth for the existing plots to be inadequate.

With regard to the limited size of the frontage which is inadequate to enable a vehicle to park. The arrangement for a parking space at the front of No.11 is currently inadequate; however with the demolition of the porch this could be increased. This would still leave the potentially hazardous manoeuvre of reversing out of or into the space to and from the highway which is somewhat
unsatisfactory. The Council has granted permission with this arrangement at No’s 15 & 15a, it is difficult to reject that arrangement in this appeal.

The inspector considered that in the event of a further application discussions between the appellants and the Highway Authority can resolve the parking issue whilst further details in the application and/or conditions on a permission can deal with some of the concerns of adjoining residents.’

With regard to the concerns raised by the neighbouring properties, the dwelling is sited closer to the neighbouring property to the south than the appeal proposal. Officers consider however that the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on the amenities of this property as the proposal is on the northern side of No.17 is only single storey in height and it would be conditioned so that there would be no windows within the roof plane. The concerns raised by the Inspector have been overcome as the depth of the frontage to No.11 has been increased by demolishing the existing porch.

It is considered by officers that in light of the comments by the Planning Inspector that the proposal is acceptable and complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

RECOMMEND:

Subject to the receipt of satisfactory elevational plans for the garage

PERMISSION: Materials to be submitted; boundary treatment; no windows/dormer windows/velux windows within any roofplane; single storey eaves height; arboricultural method statement; protective fencing; parking to be provided including that for 11 Hunts Pond Road following demolition of the porch; levels; no mud on road; hours of construction; no burning; noise assessment

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0864/FP; P/04/1093/OA

(8) P/05/0960/FP TITCHFIELD COMMON
MR & MRS BOWERS Agent: MR MARTIN MOYSE
ERECTION OF SELF CONTAINED 19 LYNDALE ROAD
ELDERLY PERSONS ANNEXE PARK GATE

OFFICERS REPORT - Joanne Wilson Ext 2679

Site Description

The application site comprises a semi-detached dwelling situated at the far end on the northern side of Lyndale Road. There are two mature Lombardy Poplar Trees subject of a Tree Preservation Order along the eastern boundary within the neighbouring garden.

Description of Proposal

dc-050810-r01-awe.doc
Permission is sought for the erection of a detached single storey extension to be used as a self contained elderly person’s annexe.

The building would measure 6 metres in width, 10 metres in length with a maximum roof height of 3.9 metres.

Four car parking spaces are shown for the annexe and the existing property.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies - DG3; DG5; T5 and H9

**Relevant Planning History**


**Representations**

At the time of writing this report one letters of objection has been received raising the following comments:

- Problems within the area of surface water drainage and flooding, the proposal would make the situation worse.

The application has been publicised by notifying neighbours and a site notice and the publicity period expires on 8 August 2005.

**Consultations**

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – no objections

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – subject to conditions there are no objections as the annexe has now been reduced in size and moved further away from the two existing poplar trees.

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – comments awaited

**Comments**

The previous application was refused as it was considered that the annexe would have resulted in: a form of backland development harmful to the character of the area; the siting of the building adjacent to two mature Lombardy Poplars the proposal would have resulted in a detrimental impact on the health and wellbeing of the trees. In addition of the basis of the limited information submitted with the application, officers were not satisfied that the annexe is needed for dependant relatives.

The annexe as previously submitted was ‘L’ shaped in design and had an overall depth of 9 metres and overall width of 10 metres. The proposal has been reduced in size so that the overall width would now measure 6 metres. Due to the reduction in size the building has also moved further away from the two Lombardy Poplar trees.
The proposed building is sited along the southern boundary and would replace an existing garage and a number of outbuildings. Officers consider that due to the proposal replacing existing buildings and that a 1.8 metre fence is proposed along the southern boundary, only 0.5 metres of brickwork would be viewed above the boundary screening. As a result officers consider that the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Policy H9 of the Local Plan relates to annexes for dependant relatives and they will be permitted provided that they can satisfy a number of requirements in particular providing adequate gardens and car parking spaces and subject to a legal agreement.

The agent has submitted a supporting statement with the application which states that the existing dwelling is occupied by Mr and Mrs Bowers, their two children and Mr Bowers parents. The existing bungalow has already been extended and is still insufficient in size to house all the family. Mr Bowers parents would occupy the annexe, and this would enable Mr Bowers to care for his parents.

There would be a shared garden area for the family and four car parking spaces are shown. It would be necessary for the applicant to enter into a legal agreement to ensure that the annexe can not be sold or let as an independent unit of accommodation.

Officers consider that the proposal is acceptable and complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

RECOMMEND:

Subject to

1. comments received from the Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer and any conditions they may recommend.
2. the applicant/owner entering into a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on terms drafted by the Solicitor to the Council to secure that the annexe can not be sold or let as an independent unit of accommodation by no later than 2 September 2005.

PERMISSION: Materials; boundary screening; parking to be made available; arboricultural method statement; protective fencing.

OR

In the event that the obligation is not completed by 2 September 2005

REFUSE: Contrary to policy; unacceptable level of amenity between the proposed building and existing bungalow; lack of contribution towards off-site public open space.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0960/FP; P/04/1273/FP

dc-050810-r01-awe.doc
Site Description

The site is the former “Polybond” premises with frontage to Warsash Road and a further frontage to Church Road, Warsash.

Description of Proposal

The proposal is essentially a response to the reasons for refusal of the earlier application P/05/0274/FP for 54 dwellings, as refused permission in May 2005. (See below).

The development is based on a new estate road from the Church Road frontage in approximately the same location as the former main entrance to the industrial premises. The possibility of an entrance from Warsash Road has been considered but rejected due to serious highway safety concerns. A new pedestrian link would, however, be formed linking the Warsash Road with Church Road.

The frontage to Warsash Road would be formed by six two storey four bedroomed houses. The frontage to Church Road would consist of one detached and two semi-detached houses of similar scale, to either side of the new entrance road.

Within the scheme and grouped around the new road would be a further forty dwellings consisting of 2 and 2½ storey buildings, largely 2 and 3 bedroomed houses, but also including some 1 and 2 bedroomed flats. Twelve of the forty nine dwellings would be allocated as “affordable dwellings”- towards the eastern extremity of the site.

Parking would generally be provided in courtyards behind the main internal frontages and at the level required to comply with the Council’s maximum standard for a location of low/medium accessibility. Where applicable, in the case of flats, a residents amenity area is provided in excess of 25 sq metres per dwelling. “Back to back” distances within the scheme and with neighbouring properties are at or in excess of the minima set out in Appendix 6 to the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review, though the flank wall of one two storey house to the rear of 5 – 8 Haley Court, Church Road would be at a distance of 7 metres rather than the minima of 12.5 metres. However, that two storey house replaces a recently demolished former factory/warehouse in the
same location which was rather larger. Amended drawings will be submitted which further improve this aspect and give comparative information about what is proposed and what existed.

**Policies**


**Relevant Planning History**

P/05/0274/FP – Fifty four dwellings – refused May 2005

P/04/1589/FP – as above – withdrawn.

**Representations**

Two letters have been received. In relation to the previous application fourteen letters were received, including one from The Warsash Residents Association objecting to the proposals. Points of objection can be summarised as:

- Too many houses – excessive density
- Adverse effect of cumulative development in Warsash
- Inadequate car parking
- No recreational provision within the site
- Church Road is very busy, notably at either end of the school day
- Will aggravate local congestion – journey to work
- Suggest new mini-roundabout at Church Road/Warsash Road junction
- Inadequate local facilities – will be aggravated by additional households
- Noise, dust and disturbance from construction.

**Consultations**

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – final comments awaited

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – no objections

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (countryside) – no objections, noting that wildlife has been translocated already

Chief Strategic Housing Officer – supports the application

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – (i) no objection; outlining conditions re decontamination: (ii) - Properties on Warsash Road and Church Road should be fitted with thermal double glazing to mitigate traffic noise

Hampshire Constabulary – no objections
Environment Agency – no objections but ask for conditions re groundwater

Southern Water – no objection but note inadequacy of local sewers and request an informative requiring the developer to fund improvements under the Water Industry Act 1991.

Comments

In summary, the reasons for refusal of the former application were the scale of the then proposed buildings; the height of three storey elements; and the extent of unbroken terraces within the scheme – comprising overdevelopment which would have been harmful to the character of the area.

Those and other criticisms have been addressed in the current proposals which advise a reduction of 5 dwellings, and, in the opinion of officers, achieves a significantly different internal character and impact upon its surroundings.

The key issues in this case are:

- The principle of residential development to this order of density
- Traffic implications – notably regarding Church Road
- Neighbourly interests in aspects of the design and layout
- Safe and effective remediation of ground contamination.

Principle of development.

The site was identified for residential development in the Councils Urban Capacity Study which underpins the housing policies of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review. That 2002 document assumed development of around 37 dwellings. The need to accommodate growing numbers of smaller households means that a number of flats either 1 or 2 bedroomed have been included in the scheme with the resultant increase in the number of units. Members will be aware of Government advice on making efficient use of previously developed land and for “mixed” communities.

Officers believe that this approach is acceptable and will contribute 12 affordable housing units meeting an important corporate objective.

Traffic Implications

Arising from residents’ views in considering the previous application, consideration was given to accessing at least part of the development from Warsash Road. In practice the issue of proximity to junctions and forward visibility proved to be serious road safety objections. These same issues have also been identified in appeal decisions elsewhere in Warsash Road. An independent Traffic Study has been prepared in consultation with the Council’s traffic engineers. That document projects that vehicle movements arising from the development would be in the order of 274 vehicle movements per average day. This compares with a potential projection of 370 to 500 vehicles (including commercial vehicles), were the former industrial uses to be recommenced. A further traffic issue is the potential of the site to conflict with
congestion arising at the beginning and end of the school day in Church Road. Traffic generation from the development at those hours should be below peak hour projections. The applicants have agreed to make a financial contribution to the improvement of local pedestrian facilities which in part would implement aspects of the Hook with Warsash School “Travel Plan”. This specifically aims to reduce current traffic problems by encouraging less use of cars arising from pupils living in the built up area of Warsash. The development would in itself include a new and potentially important pedestrian link from Warsash Road to Church Road.

Neighbourly Interests.

There are no longer any three storey buildings within the proposed development and the ‘visibility’ of the proposed buildings is correspondingly lower. Some 2½ storey buildings would have rear facing skylights, which in all cases would have an internal cill height above 1.7 metres. The “back to back” distances of all buildings are in excess, or well in excess of the 22 metre standard contained in Appendix 6 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review. At the time of writing the report, amended drawings are expected which should further improve the relationships between the proposed development and 5 – 8 Harley Court.

Decontamination.

At the time of writing this report further on-site investigations are continuing, but an expert “Method Statement” has been agreed regarding the means to be applied in safely remediating the various sources of contamination on-site. Some aspects have to do with construction details, including impermeable foundation design. As a precautionary measure it is also recommended that permitted development rights relating to extensions or outbuildings should also be removed by condition. Such control will enable the Council to require that similar measures are incorporated in any such future building works.

RECOMMEND:

Subject to:

- The receipt of satisfactory amended plans relating to proposed layout behind Harley Court; and,
- The applicant/owner entering into a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 by the 13 of September 2005 on terms drafted by the Solicitor to the Council to secure:
  (i) A financial contribution towards the improvement/enhancement of public open space and/or recreational facilities; and,
  (ii) A financial contribution towards the improvement of local pedestrian facilities

PERMISSION: Materials samples, levels, boundary treatments, restriction of outbuildings, porches, extensions (plots to be designated), making up of highway, car parking, cycle/bin storage to be constructed prior to occupation, provide parking and turning areas, visibility splays and junction, hard and soft landscaping, landscaping implementation and maintenance, tree protection,
measures to prevent mud on road, provision for construction traffic within site, hours of operation, no burning, Environment Agency conditions, provision of affordable housing, remediation of contamination within site.

OR: In the event that the planning obligation is not completed by 13 September 2005.

REFUSE: Contrary to policy, inadequate provision of open space.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0838/FP, P/05/0274/FP.

Site Description

The application site is situated on the eastern side of Osborne Road within the rear garden of No.9 Osborne Road. The rear gardens of No’s 10 & 14 Church Road forms the eastern boundary, the rear garden of No.7 Osborne Road forms the northern boundary whilst No.11 Osborne Road forms the southern boundary.

Description of Proposal

- This application seeks outline consent for the erection of one detached bungalow with attached garage.
- Approval for means of access and siting is sought at this stage with all other matters reserved.
- Access would be provided between No’s 7 & 9 Osborne Road. This would be achieved by demolishing approximately 3 metres from the northern side of No.9 Osborne Road.
- Illustrative plans have been requested showing the reconfiguration of the existing dwelling

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies – DG1; DG3; DG5; H2; R5 and T5
Representations

One letter has been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Loss of privacy
- Noise and disturbance
- Loss of value of neighbouring properties
- There is insufficient distance from the proposed dwelling to neighbouring properties

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – no objections provided the parking for the existing plot would be able to turn using the new turning facility.

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – no objections subject to conditions.

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – no objections subject to conditions.

Comments

The main issues which need to be considered in the determination of this application are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the character of the area
- Impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Principle of Development

The land is within the urban area where residential infilling; redevelopment and development on neglected and underused land will be permitted, providing it does not adversely affect the character of the surrounding area or amenity of existing residents.

Impact on the character of the area

The site is within a predominant well established residential area. There are a variety of dwelling types, ages and sizes in the vicinity of the site.

Within the surrounding area, the development permitted at the rear of the existing properties has been predominantly bungalows. Officers consider that the bungalow should be conditioned to have a single storey eaves height so that the proposal would not detract from the character and appearance of the immediate area.
The existing dwelling and the proposed would have a plot size comparable to others within the surrounding area; officers consider that the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

The existing bungalow would be reduced by 3 metres to allow for the access to be provided; illustrative plans have been requested showing the elevations of the remaining bungalow and the floor layout. Officers consider that the width of the retained dwelling would not look out of character with the surrounding area.

**Impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties**

With regard to the concerns raised by neighbouring properties that the proposal would result in loss of privacy, the proposed dwelling would have a single storey eaves height and officers consider that the privacy of adjoining occupiers can be secured by removing permitted development rights in relation to extensions/windows within the roofplane.

It is considered that with satisfactory screening and the removal of permitted development rights the proposal would not result in a loss of privacy to the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

With regard to the impact on neighbouring properties from the proposed access, the access would be utilised by No.9 Osborne Road and the proposal dwelling. There are no windows within the side elevations of No's 7 & 9 Osborne Road and there would be a separation of 5.3 metres between the properties.

There are a number of properties which have been constructed within the rear gardens of properties within the surrounding area, officers consider that provided screening is erected along both sides of the driveway the use of the accessway would not result in a detrimental impact on the adjoining properties from noise and disturbance.

Officers consider that the proposal is acceptable and complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

**RECOMMEND:**

Subject to the owner/applicant 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 to secure contributions towards the provision and/or improvement of off site public open space and/or facilities by 15 August 2005.

**PERMISSION:** Submission of reserved matters (design, external appearance and landscaping); materials to be submitted; boundary treatment; levels; parking; landscaping implementation; no openings/dormer windows/rooflights within any roofplane; single storey eaves height; arboricultural method statement; tree protection; desk top study; hours of construction; no mud on road; no burning;
**OR:** In the event that the applicant/owner fails to complete a Section 106 agreement by 15 August 2005.

**REFUSE:** Contrary to Policy; inadequate provision of open space.

**Further Information**

The desk study should be in accordance with British Standards Institute BS 10175: 2001 Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites – Code of Practice and should be carried out by or under the supervision of a suitably qualified competent person. This person should be a chartered member of an appropriate professional body and have experience in investigating contaminated sites.

Please note that commercial property searches available over the internet are not considered to be sufficiently detailed enough to constitute a desk study in the context of the above condition. These desk studies do not formulate a conceptual model for the site neither do they qualitatively risk assess the site. They should not be used. Please do contact Wendy Harrison, Contamination Officer to discuss this in more details.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** File P/05/0839/OA

(11) **P/05/0879/FP**

WARSAH

as amended by plans received on 18 July 2005

ANTLER HOMES WESSEX

SUBSTITUTION OF HOUSE TYPES

PITCHPOND ROAD

ON PLOTS 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9

- WYNSDALE -

AND 10

WARSAH

**OFFICERS REPORT** - Kim Hayler Ext 2367

**Site Description**
- The site lies on the southern side of Pitchpond Road, 30 metres east of its junction with Newtown Road;
- The site comprises a small single storey detached dwelling;
- The site is steeply sloping in a mainly north west to south east direction, with a change in levels of approximately 7.5 metres from the site frontage along Pitchpond Road to the rear site boundary with the existing dwellings in Lower Spinney;
- Mature hedgerows bound the site on a number of sides and there are also a significant number of mature trees present. A number of trees present upon the application site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (FTPO 521);
- Vehicle access to the site is gained from Pitchpond Road;
- An existing foul sewer runs through the centre of the site.

**Description of Proposal**

The application seeks permission to change the approved house types on eight of the ten plots. The dwellings remain two storey; the size and shape of the plots remain the same and the house footprints are similar. A subsequent application has been received (P/05/0964/FP refers) for the substitution of house types on plots 2 and 3 only.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies DG1, DG3, DG4, DG5, DG6, H2, R5 and T5

**Relevant Planning History**

P/04/1590/FP  Demolish existing bungalow and erect ten dwellings with associated parking, turning areas, open space and new road  -  Permission 17.01.05

**Representations**

The application has been publicised by notifying neighbours and site notices. Six letters have been received raising the following concerns:

- The main sewerage system would be affected by the proposal as there are already problems in the area;
- The risk of flooding in Lower Spinney;
- The risks associated with building on, or adjacent to unstable land, and the impact this could have on Lower Spinney.
- Lower Spinney is built on a flood plain and the government has expressed great concern over the building of properties on or near flood plain areas.
- Specific trees/hedges/shrubs should not be removed.
• Plots 4, 5 and 6 too close to property and will be overbearing and block sunlight
• The application should be rejected by Fareham Borough Council until such time as: appropriate solutions to the surface and foul sewage drainage problems have been overcome; the relevant competent bodies (Environment Agency, Southern Water etc) have no objections; and Fareham Borough Council have confirmed that they will be implemented before development commences.
• Area between plots 3 and 4, 5 and 6 should not be left as open space as this will be turned into a children’s play area.
• The area beyond the open space should not be allowed to be a car park.
• Lower Spinney is not overlooked by other properties
• Terraced properties are out of character
• Site is an oasis for flora/forna
• Dangerous access
• Too many dwellings
• No enough infrastructure in the area for any new residents
• Antler Homes approached residents requesting Grant of Deeds of Easement to existing drainage, no agreements were made and there is no information on the revised plan to show them.

Consultations

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – no objection

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – No objection

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – There are no arboricultural grounds for refusal and therefore no objection is raised.

Environment Agency – No objection

Southern Water Services – No objection subject to the public sewer crossing the site being diverted.

Residents of Lower Spinney have suggested that the new development would have an adverse effect on their sewer, which has suffered from flooding in the past. Lower Spinney is however on a separate sewer so the new development would not result in an increased risk of flooding.

Comments

The principle of developing this site has already been accepted. The Committee has approved a detailed layout and designs for the erection of 10 houses. The sole purpose of this application is to secure the Council’s approval for revised house types in lieu of the approved house types on eight plots. In this regard, although the respective house types are similar in design and size, when considered in their totality. Officers concluded that the changes could not be treated as a minor amendment to the approved plans. Officers consider that the revised designs are acceptable
Officers are satisfied that had the revised designs been submitted as part of the previously approved Reserved Matters application, they would have been recommended for approval.

Local residents raised concerns at the previous planning meeting and have since contacted the Planning Department regarding an ongoing drainage problem in Lower Spinney. A condition was imposed on the previous application requiring drainage details before development commences. These details have not been received to date, however officers have agreed with local residents that when details are received Southern Water Services, The Environment Agency and the Council’s Drainage Engineer would be consulted.

Having regard for distances from party boundaries and vegetation in place, officers consider the revised house types are acceptable.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: Materials, hard surfacing, landscaping implementation, levels, no mud on road, construction hours, construction traffic, no burning on site, boundary treatment, remove pd rights specified elevations, remove pd rights extensions and outbuildings specified plots, parking and turning, arboricultural assessment, drainage details.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0879/FP

P/05/0916/FP WARSASH
MR & MRS MOREY Agent: MR J K WARBURTON
ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY 111A BROOK LANE
FRONT EXTENSION AND WARSASH
PORCH CANOPY

OFFICERS REPORT - Susannah Chaplin Ext 2412

Site Description

This application relates to a detached chalet bungalow to the north of Brook Lane close to the junction with the southern part of Brook Avenue. The dwelling does not front directly onto Brook Lane but is accessed via a cul de sac which also serves the three neighbouring properties.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought to erect:
• a single storey front extension measuring 3.9 metres in depth. The width and height would be the same as the existing dwelling at 7.8 metres and 5.9 metres respectively.
• a porch canopy to the front of the extension with a height of 3.5 metres, depth of 1.1 metres and width of 2.7 metres.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies – DG3 and DG5

**Representations**

The neighbour notification period expires on 28 July 2005. At the time of writing one letter had been received objecting on the following grounds:

• Front extension over the building line would significantly alter the aesthetic appearance of the four properties
• Loss of light
• Loss of outlook
• Loss of property value

**Comments**

The four properties on this cul-de-sac off Brook Lane are all of a similar style and are currently built on the same line. The proposed extension would bring the application property forward of this line by 3.9 metres. The property is well screened from the main road by a line of trees and does not feature within the streetscene of Brook Lane. Although the proposed extension would be forward of the current building line officers do not consider that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the aesthetic appearance of the property or the neighbouring properties.

The objectors property to the east does not have any windows within the side elevation at ground floor level. There is a side dormer at first floor level within the facing elevation which already looks out on to the roof of the application property. Subsequently officers do not consider there would be a detrimental loss of light to or outlook from this bedroom. The distance of separation between the two properties is 4.2 metres. A line drawn at an angle of 45 degrees from the window serving the front room of the objectors property would not be breached by the proposed extension. The distance to the neighbouring property to the west is greater at 7.4 metres.

Officers consider that the proposal complies with the adopted Fareham Borough Local Plan Review and the approved Extension Design Guide and consider the proposal acceptable.

Loss of property value is not a material planning consideration.

**RECOMMEND:**

**PERMISSION:** Materials to match, Withdraw PD: Windows (east & west) ground floor.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** File P/05/0916/FP
MISCELLANEOUS ITEM

(1) REMOVAL OF PUBLIC PAYPHONES – NEWGATE LANE, FAREHAM & HISPANO AVENUE, WHITELEY

Officers Report: Susannah Chaplin Ext 2412

The number of calls made from BT payphones has more than halved in the last four years due to the increased usage of mobile phones. BT are seeking the Council’s view on removing two public payphones within the Borough. It is a requirement that the Council reply in writing to BT giving their comments and any objections received from the local community. A notice has been placed in the phone box to allow users of the payphone to comment.

The first phonebox is located on Hispano Avenue in Whiteley. BT have confirmed that the use of this phonebox is currently less than 18% of what would normally be expected. Officers consider that the removal of this phonebox would be acceptable subject to a replacement being provided at the Whiteley Local Centre.

The second phone box is located on Newgate Lane close to the roundabout at the junction of Gosport Road, Rowner Road and Newgate Lane. BT have confirmed that the use of this payphone is less than 7% of what would be expected. Due to the isolated location of this phone box and the low usage officers do not consider it would be appropriate to raise objection to the loss of this phonebox.

RECOMMEND: BT be advised that this Council raises objection to the removal of the payphone on Hispano Avenue unless a replacement is made available at the Whiteley Local Centre. No Objection raised to the removal of the payphone on Newgate Lane.
ZONE 2 – FAREHAM

North
North West
West
East
South
Site Description

The application site comprises an area forming part of the rear garden of No.49 Old Turnpike. Furneaux Gardens forms the north-west boundary, No.43 Old Turnpike forms the south-east boundary whilst an area used as a front garden by No.12 Furneaux Gardens forms the north-east boundary. There is a drop in levels between the application site and the properties within Old Turnpike.

Description of Proposal

- As originally submitted the application seeks full permission for the erection of a detached two bedroom dwelling and garage;
- The dwelling would measure 8.8 metres in width, 7.5 metres in depth with a maximum roof height of 6.8 metres;
- As initially submitted the application proposed a garage within the retained rear garden of No.49 Old Turnpike. The application has been amended by deleting the garage. Parking would now be provided in the form of a hardstanding to the side of the dwelling with two spaces for the proposed dwelling and two spaces for the existing.

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies – DG1; DG3; DG5; H2; T5 and R5

Relevant Planning History


Representations

Five letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Not in keeping in style with the rest of the properties in the road
Intrusive affecting both light and space
Parking is already difficult in Furneaux Gardens and Old Turnpike
Site is too small and would be within 20ft of rear of house
Will reduce appeal of property
Reduce privacy
The proposed garage is too close to kitchen window; concerns regarding noise
Concerns regarding provisions for run-off water.
Concerns relating to possible felling of trees
The proposed access is on a dangerous bend and would be hazardous for pedestrians and cars turning.
The removal of a small patch of grass and the row of trees would create an uninspiring mass of concrete and cement.

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – No objection

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – No objection

Comments

The previous application was refused as it was considered by officers that the proposal would have resulted in an overbearing and unneighbourly form of development due to the change in levels. In addition, by virtue of the size of the dwelling and the limited size of the plot and relationship with the site boundaries it would have resulted in a cramped form of development which would be out of character with the surrounding area. Lastly the proposal would have resulted in the parking of vehicles on the highway verge creating hazards to road users and pedestrians at this point.

The main issues which need to be considered in the determination of this application are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the character of the area
- Impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties
- Highway safety and vehicle parking

Principle of development

The land is within the urban area where residential infilling; redevelopment and development on neglected and underused land will be permitted, providing it does not adversely affect the character of the surrounding area or amenity of existing residents.

Impact on the character of the area

The previous application comprised of a two storey dwelling, 7 metres wide within a plot of only 9.5 metres in width, with two parking spaces shown at the front of the dwelling on the highway verge. Officers consider that the proposal
would have resulted in a cramped form of development out of character with the surrounding area.

The proposal has been amended by increasing the size of the plot to 12.5 metres in width, the proposed building has been reduced to single storey eaves height and the width of the dwelling is now shown at 8.8 metres. Officers consider that the proposed plot size would now be comparable to others within the area in particular properties along Old Turnpike and would no longer result in a cramped form of development.

There are a variety of dwelling types around the area, the properties in Furneaux Gardens mainly comprise of two storey dwellings; however there is a wide variety of dwelling types within Old Turnpike. Officers consider that the proposal would not look out of character or result in a detrimental impact on the streetscene.

Impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties

The application has been assessed in terms of loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. There are no windows shown within the side elevations of the proposed dwelling and only one velux window within the rear roofplane, this window can be conditioned to be obscure glazed. Officers consider that subject to conditions restricting windows being inserted within the roofplane the proposal would not result in loss of privacy to any neighbouring properties.

To overcome the concerns raised by officers that the previous application resulted in an overbearing and unneighbourly form of development, the ridge height of the proposed dwelling has now been reduced by 0.50 metre and the eaves height has been reduced by 3 metres, the dwelling now comprises of a single storey dwelling with accommodation within the roof; in addition the proposal has also been re-sited 1 metre closer to the highway boundary. Officers consider that the proposal would no longer be detrimental to the amenities currently enjoyed by neighbouring properties.

The rear garden area as previously submitted was only 3.5 metres in depth and located close to tall conifer trees along the north eastern boundary; which would have restricted light to the garden area. The garden area has been increased to 4 metres in depth and is located further away from the conifer trees. Officers acknowledge that the garden area is limited in size but it is comparable to other properties within Old Turnpike.

Highway safety and vehicle parking

Two parking spaces are shown adjacent to the proposed dwelling alongside the conifer trees and a garage with an additional space is shown within the rear garden of the existing dwelling. Amended plans have been received deleting the garage and replacing this with a parking space. The Council’s Highway Engineers have been consulted and consider that the proposal would not result in a danger or inconvenience to users of the adjoining highway.

Officers consider that the proposal is acceptable and complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.
RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: Materials to be submitted; boundary treatment; velux window to be obscure glazed; no openings within specified elevations of the roofplane; levels; parking; landscaping; landscaping implementation; hours of construction; no burning; no mud on road; surface water drainage to be agreed.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0857/FP; P/04/1690/FP

(14) P/05/0876/FP
MR P J MIFSUD
FAREHAM EAST
Agent: BOTH CREATIVE PARTNERSHIP

ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TO FORM TWO FLATS.

FAREHAM

1 FERN COTTAGES
WICKHAM ROAD

OFFICERS REPORT - Joanne Wilson Ext 2679

Site Description

- The application site comprises of an end of terrace dwelling with a large triangular garden situated on the eastern side of a footpath running between Wickham Road and Archery Lane. The former Adult Education Centre is opposite the application site; the eastern boundary comprises a footpath and properties within Wickham Road; whilst the southern boundary is No. 2 Fern Cottages. The garden area associated with the site is presently overgrown.

Description of Proposal

- Permission is sought for the erection of a two storey side extension and the conversion of the building to form two flats.
- The flats would comprise one, one bedroom dwelling and one, two bedroom dwelling.
- The two storey side extension would measure 6.2 metres in width, 5.2 metres in depth 6.7 metres in height;
- There is not vehicular access to the site and hence no parking spaces are provided. The site is accessible solely by a public footpath.

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies – DG1; DG3; DG5; H2; H5; T5 and R5

Representations

dc-050810-r01-awe.doc
Four letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Lack of parking and impact from this on neighbouring residents
- Change in the character of the cottages and the area
- Loss of privacy
- Increase in noise from two flats, this could be overcome by sound proofing between the properties

**Consultations**

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – Due to the highly accessible location and as there was no previous parking provision – no objections.

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – no objections, the applicant should be advised that the flats should be converted in line with the current Building Regulations.

**Comments**

The main issues which need to be considered in the determination of this application are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the character of the area
- Impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties
- Highway safety and parking

**Principle of development**

The land is within the urban area where residential infilling; redevelopment and development on neglected and underused land will be permitted, providing it does not adversely affect the character of the surrounding area or amenity of existing residents.

**Impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties**

The proposed scheme has been assessed both in terms of the impact that the scheme will have on adjoining properties as well as living conditions (in terms of outlook and privacy) for future residents.

The main impact of the proposal would be on the occupants of the properties within Wickham Road to the rear of the site. There is one additional window shown at first floor level within the rear elevation of the proposed two storey side extension serving a kitchen. It is considered by officers that to overcome concerns raised that this windows would cause loss of privacy to neighbouring properties, it should be conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed shut up to 1.7 metres above finished floor level.
It is considered by officers that provided the proposed extension is conditioned so that no additional windows can be inserted within the rear or side elevations at first floor level that the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by neighbouring properties.

**Impact on the character of the area**

The area comprises a variety of dwelling types and uses. There are two storey dwellings within Wickham Road, a former Adult Education Centre opposite the site and a community facility (Ashcroft Centre) to the south along Osborn Road. Officers consider that the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on the existing properties or character of the area.

**Highway safety and parking**

The Council's Highway Engineers have been consulted and consider that as there was no parking provision previously for the existing dwelling and that the site is within a highly accessible location, they have no objections to the proposal.

Officers consider that the proposal is acceptable and complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

**RECOMMEND:**

**PERMISSION:** Materials to match; no openings within the northern and eastern elevation at first floor level; window at first floor within the eastern elevation to be obscure glazed and fixed shut; boundary treatment; construction hours; no burning.

**Further information:**

You are advised that as the property is being converted in to separate flats, the sound insulation between the properties and the floors above should be converted in line with the current Building Regulations (approved Document E).

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** File P/05/0876/FP

(15) P/05/0881/VC FAREHAM EAST
MR S.J WENDLAND Agent: MR SJ WENDLAND

VARIATION OF CONDITION 6 OF
P/04/1096/VC (TO PERMIT CARAVAN
TO BE SITED WITHIN HAY STORE
FOR ANCILLARY USE)

FAREHAM EAST - THE OLD
POOK LANE - STABLES
FAREHAM

**OFFICERS REPORT** - Tony Boswell Ext 2526

*Site Description*

dc-050810-r01-awe.doc
The site consists of a large paddock and stables just to the north of the M27 and to the east of the A32 Wickham Road.

**Description of Proposal**

The objective of the application is to allow a caravan and its facilities to be located within an existing hay store near the western boundary. The primary intention is to create day to day sitting, tea-making and toilet facilities. However, the applicant also intends that in the event of equestrian emergencies, a carer might be able to ‘overnight’ at the site.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review policies C1, C2, C3

**Relevant Planning History**

P/04/1096/VC – variation of condition to allow use of land to care for ponies – Permitted 11th January 2005

P/04/1406/FP – Erection of hay store etc – permitted 5th November 2004

**Representations**

Two letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Concerned at traffic and disturbance arising from activities on site
- Previous proposals by a previous owner for a caravan have been rejected, might this lead to precedent for a future dwelling?
- Parts of the site are landfill. Is it safe to disturb?

**Consultations**

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – no objection

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – Points out that if the caravan is to be slept in then a Caravan Site Licence will be required and is unlikely to be granted due to fire safety concerns.

**Comments**

Condition 6 of the planning permission P/04/1096/VC required that “no other structures/caravans or containers shall be parked or stored at the site …” The stated reason was to allow any such proposal to be judged against Policy C1 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

Policy C1 would not permit any new development unless “essential” for the purposes of agriculture – a definition in which equestrian uses are not accepted.
The use of the land for equestrian purposes has already been accepted, as have the existing stable buildings and hay store. The ancillary uses to which the proposed caravan would be put are clearly capable of being met by other means and, 'in extremis', one or more persons might perhaps resort to camp beds if it were essential to care for a distressed horse. The advantage of installing a small caravan within one end of the previously permitted hay store is therefore a matter of convenience.

The views of the Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer will be noted and in practice the proposal may not be able to proceed if used as sleeping accommodation. Overnight use in the event of equestrian emergencies is of course only part of the intended use. However, in terms of planning control, if located within the hay store then there would clearly be no visual implications. In the view of officers the balance of advantage is in allowing a caravan, physically constrained by the size of the hay store, and conditioned to ensure that it cannot form any precedent or lawful residential use. Were existing buildings to be used in a similar manner but out of sight, and without a specifically conditioned planning permission, then such problems might subsequently arise. The size of caravan can be controlled by condition – essentially to ensure that no new hay store becomes necessary in future. A small caravan with basic facilities would occupy no more than 50% of the floor area within the hay store as previously permitted.

The original planning permission P/04/1096/VC carries forward a number of safeguarding conditions relating to landscaping, absence of lighting, and prevention of other uses and prevention of vehicle storage. An informative should be added to any permission requiring the applicants to liaise with the CH&RSO regarding a Caravan Site Licence before any use is commenced.

RECOMMEND:

**PERMISSION:** Caravan shall be ancillary to equestrian use only, any overnight accommodation shall be for one person and then only in equestrian emergencies. Caravan shall occupy not more than 50% of the permitted hay store.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** File P/05/0881/VC, P/04/1096/VC, P/04/1406/FP

(16) P/05/0926/FP  
HITCHCOCK MANAGEMENT SERVICES  
FAREHAM NORTH  
Agent: DANIELLS HARRISON SURVEYORS  
ERECTION OF BUILDING FOR  
B1 BUSINESS USE  
FUNTLEY HILL - FUNTLEY COURT  
FAREHAM  
- LAND TO REAR OF -

**OFFICERS REPORT** - Tony Boswell Ext 2526

*Site Description*
Funtley Court is a former School converted to offices, on Funtley Hill just to the south of the M27. The application comprises a building to be erected to its rear, with 1 to 10 Red Barn Lane to the south.

**Description of Proposal**

The proposed building would be of two storeys under a steep pitched roof, cut slightly into the rising ground to the south. Overall dimensions would be 14.5 metres x 15.5 metres, with an overall floor area of 461 sq metres.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies DG1, DG3, DG4, DG5, DG6, E1 and T5

**Relevant Planning History**


P/99/0129/CU – Use of land for car parking – permission April 1999

P/03/0320/OA – Erection of B1 building – permission 15 April 2003

**Representations**

No letters have been received at the time of writing this report. Any received by the 2 of August will be reported as an update to this report.

**Consultations**

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – comments awaited

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – comments awaited

Chief Health and regulatory Services Officer – comments awaited

Southern Water – no objection

**Comments**

The principle of a very similar building at this location was established by the 1997 appeal decision. The subsequent 2003 outline permission was for a building of 400 square metres floor area and, condition 11 of that permission required that the building should not exceed that size. The particular concern of the condition was to safeguard nearby trees within the site.

The building now proposed is very similar to the indicative siting and finished floor level shown on the earlier outline planning permission. Elevations are in brick with dormer windows to the first floor, with eaves height reduced to 5 metres and an overall height of 12.5 metres to the ridge. The building would be around 3 metres below the southern boundary to properties in Red Barn.
Lane which are 50 metres to the south, with a substantial amount of tree cover between. The only significant difference is the increase in size from 400 sq metres to 461 sq metres.

**RECOMMEND:**

Subject to the receipt of comments from the following and any additional conditions they may recommend: The Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways and Arborist) and The Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer.

**PERMISSION:** External materials, tree protection, landscaping, hours of construction, no mud on road, no burning, site and slab levels in accordance with submitted plans unless otherwise agreed.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** File P/05/0926/FP, P/96/1161/OA, P/99/0129/CU, P/03/0320/OA

---

P/05/0883/FP
WEBLINE LTD
FAREHAM SOUTH
Agent: H J CONCEPTS LTD

ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS, NEW GENERATOR COMPOUND & INSTALLATION OF 3 AIR CONDITIONING UNITS

99 GOSPORT ROAD - ENFIELD HOUSE -FAREHAM

**OFFICERS REPORT** - Tony Boswell Ext 2526

**Site Description**

The site is a prominent Grade II Listed Building on the corner of Mill Road and Gosport Road. Houses in Eden Rise lie beyond its western and northern boundaries.

**Description of Proposal**

The proposal involves a substantial refurbishment of the building – see Listed Building report which follows. The building would then be extended on its northern and western side, with an existing central courtyard converted to a glazed atrium. There are then a series of internal alterations to circulation.

An electrical generator would also be installed within its acoustic enclosure, and then enclosed within a small brick built building on the eastern side, close to the rear garden boundary with 14 Eden Rise and the Gosport Road frontage.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review policies DG1, DG3, DG5, HE2, E6 and T5.
Relevant Planning History

P/01/0192/FP – conversion to seven dwellings – not determined and subsequent appeal withdrawn.

Representations

Two letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Concerned at potential disturbance from construction or continued use as offices.
- Potential noise from air conditioning units.
- Potential noise from generator – suggests that it be re-sited further away.

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – comments waited

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Conservation) – no objection subject to conditions controlling details of implementation

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – no objection but suggesting conditions to safeguard adjacent tree.

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – comments awaited.

Comments

The extensions and alterations to the Listed Building are supportable and should involve little effect upon the amenities of adjoining properties. Conditions are required to control the use of materials and detailed implementation. Although the northern extension would intrude onto the existing car park, parking provision will remain at the levels required by Hampshire County Standards. Some 17 car spaces are currently available and 16 would remain available to serve the enlarged building.

There are three particular issues raised by residents’ concerns:

- The location and use of the proposed generator. This is intended for emergency use only – in the event of mains failure. An existing unit at the applicant’s current premises has run for only 2 hours in the last 18 months. Were the unit not within the proposed brick enclosure then its external noise level would be 67dBA. Within the proposed building that level will clearly be lower on those occasions when it is used and, adjacent to the A32 Gosport Road, should be barely perceptible. Officers have considered re-siting that building but this would adversely effect the landscaped grounds or setting of the Listed Building.
- The proposed extension has been configured to avoid harm to an adjacent tree which, though it forms part of a larger group, is of significant amenity
value - (although not subject of a TPO). Conditions are required regarding construction and foundation design to safeguard that point.

- The proposed air conditioning units are to be positioned at the rear of the building in an alcove away from boundaries and enclosed on three sides. In that location it is extremely unlikely that they would have any neighbourly effect.

Notwithstanding the objections and concerns received officers consider the proposal acceptable.

RECOMMEND:

Subject to the views of the Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer;

**PERMISSION**: External materials (sample panel), tree protection, details of foundation design, complete generator housing prior to occupation and shall only be used in emergencies, hours of construction, no mud on roads, no burning.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**: File P/05/0883/FP, P/05/0884/LB

---

**P/05/0884/LB**

FAREHAM SOUTH

WEBLINE

Agent: H J CONCEPTS LTD

ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS, NEW GENERATOR COMPOUND & INSTALLATION OF 3 AIR CONDITIONING UNITS

99 GOSPORT ROAD - ENFIELD HOUSE - FAREHAM

OFFICERS REPORT - Tony Boswell Ext 2526

Please see the preceding report on the related planning application P/05/0883/FP.

The Listed Building application includes aspects of internal alteration, including rearrangement of an internal staircase and the refurbishment of internal window shutters. As works proceed it may be that other detailed matters emerge which will require control. A further condition is therefore required, over and above those on the planning application, to control matters of detailed design and implementation relating specifically to the Listed Building.

RECOMMEND:

**GRANT LISTED BUILDING CONSENT**: External materials (sample panel), details of internal alterations.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**: File P/05/0884/LB
OFFICERS REPORT - Joanne Wilson Ext 2679

Site Description

The application site lies on the south side of Fairfield Avenue close to the junction with St Michaels Grove. To the north-west of the site is a parade of shops with flats above, the north-east boundary adjoins Fairfield Avenue; whilst the south-west boundary abuts a rear access which serves a number of properties.

Description of Proposal

- Permission is sought for a two storey side/rear extension to form a separate one bedroom dwelling;
- The two storey side/rear extension would measure 3.6 metres at its widest point; 8.4 metres in depth with a maximum roof height of 6.7 metres. Beyond the two storey extension would be single storey extension measuring 3.2 metres in depth;
- The proposed conservatory to the existing dwelling would measure 3 metres in depth and 3.3 metres in width;
- Two parking spaces are shown within the rear garden of the dwelling. Access would be provided from an existing rear access.

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies – DG1; DG3; DG5; H2; R5 and T5

Relevant Planning History


Representations

One letter has been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Proposed development is detrimental to standard of living and will have an adverse effect on the general area.
Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – no objection provided an amended plan is received showing one space within the rear garden of the proposed dwelling and two within the existing dwelling.

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – No objection subject to conditions

Comments

The previous application was refused as it was considered by officers that the proposal would have resulted in a plot noticeably smaller than those prevailing in the area which would be out of character with the pattern of development. In addition by virtue of its size and excessive depth the proposed dwelling would have resulted in an overbearing form of development, reducing the outlook from and light available to the existing dwelling. Lastly there was no commuted payment towards public open space provision.

The main issues which need to be considered in the determination of this application are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the character of the area
- Impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties

Principle of development

The land is within the urban area where residential infilling; redevelopment and development on neglected and underused land will be permitted, providing it does not adversely affect the character of the surrounding area or amenity of existing residents.

Impact on the character of the area

The previous application was of an contrived design in the opinion of officers with a separate front entrance to the proposed dwelling and a plot considerably smaller than those within the area. Officers considered that the proposal would have been out of character with prevailing pattern of development to the detriment of the area.

The proposal has been amended by re-designing the two storey extension so that whilst it is a separate dwelling, it has the appearance of well designed extension to the existing dwelling. The existing plot has also been separated equally so that the proposed dwelling would have a plot size comparable to other neighbouring properties within the area. In addition the parking spaces are shown within the rear gardens so that the front garden would no longer be used as a hardstanding and can be landscaped.

Officers consider that the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on the streetscene or the character of the area.
Impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties

The proposed scheme has been assessed both in terms of the impact that the scheme will have on adjoining properties as well as living conditions (in terms of outlook and privacy) for future residents.

The impact on the occupants of the existing dwelling needs to be carefully considered as this is the closest property. The previous application was refused as a result of the depth of the proposed extensions which would have restricted light and outlook to this property.

The depth of the extensions which will create the separate dwelling have not been reduced, however it is now proposed to erect a conservatory at the rear of the existing dwelling. Provided the conservatory is conditioned to be constructed at the same time, officers consider that the proposal would not result in an overbearing impact on this property.

With regard to the impact on No.37 & 41 Fairfield Avenue, No.41 comprises of a one-stop shop with a flat above. There are no windows within the side elevation facing towards the proposal. With regard to No.37, the main impact on this property would be from the proposed conservatory. The conservatory extends 3 metres in depth and is set 0.40 metres off the boundary. Officers believe the conservatory complies with the guidelines set out within the Fareham Borough Extension Design Guide.

Officers consider that the proposal would not have a material impact on the residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

Officers consider that the proposal is acceptable and complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

RECOMMEND:

Subject to the receipt of satisfactory amended plans showing a revised parking layout in accordance with the comments of the Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways).

PERMISSION: Materials to match; boundary treatment; no other openings within the south east elevation of the two storey extension; conservatory to be constructed currently at the ear of No.39 before new dwelling occupied.; parking; landscaping; landscaping implementation; desk top study; hours of construction; no mud on road; no burning.

OR:

In the event that satisfactory amended plans are not received by 18th August 2005.

REFUSE: Contrary to policy; detrimental to highway safety

Further Information
dc-050810-r01-awe.doc
The desk study should be in accordance with British Standards Institute BS 10175: 2001 Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites – Code of Practice and should be carried out by or under the supervision of a suitably qualified competent person. This person should be a chartered member of an appropriate professional body and have experience in investigating contaminated sites.

Please note that commercial property searches available over the internet are not considered to be sufficiently detailed enough to constitute a desk study in the context of the above condition. These desk studies do not formulate a conceptual model for the site neither do they qualitatively risk assess the site. They should not be used. Please do contact Wendy Harrison, Contamination Officer to discuss this in more details.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0885/FP; P/05/0567/FP

(20) P/05/0898/FP  FAREHAM SOUTH
MR A RICHARDS

RETAIN PITCHED ROOF AND 1 FAYRE ROAD
CHANGED MATERIALS RELIEF FROM FAREHAM
CONDITION 2 OF P/03/1360/FP
FOR MATCHING MATERIALS

OFFICERS REPORT - Clare Roberts Ext 2428

Site Description

This application relates to an end of terrace dwelling on the north-western side of Fayre Road, north of the junction with Redlands Lane.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is required to change the existing flat roof to pitch roof, this would increase the roof from 2.5 metres to 3.8 metres at the highest point and for relief of a condition for matching materials

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review – DG3 and DG5

Relevant Planning History

P/03/0839/FP – Erection of two storey side/rear extension – Refuse – 3-07-2003

P/03/1360/FP - Erection of two storey side/rear extension – Permission - 9-10-2003

Representations
dc-050810-r01-awe.doc
One letter has been received objecting on the following grounds:

- The alley and garden are like a landfill site
- The materials do not match
- This is an ongoing project that has taken more than two years and shows no sign of completion
- The heath and safety procedures are not occurring on site

**Comments**

Permission is sought to retain a pitched roof and relief from a condition to allow change of materials, this is a retrospective application. The increase in the height of the roof would not impact on the neighbour as the roof hips away from the boundary. Officers are of the opinion that although the materials are not an exact match they do not have a detrimental impact on the streetscene.

The objector raises a number of issues relating to the mess of site, the length in the completion of site and the health and safety issues on site, although officers appreciate that these are issues of concern they are not material planning issues and therefore can not be taken into consideration when determining this application.

**RECOMMEND:**

**PERMISSION:** No five year

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** File P/05/0898/FP

---

P/05/0941/FP

FAREHAM SOUTH

LINDEN HOMES SOUTHERN LTD

P.L.C.

DEMOLISH EXISTING BUILDINGS & ERECT 49NO FLATS & 3NO HOUSES WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND LANDSCAPING

93 REDLANDS LANE - FORMER ELLIOTTS SITE -FAREHAM

Agent: WHITE YOUNG GREEN

---

**OFFICERS REPORT** – Tony Boswell Ext 2433

**Site Description**

The site is that of the former Elliotts Builders Merchants on Redlands Lane. Cams Alders Playing Field lies immediately to the south, with a public footpath and landscaping immediately adjoining the boundary. To the north are the grounds and various buildings of St John’s Church, including the Vicarage. To the south west of the site is Upper St Michaels Grove serving rear garages of properties in Highfield Avenue, and the flats of St Michael’s House. On the Redlands Lane frontage, number 91 lies immediately to the north of the site, 116 and 116a are immediately opposite with the return frontage of number 1
Chamberlain Grove. The site has a frontage of 76 metres to Redlands Lane and an overall area of 0.52 hectares.

**Description of Proposal**

The bulk of the proposal would be grouped around a new vehicular entrance towards the northern end of the frontage some 43 metres from Chamberlain Grove opposite the southern part of the site. Between that entrance and the existing house at 91 Redlands Lane would be a terrace of three x 2½ storey houses with gardens to their rear, but dormers face only into the site rather than onto Redlands Lane. Although there is no consistent “building line” as such, these houses would be two metres forward and 5 metres from number 91, which assists the visual transition from its very low pitched roof and the taller hipped roofs of the proposed houses in modern tile.

To the south of the entrance, opposite number 1 Chamberlain Grove, would be a 2½ storey building of 1 and 2 bedroomed flats. The upper floor within the roof space faces only into the development and thus the elevation to Redlands Lane is that of a two storey building – with slightly taller roof than normal. Abutting that building and continuing south around to the boundary onto Cams Alders would be a further building of 2 and 3 storeys containing further 1 and 2 bedroomed flats. In the centre of the Cams Alders frontage would be a larger 3 and 3½ storey building also containing 1 and 2 bedroomed flats. Following recent amendments that has been reduced in scale. At the eastern end of the Cams Alders boundary there would be a further 2 and 2½ storey building containing 5 x 1 and 2 bedroomed flats and finally, towards the rear and reached from Upper St Michaels Grove would be a further 2 and 2½ storey building containing 8 x 1 and 2 bedroomed flats.

Alongside the above would be a landscaped car park with 15 car spaces accessed from that same direction. Accessed from the main access to Redlands Lane would be a further total of 45 car spaces – 6 within car ports. Resident’s amenity area, totalling some 550 sq metres is provided in the development, along the boundary to Cams Alders and behind the proposed hedge to the Redlands Lane frontage.

Flats overlooking Cams Alders would generally have balconies. Materials are intended to be brick and tile throughout, with horizontal timber cladding used at upper floor levels. Internal bin and secure cycle stores are all provided within or alongside the ground floor lobbies of the buildings concerned, with carry/push distances not exceeding about 15 metres.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review policies DG3, DG4, DG5, H2, H10, R5, T5, and T6

**Relevant Planning History**

P/05/0633/FP – Erection of 52 dwellings – refused June 2005

**Representations**

dc-050810-r01-awe.doc
Nearby residents were notified and site notices posted on the 13th of July. At the time of drafting this report no letters had been received and any responses will be reported as an update to this report.

In response to the previous application P/05/0633/FP a total of 49 letters were received objecting on the following grounds

- Buildings fronting Redlands Lane are too high and forward of the building line.
- Inadequate parking provision (when the proposal included 55 spaces rather than 60), requesting parking/traffic measures on Redlands Lane and St Michaels Grove. Parking for the Church is also inadequate.
- Probability of parking with Chamberlain Grove or Redlands Lane
- Increased traffic danger – local schools in proximity
- Access should be only from Redlands Lane. Upper St Michaels Grove is used by playing children.
- Density too high
- "Out of keeping" with surroundings
- Pressure on local infrastructure and facilities
- Where will children play?
- Too many flats being provided within the locality
- Will dwarf St Michaels Church as a local landmark
- Flats within Block C will overlook 3a Upper St Michaels Grove (The Vicarage).
- Overlooking and loss of privacy to those nearby
- Noise and air pollution
- Flooding problems in Highfield Avenue may be exacerbated.

**Consultations**

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – comments awaited

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – requesting landscape scheme and tree protection measures

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – notes the probability of site contamination and requesting condition requiring further studies and remediation

Director of Leisure and Environment – comments awaited

Environment Agency – comments awaited

Chief Strategic Housing Officer – support scheme

Southern Water – final comments awaited

Hampshire Constabulary – No objections

**Comments**
This application is an amended submission following refusal of P/05/0633/FP in June – (under delegated powers). The reasons for refusal concerned three points:

- The inadequate provision of amenity space for use by future residents;
- The inadequate provision of off-street parking, leading potentially to on-street parking on the access road or possibly elsewhere in the locality; and,
- The excessive height and bulk of Block C (the 3½ - 4 storey element above).

The key issues in this case are essentially the same, and this revised scheme should be compared to its predecessor as part of its assessment.

**Amenity Space.** The former refused proposal had a small and very fragmented element of useable open space for use by future residents. While the position of buildings has not altered significantly, the space between them in the centre of the scheme has been reconfigured to increase its “useability”. The revised figure of some 550 sq metres includes the frontage to Redlands Lane, the area between buildings and the Cams Alders Playing Field boundary, and an area in the centre of the site. That figure equates with some 11.2 sq metres per flat – (The 3 houses have their own private gardens). The figure is below the normal requirement of “approximately 25 sq metres” per flat generally required by Policy DG5 (E) and Appendix 6 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review. However, in mitigation, the applicants draw attention to the recreational value of the adjacent playing field. Reflecting that point, they have offered to make an enhanced contribution towards the improvement of local open space provision directed specifically at enhancing the current play facilities within Cams Alders - in addition to the normal requirements of Policy R5. The area immediately adjoining the site is leased to Fareham Town Football Club but in the wider context of the Playing Field and the application site as a whole, this suggestion clearly has some merit. The proposed layout indicates a potential pedestrian link and gate (key controlled access) to the footpath adjoining the Cams Alders boundary.

**Parking Provision.** The previous refused scheme included 55 off street parking spaces. As now reconfigured the proposal involves 60 spaces. The location of the site is shown as “low/medium” accessibility in the Council’s “Residential Car Parking Standards”, adopted in January 2003. The standards require a maximum provision of 71 car spaces. (If the site were located elsewhere in an area assessed as “medium/high” accessibility then the maximum requirement would be 54 spaces).

The applicants have advanced an argument on the basis that the assessment of the site as “low/medium accessibility” in the Council’s standards is flawed. Via local pedestrian and cycle links the site is within 800 metres of the Town centre, rail station, and bus links. Four schools, local shops and other facilities are also within closer proximity. Nearby bus links provide access to the Town Centre and other locations including Gosport. They also draw attention to advice in PPG’s 3 and 13 stating that – “Developers should not be required to provide more parking than they or potential occupiers might want, nor to provide off-street parking where there is no need, particularly in urban areas.
where public transport is available or where there is demand for car free housing”. That advice also points out that for journeys up to 800 metres private cars are rarely used.

The reason for refusal of the previous application was concerned with the probability of parked cars obstructing the access road to Redlands Lane or other roads in the locality. (Note the resident’s objections on this same point). The possibility of that situation arising is clearly reduced significantly by the increase from 55 spaces to 60. The parking accessed from the western side of the site has been increased from 13 to 15 spaces and the applicants have offered to fund a Road Traffic Order preventing on-street parking along Upper St Michaels Grove.

**Visual bulk of buildings.** As refused permission, the “Block C” in the centre of the Cams Alders frontage was of 3½ storeys viewed from the playing field, with a higher roof behind which was to have been some 16.5 metres to ridge, mainly as a result of its deep “S” configured plan form. The roof has now been reconfigured and that higher element has been reduced to some 14.5 metres high. The remainder of the elevations have also been re-drawn so that the eaves height to Cams Alders has been reduced from 9.9 metres to 8.9 metres. In the view of officers the scale of that building is now acceptable. Elsewhere within the revised proposals the ridge height to Redlands Lane has also been reduced in part, where facing the bungalow some 22 metres away at 1 Chamberlain Grove opposite.

Elsewhere within the scheme the proximity of Block A to Block B towards the western part of the site is below the normal policy requirement of 22 metres between facing windows. The rooms concerned are two second bedrooms, two secondary windows in main bedrooms, and four bathroom or kitchen windows – (effecting four flats). This can be resolved by a condition requiring obscured glazing as recommended below. The Vicarage at 3a Upper St Michaels Grove would be some 38 metres from the windows of flats in Block C and its garden some 20 metres from those same windows. (See objection above). That is approximately twice the normal requirement and cannot be sustained as a reason for refusal. Other aspects of the development are acceptable.

In conclusion, the proposal underwent a number of amendments prior to refusal in June, some of which were intended to address issues raised by residents’ objections. Following refusal of those proposals, the recent changes are of more merit in officers view and, in relation to scale of buildings and parking matters are felt by officers to be acceptable. In the context of Government Policy within PPG3, stressing the best use of urban land, officers believe that this site, next to a large open space, is a good location for a higher density scheme. The absence of the level of residents’ amenity area to meet the normal requirements of Policy DG5 (E) is in this case considered satisfactory with the applicant’s commitment to enhance play facilities within Cams Alders. Subject to the necessary Section 106 Agreement and appropriate conditions the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

**RECOMMEND:**
Subject to:

1) The views of outstanding consultees; and,
2) The Director of Leisure and Environment being satisfied with the approach to amenity space which relies upon same use of enhanced facilities at Cams Alders and it being considered satisfactory.
3) The applicant first entering into a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on terms drafted by the Solicitor to the Council by the 4th of October 2005 apt to secure:

- a financial contribution towards the provision of open facilities – including enhancement of the play facilities at Cams Alders; and,
- A financial contribution towards the funding of a Road Traffic Order relating to on-street parking controls at the western approach to the site.

PERMISSION: External materials, surfacing materials, levels, scheme for affordable housing to be submitted, obscure glazing (plots 41, to 44), provision and laying out of parking, bin/cycle storage, landscaping details, landscaping implementation and maintenance, provision for construction vehicles and materials, desk top study, contamination implementation of scheme, no mud on roads, hours of construction, no burning.

OR:

In the event that a planning obligation is not entered into by the 4th of October;

REFUSE: Contrary to policy, absence of open space contribution.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0941/FP, P/05/0633/FP.

(22) P/05/0945/TO
MILLER HOMES LTD
FAREHAM WEST
CROWN LIFT TO 4 METRES ABOVE 82-84 THE AVENUE
GROUND LEVEL VARIOUS TREES FAREHAM
COVERED BY FTP0543

OFFICERS REPORT - Emma Betteridge Ext 2677

Site Description

This application relates to six trees along the northern boundary of 82-84 The Avenue. This site is to the south of Heath Lawns and east of Heathfield Avenue.

Description of Proposal

Consent is sought to Crown lift to 4 metres from ground level six trees along the north boundary of 82-84 The Avenue.
Policies
Fareham Borough Local Plan Review – DG4

Relevant Planning History
P/03/1099/OA Erection of Eight Detached Dwellings and Garages and Construction of Access Road (Outline Application) - Withdrawn 04-09-2003

P/04/0013/OA Erection of Eight Detached Dwellings and Garages and Construction of Access Road - Outline Permission 08-04-2004

P/04/1488/FP Erection of Eight Detached Dwellings and Garages and Construction of Access Road - Permission 18-11-2004

Representations
Three letters has been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Loss of privacy
- Tree works were previously agreed in the approved application and did not include any works of this nature
- Work should be limited to thinning and removal of dead wood
- The overall height should be maintained to ensure that the skyline is retained
- If works are approved it would be setting a precedent for removal of crowns of many trees.

Consultations
Director of Planning and Transportation (arborist) – No objection

Comments
This application has been submitted by Miller Homes who have planning permission for the erection of eight dwellings at 1 Heathfield Avenue/78-86 The Avenue. When this application was submitted the trees on the site were viewed by the arborist and a number were considered to have amenity value. A Tree Preservation order was placed on 14 trees within the site on the 29 October 2004.

The applicants have decided to submit this application so that the trees within the site are all maintained at the same time and so works can be carried out before the plots are transferred over to private ownership.

The works proposed are to crown lift six trees by 4 metres along the northern boundary of the site, the councils arborist comments are as follows:-

The proposed works were agreed at a pre application meeting with the applicant and are to be undertaken for sound Arboriculture management
reasons to remove low overhanging and increase the ground clearance beneath the trees.

The proposed tree works would not be detrimental to the health and vigour of the trees affected and would have no detrimental impact on public amenity.

Officers have taken into account the issues raised by the objectors and the arborist and are of the view that the application is acceptable with no detrimental impact on privacy or to the amenities of the surrounding area. The application is in compliance with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

RECOMMEND:

CONSENT: 2 Years, Works in accordance with BS 3998:1989

Further Information

5 Days notice before works

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0945/TO
ZONE 3 – EASTERN WARDS

Hill Head
Portchester West
Portchester East
Stubbington
HILL HEAD
MR & MRS MCCLELLAND
Agent: MRS ANGELA L FORD
90 OLD STREET
HILL HEAD

ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE /REAR CONSERVATORY

OFFICERS REPORT - Clare Roberts Ext 2428

Site Description

This application relates to a detached chalet bungalow on the south-eastern side of Old Street south of junction with Crabthorne Farm Lane.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for erection of single storey side/rear conservatory. The proposal would measure 3.5 metres in width, 4.5 metres in length with an eaves height of 2 metres and a ridge height of 2.9 metres.

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review – DG3 and DG5

Relevant Planning History

P/01/1487/FP - Extensions to bungalow to provide accommodation within the roof space, detached double garage and conservatory – Permission – 23-01-2002

Representations

One letter has been received objecting on the following grounds:

- The objectors have endured noise for the last seven years from building works and in particularly two years ago when no.90 had a loft conversion.
- The objectors are of ill health and do not wish to deal with any problems the extension may cause.
- The proposal would cause overlooking.

Comments

Planning permission is sought for a single storey conservatory which would be located to the rear of the garage. The proposed conservatory would be set 1.7 metres off the boundary and would be screened by both an existing garage and a fence and hedging and would therefore not impact on the neighbour in terms of overlooking.

Whilst officers appreciate the neighbours concerns relating to the noise and disruption and any impacts on their health, these issues do not justify a reason for refusal and therefore officers are of the opinion the proposal is acceptable.
RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: Brickwork to match

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0894/FP

(24) P/05/0911/OA HILL HEAD
MR H JENKINS & MR J KNIGHT Agent: WHITE YOUNG GREEN P.L.C.

ERECTION OF DETACHED DWELLING 10 SEAMEAD
(OUTLINE APPLICATION) STUBBINGTON
- LAND TO REAR OF -

OFFICERS REPORT - Joanne Wilson Ext 2679

Site Description

The application site comprises of a level area of land forming part of the rear garden of 10 Seamead. The north-west boundary consists of No.13 Seamead; the south-east boundary is the rear garden of No.8 Seamead, whilst a private road forms the south-west boundary.

Description of Proposal

- This application seeks outline consent for the erection of a dwelling.
- Approval for means of access and siting is sought at this stage with all other matters reserved.
- Access would be provided off a private road which also serves the Stubbington Study Centre.

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies – DG1; DG3; DG5; H2; R5 and T5

Representations

Six letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Access road is inadequate for delivery or service vehicles attending the new dwelling and would create an obstruction for emergency access to the Study Centre, Seamead should never be considered as an alternative.
The applicant is misleading and there are no dormer bungalows on the southern side of Seamead, this would lead to overlooking of private rear gardens and out of keeping with the area

- Loss of privacy and light
- The applicants are not the freehold owner of the land
- A beech hedge would need to be removed to widen the entrance which is owned by HCC
- Connection to mains/power/gas/sewerage would be difficult
- The height of surrounding bungalows were kept low because of the flight path into Daedalus Airfield
- Reduction in value of neighbouring properties

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highway) – no objection, a note for information should be added that the access road is privately owned by Hampshire County Council.

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – no objections subject to conditions

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – no objections

Comments

The main issues which need to be considered in the determination of this application are:

- Principle of Development
- Impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties
- Impact on the character of the area

Principle of Development

The land is within the urban area where residential infilling, redevelopment and development on neglected and underused land will be permitted, providing it does not adversely affect the character of the surrounding area or amenity of existing residents.

Impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties

The proposed scheme has been assessed both in terms of the impact that the scheme will have on adjoining properties as well as living conditions (in terms of outlook and privacy) for future residents.

The impact on the occupants of No.13 Seamead has been carefully considered as this dwelling is closest to the application site. There are two principal windows within the side elevation of No.13 Seamead facing onto the proposal and there would be a separation of 4.4 metres between the proposed building and the closest window. As a result, officers consider that the
dwelling should be restricted to single storey with no accommodation within the roof.

Officers consider that a bungalow would not have a material impact on the residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of this property.

**Impact on the character of the area**

Officers have considered whether the proposal would be in character with the surrounding area or whether it would represent over-development. The area comprises of predominately bungalows.

The proposed plot size is comparable to No.10 Seamead and other neighbouring properties within Seamead. Officers consider that the scheme would not be harmful to the character of the area or represent over-development.

Officers consider that the proposal is acceptable and complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

**RECOMMEND:**

Subject to the owner/applicant 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 to secure contributions towards the provision and/or improvement of off site public open space and/or facilities by 26 August 2005.

**PERMISSION:** Submission of reserved matters (design, external appearance and landscaping); materials to be submitted; single storey eaves height; no windows/dormer windows/rooflights within the roofplane; boundary treatment; parking; levels; landscaping implementation; hours of construction; no mud on road; no burning.

**OR:** In the event that the applicant/owner fails to complete a Section 106 agreement by 26 August 2005.

**REFUSE:** Contrary to Policy; inadequate provision of open space.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** File P/05/0911/OA
Site Description

- The site lies to the west of Old Street, Hill Head in an area designated coast and countryside, special landscape character and within the Meon Valley strategic gap.
- The site forms part of a private garden area of Meon View farmhouse

Description of Proposal

- The application is for full planning permission for the erection of one four bedroom detached dwelling and detached double garage to be sited within the garden area situated on the southern side.
- Access to the site is from Old Street

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Policies C1, C9, C11, DG3, DG4, DG5, H11, H14, R5 and T5

Relevant Planning History

P/05/0590/FP Erection of Single Detached Dwelling and Garages – Withdrawn 16 June 2005

Representations

Three letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:
- Harmful to the environment
• Extra traffic on country road
• The ‘farm’ is supposed to be a farm.
• Any development on the western side of Old Street will be the ‘thin end of the wedge’ and could open up development of currently rural and semi rural land.
• The development would be unsightly and out of keeping with the older properties on this side of the street.
• If the application is approved could we consider moving the access so that it is via the existing track which goes to the rear of the property.
• The size of the new dwelling some not seem to be in proportion to the area of development.
• Old street is a narrow road and not suitable for the lorries etc needed to build a new property.
• Concerns that the lands proposed for this development is designated as agricultural land.

The amended plans have been re advertised; no letters had been received at the time of writing this report.

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – No objection

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – No objection subject to conditions

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Countryside Officer) – The site consists of a formal garden with trees and shrubs on three sides. The garden is intensively managed and of little wildlife value. Whilst badgers are known to be present in the local area there is no evidence of badger activity in the garden.

The proposed development will not have an adverse impact on local wildlife.

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – No objection

Comments

The site is located within an area of countryside, as designated by the Local Plan, and hence is subject to restrictive policies that limit new development within the open countryside. However, Policy H14 of the Local Plan does permit frontage infill in the countryside where:

• The development is for one or two new dwellings;
• The development would occupy a gap between existing dwellings in an otherwise continuously built-up frontage and would not harm the character of the area;
• The new dwellings and plots are similar in size and character to adjoining properties;
• The development does not consolidate an isolated group of dwellings;
• The development does not create dwellings in the rear garden of existing properties.

The site occupies a gap between existing dwellings within a built up section of Old Street. Officers consider the principle of development on this site is acceptable in policy terms.

The existing farm house, 57 Old Street lies to the north of the site. The proposed property would be set back from this property. In light of this relationship the property has been designed with single storey eaves on the northern side in order to minimise the impact upon the existing property. Since receipt of the application amended plans have been received resiting the dwelling slightly further forward to ensure a satisfactory relationship.

Officers consider that the proposal would not be detrimental to the character of the surrounding area in terms of scale, layout and space around and between dwellings and subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions permission should be granted.

RECOMMEND:

Subject to:

(i) the comments of the Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer;

(ii) the applicant/owner entering into a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 on terms drafted by the Solicitor to the Council to secure a financial contribution towards off-site public open space and/or facilities by 29 August 2005

PERMISSION: Tree protection measures; arboricultural method statement detailing a ‘no dig’ specification; materials; landscaping and implementation; boundary treatment; no burning on site; construction hours; no mud on highway; car parking; levels; no openings specified elevations; high level windows/obscure glaze windows within specified elevations: desk top study.

OR:

In the event that the owner/applicant fails to complete the required Section 106 Agreement by 29 August 2005

REFUSE: Contrary to policy; inadequate provision for Public Open Space and/or facilities.

Further Information

The desk study should be in accordance with British Standards Institute BS 10175: 2001 Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites - Code of Practice and should be carried out by or under the supervision of a suitable qualified competent person. This person should be a chartered member of an appropriate professional body and have experience in investigating contamination sites.
Please note that commercial property searches available over the internet are not considered to be sufficiently detailed enough to constitute a desk study in the context of the above condition. These desk studies do not formulate a conceptual model for the site neither do they qualitatively risk assess the site. They should not be used. Please do contact Wendy Harrison, Contaminated Land Officer to discuss this in more details.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0921/FP; P/05/0590/FP.

**OFFICERS REPORT** - Kim Hayler Ext 2367

**Introduction**

Members will recall that this application was reported to the meeting on 13 July 2005. At that meeting Members resolved to undertake a site visit on 28 July 2005. The application is now reported back for determination.

**Site Description**

- The site lies on the western side of Mays Lane, west of Summerleigh Walk and north of Marks Tey Road;

- The site comprises a former garden to a demolished bungalow with the old entrance to the site opening onto the part of Mays Lane that forms a junction with Oakcroft Lane. This part of Mays Lane forms the northern boundary of the site. Within the southern section of the overgrown garden, there is the remains of an old domestic orchard;

- The site contains trees subject to Tree Preservation Order Nos. 108 and 359.

- The site falls within the urban area and is identified as an allocated housing site, and a Site of Nature Conservation Value containing a large badger sett;

- The site has a net developable area of 0.877 hectares.

**Description of Proposal**
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- The application is for outline permission with access only to be considered at this stage;

- Access to the site is from Summerleigh Walk, with five dwellings indicated as being accessed from Mays Lane to the north;

- The development layout incorporates an active badger sett located near the southern boundary fence line with neighbouring properties in Marks Tey Road;

- An illustrative layout has been submitted with the application demonstrating that a mix of units of 2, 3 and 4 bed types can be satisfactorily accommodated within the site; on the basis that the net developable area identified is soundly based.

- At the time of drafting the report permission is sought for 30 dwellings but since the layout is only indicative at this stage the dwelling mix upon the layout is not part of the proposal.

- A comprehensive ecology report and tree survey forms part of the submission.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies DG1, DG3, DG4, DG5, DG6, C17, C18, H1, H2, H10, R5 and T5

**Relevant Planning History**

P/96/1229/FP  Erection of 14 dwellings  Land rear of 113 Mays Lane  Permission September 1997

**Representations**

Twenty-three letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

( Including one letter supporting the access arrangements).

- Site of nature conservation value part of site is being considered for upgrading to SINC status
- Council of the European Communities Directive encourages the conservation of wildlife
- Area is being considered as a ‘Site of importance for Nature Conservation’
• Disturbance to badgers
• Density of housing proposed too high; contrary to policies
• Out of character with surrounding area
• Supporting statement misleading
• Orchard to be retained
• Inadequate car parking
• Insufficient infrastructure for more housing in Stubbington
• No open space provided
• Developer should provide mini roundabout at the junction of Mays Lane and Peak Lane
• Will increase traffic on an already busy road (Mays Lane)
• Access via Summerleigh Walk not suitable; disturbance from headlights and noise.
• Development too close to existing houses
• Will destroy habitat for a wide range of wildlife
• Already problems with parking on the highway
• Concerns that hedgerows will not be destroyed
• Buffer zone not adequate
• Loss of trees and no details of replanting or landscaping
• Trees with TPO’s would be destroyed
• The mix of shared ownership and social rental housing is inappropriate.

Consultations

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – no objection subject to conditions

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – no objection to the means of access. A highway infrastructure contribution is required for works in Mays Lane.

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – Extensive pre-application discussions have taken place between the Council’s Arborist and Countryside Officer in relation arboricultural features within the site. An ecological evaluation report and arboricultural survey were undertaken by the applicant and have been submitted in support of the application. The proposal seeks to retain trees along the western strip and southern and northern end of the site. There would be an opportunity for new strategic planting, tree management, new and replacement planting and enhancement of badger foraging.

There is no objection to the proposal subject to conditions.

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Countryside Officer) – Whilst development of the site will result in a loss of some of the site’s biodiversity interest it is considered that, realistic mitigation measures have been put forward in the Planning Statement. If these mitigation measure are fully implemented a reasonable amount of the site’s biodiversity interest can be maintained.
The following points should be secured in the planning permission:

- The mitigation measures set out in the Badger/Wildlife Mitigation Proposals April 2005 must be followed;
- Provision of a detailed landscape planting and management plan for the sett protection area and tree belt. This should include details of land tenure and how long term management of the sett protection area and tree belt will be achieved;
- Timing of vegetation clearance, tree works, fencing and construction work within 30 metres of the badger sett. Work will need to avoid the closed season for Sett Disturbance Licenses;
- Provision of a suitably qualified person to oversee the biodiversity mitigation work;
- Details of fencing for the sett protection area and tree belt;
- Re-survey of badger and bat activity if more than six months elapse before construction commences.

Chief Strategic Housing Officer – The application has the support of the Department of Strategic Housing. The seven units proposed as affordable units would contribute towards the Council’s high-priority corporate objective to provide 100 new affordable homes per annum.

Hampshire Constabulary – no objections

Comments

- Principle of development
- Character of the area
- Highway implications
- Impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties
- Affordable Housing
- Nature Conservation Issues

Principle of development

The site has been allocated for housing. Within the Fareham Borough Urban Housing Capacity Study 2001 – 2011, the site is recognised as an existing housing allocation and an indicative capacity is given of 32 units which reflects the figure in the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

Character of the area

Stubbington is essentially residential in character, containing a full range of house types and mixed tenures which are mostly two storey.

Summerleigh Walk has an established density of 26 dph; Marks Tey shows an average density of 32.4 dph, whilst dwellings in Marks Tey Road are at an average density of 47 dph.

The proposal for 30 units achieves a net density of 34 dph. It is intended that the dwellings would be predominantly two storey, with possibly a small number
of 2.5 storey units accommodated within the site away from the adjacent established housing.

To the west of the site boundary lies the open countryside; this boundary is defined by a dense mature wooded belt of trees. The proposed development layout would retain this wooded belt of trees some 9 metres in width along the western boundary. The text accompanying Policy DG6 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review states that a separation between new development and the countryside may include planting belts of 15 metres. In this particular instance a well established line of trees would separate the site from the countryside. The width of the tree belt is directly comparable to that alongside Marks Tey Road immediately to the south. In light of these facts officers consider it would not be appropriate to insist on a wider width of planting belt in this case.

Highway Implications

The site lies within a low to medium accessibility area as set out in the Council’s Local Practice Note. The illustrative layout demonstrates the maximum number of parking spaces as set out within the Practice Note. The Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) considers the proposal is acceptable in highway terms.

Impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties

The illustrative layout demonstrates that due to careful fenestration detail and orientation the impact upon existing neighbours would be minimised. Housing adjoining established properties would be two storey only.

Officers are satisfied that the proposal would not materially impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent residential properties.

Affordable Housing

Seven of the 30 proposed units would be affordable. It is proposed that two 3 bed units will be for shared/intermediate ownership and the balance, comprising two 3 bed houses and three 2 bed apartments will be for social rent. The Chief Strategic Housing Officer is supportive of the proposal.

Nature conservation issues

Since the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review 2000 was adopted the investigation into SINC status has been completed. The conclusion was that the site did not meet the SINC criteria.

The development layout includes a protected badger sett, enclosure and foraging area within the southern part of the site and a corridor including a tree buffer running north south adjacent to the western boundary which the Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Conservation) considers satisfactory.

Planning conditions would be imposed to secure the long-term maintenance and management of these protected areas. Management of these areas will
be undertaken through access gates provided for that purpose in the southern boundary to Marks Tey Road.

In light of the foregoing officers consider that the proposal is acceptable.

RECOMMEND:

Subject to:

The applicant/owner entering into a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to secure (a) a financial contribution towards the provision of and/or off-site public open space and (b) a financial contribution towards highway improvements in the vicinity of the site by 14 August 2005.

PERMISSION: Submission of reserved matters (siting, design, external appearance, landscaping), dwellings shall not exceed two storeys in height adjacent to existing properties, hard surfacing, affordable housing, boundary treatment, details of the road, parking, bin and cycle storage, landscaping implementation, tree/hedgerow protection, arboricultural impact assessment, contamination report, levels, no mud on road, construction hours, parking of construction traffic/site management, no burning on site, future management of badger setts and corridor, tree management/works, implement mitigation measures

OR: In the event that the applicant/owner fails to complete a Section 106 agreement by 14 August 2005.

REFUSE: Contrary to policy, inadequate provision of open space

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0662/OA

---

P/05/0828/VC
FIRST SAXON LTD
PORTCHESTER EAST
Agent: MR R B TUTTON

VARIATION OF CONDITION 1 OF P/02/0671/VC (TO ALLOW CONTINUED USE OF FORECOURT FOR PORTCHESTER CAR SALES FOR A FURTHER 3 YRS)

OFFICERS REPORT - Kim Hayler Ext 2367

This planning application has been called in for determination by the Planning Development Control Committee by Councillor Price.

Site Description

- The site is located on the corner of West Street and Nelson Avenue, Portchester. The land and buildings are currently used for motor vehicle associated activities, including display and sale of cars and servicing/repairs.

dc-050810-r01-awe.doc
Apart from the application site, and opposite Atkinson's of Portchester Glass and Mirror Centre, the predominant use of the surrounding area is residential. Along Nelson Avenue there are mainly two storey terraced and semi-detached houses, with a row of three detached houses opposite the site. The adjacent frontage to West Street comprises mainly bungalows.

Vehicular access to the existing premises is off Nelson Avenue.

**Description of Proposal**

This application seeks to extend for a further temporary period of three years, the right of the occupier to use the forecourt area of 190 West Street for car sales.

Condition 1 of planning permission P/02/0671/VC limits the use of the premises for display of vehicles for sale to 31st August 2005, with the site to be reinstated to its former condition after this, unless a further planning permission has been granted before the expiry of that period.

The reason given for this condition is that, having regard to the circumstances of the applicant and the use, in order that the local planning authority can monitor and review its operation in the interests of the amenities of this location, of the occupiers of residential properties in the locality and of highway safety, in accordance with policies DG1, DG3, DG5 and T5 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies E6, DG1, DG3, DG5 and T5

The site is identified as suitable for housing development within the Councils Urban Housing Capacity Study.

**Relevant Planning History**

The presence of a garage on this site has been long established (since at least 1951) and has developed over time at the site, although there have been proposals recently to redevelop the site to a residential care home:

- **P/03/1228/VC** – Vary conditions 1 & 2 of P/00/0774/OA (extend time limit for development) – Permission 19 September 2003

- **P/02/0671/VC** – Variation of conditions 1 & 2 of P/01/0992/VC (To remove limitation for display of vehicles for sale) – Permission 21 August 2002.

- **P/02/0670/VC** – Continued use of forecourt for car sales until 31/08/05 (Variation of Condition 1 of P/97/1261/CU) – Permission 21 August 2002.

- **P/01/0992/VC** – Variation of condition 6 of P/97/1261/CU (To remove limitation for display of vehicles for sale) – Permission 9 November 2001.
P/00/0774/OA – Redevelopment of site by the erection of two storey rest and nursing home (outline application) - Permission 30 October 2000.

P/97/1261/CU – Continued use of forecourt for car sales for a temporary period of five years in conjunction with the previously permitted development reference P/95/1098/FP – Permission 7 September 1998

P/97/0024/VC – Relief and Variation of conditions attached to P/95/1098/FP – Permission 11 March 1997

P/95/1098/FP – Erection of front showroom extension, new side window and demolition of rear outbuilding – Permission 12 December 1995

**Representations**

The application has been publicised by notifying neighbours and via a site notice.

Six letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Car parking and access problems for residents and commercial business in immediate locality caused by overflow from car sales and their customer cars and by untaxed/abandoned/unlawfully parked vehicles.
- Use of rear of premises for car servicing/repairs creates further parking problems/noise disturbance. Cars speed out of rear of garage
- Car loaders used cause restricted view of A27 from Nelson Avenue offering potential for accidents
- Litter from workers smoking in the street and cleaning vehicles at the road side
- Car sale trade also occurs in Nelson Avenue
- Existing conditions attached to earlier permissions should continue to be applied in order to protect amenities of nearby residential properties

**Consultations**

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – No objection, if existing conditions are imposed and enforced.

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – No objection

**Comments**

Garage uses at this site have been long established and vehicular activities have been on site since at least 1951. The application now before Members seeks use of the forecourt area of the site for car sales for a further temporary period. Representations have also been made by the public in relation to the
workshop to the rear. This is undergoing separate investigation by your Officers. Also, it has been noticed by site visit that the customer parking element of the currently approved parking layout for car sales has been compromised by vehicles for sale being situated across those spaces. This particular point has been raised with the applicant's agent, seeking that his client corrects the situation on the ground.

The reasoning behind the existing temporary consent was to provide an opportunity to monitor activities and then reassess the proposal when the temporary consent comes to an end. Comments received from neighbours highlight the issue of apparent parking from the business and its customers occurring on Nelson Avenue, and activities occurring there as a result. It is recommended below that this be addressed via a condition attached to a further extension to this consent, namely for no vehicle within the control of the site operator being stored or parked on Nelson Avenue.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: temporary consent for three years, on-site parking scheme, no parking of vehicles within control of site operator on Nelson Avenue, landscaping, boundary treatment, external lighting

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0828/VC; P/03/1228/VC; P/02/0671/VC; P/02/0670/VC; P/01/0992/VC, P/00/0774/OA, P/97/1261/CU, P/97/0024/VC, P/95/1098/FP

(28) P/05/0849/FP PORTCHESTER EAST
MRS B TUPPEN
RETENTION OF DETACHED SINGLE 9 WICOR MILL LANE GARAGE PORTCHESTER
OFFICERS REPORT - Clare Roberts Ext 2428

Site Description

This application relates to an end of terrace dwelling on the western side of Wicor Mill Lane on the corner of Orchard Grove.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the retention of a detached single garage. The garage is located to the rear of the property and fronts onto Orchard Grove. The garage measures 5.33 metres in length and 3.56 metres in width and 2.55 metres in height.

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review – DG3 and DG5
Representations

One letter has been received objecting on the following grounds:

- The owners would not be able to see out of their garage and this would be a danger to pedestrians
- There is no where to put wheelie bins
- The garage is not where the original garage was sited

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – No objection - subject to reduction in fence.

Comments

Planning permission is sought for the retention of a garage which is located to the rear of the property and fronts onto Orchard Grove. A garage was previously located on the site on a slightly different footprint and fronted the access track to the rear of the property. The garage, although fairly prominent within the streetscene is located on a similar footprint to the original garage and therefore officers are of the opinion that the proposal is acceptable.

The Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) is of the opinion that the proposal is acceptable subject to the fence adjacent to the garage being lowered to 0.9 metres to allow visibility over the fence when pulling out of the garage, the applicant has been contacted and is happy to carry out these works to fence.

It should be noted however, that due to the position of the fence it does not require permission. The objector also raises the issue that they do not have anywhere to put their wheelie bins although officers appreciate that this is a concern for the neighbours it does not justify a reason for refusal.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: Timescale for reduction in the height of fence, use of garage.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0849/FP
(29)  P/05/0860/CU  PORTCHESTER EAST
MEON MARKETING LTD  EAST STREET - UNIT 6 CASTLE
Agent: MR D MARLOW TRADING ESTATE -

CHANGE OF USE OF UNIT TO CLASS EAST STREET - UNIT 6 CASTLE
B8 - STORAGE & DISTRIBUTION TRADING ESTATE -
PORTCHESTER (RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION)
AND ENCLOSE CANOPY

OFFICERS REPORT - Emma Betteridge Ext 2677

Site Description

This application relates to a site within Castle Trading Estate which is located immediately to the east of a residential area known as The Keep. This established industrial estate is accessed off East Street and is designated as a category A employment area within the adopted local plan.

Within The Keep the neighbouring residential area there is one dwelling which physically abuts the site (number 89). The north-east corner of the property has a gap of one metre between itself and the application site boundary and a distance of 12.2 metres from the property to the industrial unit. There are rows of tall conifers along the north-east boundary of 89. A gap of approximately 5.5 metres in width within this row allows the residential property to view the site from a bedroom window.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a change of use to Class B8 (Storage and distribution purposes) and enclosed canopies. The use has been implemented and the site is now used principally as a storage area with a small incidental shop.

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review DG1, DG3, DG5 and E1

Relevant Planning History

FBC.2125/81  Installation of 2000 Gallon Petrol Storage Tank – Permission 02-05-1973

FBC.2125/78  Change of use to Vehicle Depot – Permission for Hiring of Self Drive Cars 29-11-1072


P/04/0274/FP  Provision of canopy Extension for Dry Storage – Permission
19-04-2004

P/05/0208/CU  Change of Use of Unit to Class B8 - Storage & Distribution (Retrospective Application) and Enclose Canopy – Refused 18-04-2005

**Representations**

One letter has been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Increase in noise problems
- Reduction of neighbours quality of life
- One storage canopy is already constructed

**Consultations**

Health & Safety Executive – No objection

**Comments**

This is the second application that has been submitted to regularise this use for Meon Marketing within the application site. The company acquired the premises in December 2000 and has been running this business since. The previous owners of the site was Southern South Drive which had permission on the site for a sui generous use therefore consent was required for this present use.

The business that is run from this unit is the wholesale, storage and distribution of road-marking points, signs and associated equipment. There is a small shop within the unit ancillary to the business, with an office and storage areas. There is also a rear yard where equipment is also stored and the line painting machine is demonstrated and a electric fork lift is used to move stock.

The applicants are also applying to regularise the enclosure of a canopy that received permission in 2004 (P/04/0274/FP). The canopy which has been constructed is 2 metres shorter then that permitted. In light of this officer consider this element of the scheme to be acceptable.

The previous application was refused for the following reason:-

*The proposed development is contrary to Policy DG5 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review and is unacceptable in that the extensive open storage within the area on the western side of the building is harmful to the outlook available from the adjoining property No. 89 The Keep to the detriment of the residential amenities the occupiers of that property could reasonably expect to enjoy.*

Therefore this current application also includes an enclosed canopy along the southern boundary of the site to reduce the visual impact that has been created on the neighbouring property to the south-west. In officers opinion the provision of the canopy overcomes the previous reason for refusal.
Officers have taken into account the issues raised by the objector and it is in officers opinion that it would be difficult to resist a relatively low key use such as this in this location. Officers do however consider that appropriate planning conditions could be imposed to minimise any impact upon the adjoining property. These conditions would include restricting the use of the yard for any purposes to between the hours of 0730-1800 Monday to Friday and 0800-1300 on Saturdays. The yard should not be used outside of these times or on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Lastly any power tools should only be operated within the enclosed buildings whilst the doors are shut.

Officers consider that subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions the continued use of this site is acceptable.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: Hours of use within the yard between 0730-1800 Monday to Friday and Saturday 0800-1300; power tools should be used within the main building or the enclosed canopy with the door to the rear yard shut; details of proposed canopy along the south boundary.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0860/CU

(30) P/05/0900/FP MRS QUEREE PORTCHESTER EAST Agent: THORNS YOUNG ARCHITECTURAL
BULID UP HIPPED ROOF TO BARN HIP AND PROVISION OF FRONT AND REAR DORMERS 27 BAYLY AVENUE PORTCHESTER FAREHAM

OFFICERS REPORT - Clare Roberts Ext 2428

Site Description

This application relates to a semi-detached bungalow on the eastern side of Bayly Avenue north of the junction with Bentham Grove.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought to build up the hipped roof to a barn hip and the provision of front and rear dormers. The front dormer would measure 2.5 metres in width and the rear dormer would measure 1.5 metres in width.

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review – DG3 and DG5

Relevant Planning History

Representations

One letter has been received objecting on the following grounds:

- The dormer window is too close the neighbouring properties dormer window and would impinge access for maintenance.

Comments

The application seeks to gain permission to provide accommodation in the roof by increasing the hipped roof to a barn hip and the provision of front and rear dormers. The proposal is similar to others in the road and therefore would not have a detrimental impact on the streetscene. The property to the south does not have any windows within the side elevation and therefore the proposed hipped roof would not have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring property. The objector to the north raises the issue that the proposed dormer window would be located too close to their dormer window and would therefore restrict access for maintenance purposes. Officers appreciate that this is a concern, however it does not justify a reason for refusal and officers consider that the proposal is acceptable.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: Matching materials.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0900/FP

(31) P/05/0917/FP

PORTCHESTER EAST

MR AND MRS POURALL

Agent: WATKINS WOOD SURVEYORS

ERECTION OF TWO CHALET BUNGALOWS

1 SEAVIEW AVENUE

PORTCHESTER HANTS

OFFICERS REPORT - Joanne Wilson Ext 2679

Site Description

The application site comprises of an area of land on the northern side of Seaview Avenue on the corner with Southwick Avenue. No.2 Seaview Avenue comprises the eastern boundary whilst No.1 Southwick Avenue forms the northern boundary.

Description of Proposal

- Permission is sought for alternative house types to that originally permitted.
The alterations consist of a single storey rear extension to both bungalows, alterations to the design of the porch and a reduction in the width of the front dormer windows.

Three parking spaces are shown within the rear garden and one within the front garden.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies — DG3 and DG5

**Relevant Planning History**

P/04/0965/FP - Demolition of Existing Bungalow and Garage and Erection of Two Chalet Bungalows — Withdrawn

P/04/1299/FP - Demolition of Existing Bungalow and Garage and Erection of Two Two Bedroom Chalet Bungalows — Permission 13 October 2004.


**Representations**

Two letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- The occupants could change the parking layout which would result in vehicles manoeuvring on a dangerous bend
- A condition should be added that if the Robina tree dies that it should be replaced.
- The flat roof with a false pitch is out of character
- Loss of privacy
- Loss of trees and hedgerow

**Consultations**

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) comments awaited

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer — comments awaited

**Comments**

Planning permission has previously been granted for the construction of two chalet bungalows at this site. The Council is now being asked to consider the changes between the permitted scheme and the proposed.

Due to the siting of the dwellings away from the boundary and that the proposed single storey extension would only extend 3.2 metres in depth, officers consider that the extension would not result in a detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.

With regard to the concerns raised by neighbours regarding parking, the proposal would be conditioned so that the parking spaces should be laid out before the dwellings are occupied and thereafter retained.
It is considered that the proposed minor alterations to the dormer windows and the porch would not result in a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

From the submitted drawings the way in which the frontage of the site would be laid out is slightly ambiguous. Officers have therefore sought further amplification on this point.

Officers consider that the proposal is acceptable and complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

RECOMMEND:

Subject to the receipt of satisfactory details clarifying how the frontage of the site is to be laid out.

PERMISSION: Materials to be submitted; landscaping; landscaping implementation; parking; fencing; levels; no mud on road; hours of construction; no burning; no porches to be constructed on the western elevation.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0917/FP; P/05/0483/FP; P/04/12991FP; P/04/0965/FP.

(32) P/05/0851/FP PORTCHESTER WEST as amended by plans received 7 July 2005 and 18 July 2005
MOOR CONSTRUCTION LTD Agent: DANIELLS HARRISON SURVEYORS
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING 300 DORE AVENUE
DWELLING AND ERECTION OF EIGHT PORTCHESTER
FLATS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING PORTCHESTER
AND NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS

OFFICERS REPORT – Kim Hayler Ex 2367

Site Description
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- The site lies on the corner of Dore Avenue and Portchester Road
- The existing dwelling is served by a vehicular access onto Dore Avenue. Immediately adjacent to this access is a further vehicular access which serves Nos. 140 and 142 Portchester Road
- The site has a total area of 0.12 hectares
- The site contains trees subject to Tree Preservation Order No. 504 situated to the north and west boundaries of the site.
- The site is enclosed with 2 metre high brickwork boundary walls to the east and south boundaries fronting Dore Avenue and Portchester Road with the remaining boundaries formed by established hedgerows

**Description of Proposal**

- The application is for full permission
- It is proposed to demolish the existing dwelling and erect a block of eight flats consisting of 6 two bedroom and 2 one bedroom flats with associated parking, bin storage and cycle parking.
- The flats would consist of a number of elements, principally two storey with a central three storey element.
- It is proposed to create a new access onto Rockingham Way to the north. The access would serve the application site along with Nos.140 and 142 Portchester Road.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Policies DG3, DG5, DG4, H2, R5 and T5

**Relevant Planning History**

P/05/0348/OA Demolish existing dwelling and erect 3 detached dwellings (outline application) - Application withdrawn

**Representations**

Four letters of objection have been received, including one from The Portchester Society raising the following concerns:
Entry to and exit from Rockingham Way and the junction with Dore Avenue and Rockingham Way is already dangerous
The shape of Rockingham Way makes visibility difficult
Development will block the sun from garden and conservatory
The road is too narrow in Rockingham Way
No turning points appear to have been planned
Access road measures 12 ft wide and not 15 ft as shown on plan.
Proposed development will take away on road parking facilities.
Loss of a view.
Is contrary to central government and local planning authority guidelines
Housing density proposed is too high
No apartment blocks in the immediate area of the site.
No regard to ‘open space provision’

One letter of support has been received but has concerns regarding tree management.

**Consultations**

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – No objection subject to a condition requiring noise attenuation measures in relation to the A27 and nearby railway line.

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – The bin and cycle stores should not be located beneath the Monterey pines. The application should involve input from an arboricultural consultant to guide the design process and ensure that adequate tree protection measures are allowed for.

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – no highway objections; parking and access arrangements are satisfactory.

**Comments**

**Principle of development**

The land is within the urban area where residential infilling; redevelopment and development on neglected and underused land will be permitted, providing it does not adversely affect the character of the surrounding area or amenity of existing residents.

**Impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties**

In general terms, the layout of the scheme is acceptable and complies with the distances required by Policy DG5 (and set out in Appendix 6 of the adopted Fareham Borough Local Plan Review).

The proposed flats would have an amenity area in excess of 200 metres squared, which complies with Appendix 6 of the Local Plan.
The south western element of the building would be sited 8 metres back from 142 Portchester Road and 3.4 metres off the western boundary, with an oblique separation distance of 10 metres. The amenities of the neighbouring property would be secured by the imposition of conditions preventing no windows at first floor within the western elevation and the provision of a 1.8 metres high opaque screen to the first floor balcony. As a result officers consider that the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on the amenities presently enjoyed by the occupant of 142 Portchester Road.

**Character of the area**

There is a variety of dwelling types around the area; two storey dwellings to the north, west and south on the other side of Portchester Road; bungalows in The Crossway and a petrol filling station to the east.

The site lies on a prominent corner location, but is not situated within an established ‘street scene’. The proposed building and its design configuration would create a frontage to Portchester Road and Dore Avenue. Officers consider the three storey element on the corner would represent a key feature representing a building of interesting articulation.

Officers consider that the proposal would not result in development out of character or detrimental to the street scene.

**Impact on trees**

The proposal incorporates a bin and cycle store to be sited under the canopy of two protected trees. The Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) has raised concerns as this element of the proposal may impact on the health and well being of the protected trees. Officers have raised this matter with the applicant and amended plans have been requested relocating the bin and cycle stores.

**Highway implications**

The site lies within a medium accessibility area as set out in the Council’s Local Practice Note. The illustrative layout demonstrates the maximum number of parking spaces as set out with the Practice Note.

Currently three properties are accessed directly from Dore Avenue in close proximity to the junction with Rockingham Way and opposite the busy junction of The Crossway. It is considered that the proposed access arrangements which would improve the current situation by removing these existing accesses to Dore Avenue. The Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) raises no objection to the proposal.

**Summary**

The proposed redevelopment would result in the creation of a building of varying scale on this prominent corner site. This section of Dore Avenue does not have a defined streetscene in the opinion of officers and buildings of differing scales exist nearby. The scheme provides an acceptable level of car...
parking and amenity space and would provide an appropriate level of amenity space for residents. Whilst the density of the scheme may be higher than that nearby (due to its flatted nature) officers do not believe it would harm the character of the area.

The proposed highway access arrangements are considered acceptable.

Notwithstanding the objections received officers consider the scheme acceptable.

RECOMMEND:

Subject to:

(i) The receipt of satisfactory amended plans relocating the bin and cycle stores;

(ii) The comments of the Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) as a result of the receipt of the amended plans;

(iii) The applicant/owner entering into a planning obligation pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 on terms drafted by the Solicitor to the Council to secure a financial contribution towards off-site public open space and/or facilities by 15 August 2005

PERMISSION: Materials, levels, parking, bin and cycle storage, arboricultural method statement, tree protection measures, no mud on road, construction hours, no openings specified elevation, screening to balcony, hard surfacing materials, landscaping and implementation, noise insulation measures, boundary treatment; close existing access/egress onto Dore Avenue.

OR

In the event that the applicant/owner fails to complete the Section 106 agreement by 15 August 2005

REFUSE: Contrary to policy; inadequate provision for Public Open Space and/or facilities.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0851/FP
This application relates to a detached dwelling on the south side of East Cams Close which is to the north of Portchester Road.

**Description of Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for the provision of a front dormer and a new pitched roof to an existing rear dormer (alternative to P/04/1790/FP). The front dormer has been constructed narrower and taller to that shown on the approved plan. The front dormer measures 1.4 metres in width (1.7 metres), 2.4 metres in depth (1.6 metres) and 2.9 metres in height (2.2 metres) original dormers dimension are in brackets.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review – DG3 and DG5

**Relevant Planning History**

P/04/1790/FP Provision of Front Dormer and New Pitched Roof to Existing Rear Dormer Permission 07-01-2005

**Representations**

One letter has been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Front windows are all different styles
- Inconsistency in colour of guttering
- The upstairs dormer window and front door are out of alignment

**Comments**

This application has been submitted for the front dormer in its revised form and pitched roof over existing rear dormer. The front dormer is slightly out of alignment with the front door but the door was not originally constructed within the centre of the property. Notwithstanding this officers consider that the
dormer as constructed does not have a detrimental impact on the property or the street scene.

The front windows are in the original house and it is not possible to control the fenestration.

Officers consider the application to acceptable incompliance with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION:

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/05/0940/FP
MISCELLANEOUS ITEM

(2) Subject: 20 Shrubbery Close Portchester
(Enf/05/0160)

Peter Cooper Ext 2423

In June 2005 a complaint was received that the fence at the above property on the boundary with 21 Shrubbery Close was in excess of 2 metres in height. Officers established that there was a small section of trellis on top of a 2 metre fence extending the fence to a height of 2.3 metres along 2 panel lengths (approximately 3.8m) from the rear of the building.

The situation has been discussed with the owner of the fence who did not wish to remove the trellis or go to the expense of a planning application for a small piece of trellis.

It is officers opinion that the trellis causes no significant harm to the neighbouring property and if a planning application had been submitted it would have received a favourable officer recommendation.

Member may also wish to take into account that there is a conservatory at the rear of the adjacent property and the trellis is directly adjacent to it.

Having taken all factors into consideration officers are of the opinion that it is not expedient to recommend planning enforcement action in this instance to secure the removal of the section of trellis extending 0.3m (12inches) above the permitted height of the fence to a depth of two panels (approximately 3.8m) from the rear of the dwellings.

RECOMMEND:
That Members endorse officer’s recommendation that it is not expedient to take planning enforcement action in this instance to secure the removal of the section of trellis extending 0.3m (12 inches) above the permitted height of the fence to a depth of two panels (approximately 3.8m) from the rear of the dwellings.
PLANNING APPEALS

The following list details the current situation regarding new and outstanding planning appeals and decisions.

APPEALS LODGED

1. **P/05/0510/TO**
   - **Appellant:** Mr & Mrs C Mitchell
   - **Site:** 16 Haflinger Drive
   - **Decision Maker:** Officers’ Delegated Powers
   - **Recommendation:** Refuse
   - **Council’s Decision:** Refused
   - **Date Lodged:** 5 July 2005
   - **Reason for Appeal:** Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning consent to fell one Turkey Oak tree.

2. **P/05/0633/FP**
   - **Appellant:** Linden Homes Southern Ltd
   - **Site:** 93 Redlands Lane-former Elliotts Yard- Fareham
   - **Decision Maker:** Officers’ Delegated Powers
   - **Recommendation:** Refuse
   - **Council’s Decision:** Refused
   - **Date Lodged:** 19 July 2005
   - **Reason for Appeal:** Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings & erection of 49no. flats & 3no. houses with associated parking & landscape.

3. **P/05/0577/FP**
   - **Appellant:** Mrs Caulfield
   - **Site:** Warsash Road – 343-347 – Titchfield Common – Land to Rear of -
   - **Decision Maker:** Officers’ Delegated Powers
   - **Recommendation:** Refuse
   - **Council’s Decision:** Refused
   - **Date Lodged:** 26 July 2005
   - **Reason for Appeal:** Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for the erection of two detached houses with garages and two flats.
WITHDRAWN

4. P/04/1530/FP
   Appellant: O2 (UK) LTD
   Site: Fitness First, Downend Road, Fareham
   Decision Maker: Officers’ Delegated Powers
   Recommendation: Refuse
   Council’s Decision: Refused
   Date Lodged: 15 February 2005
   Reason for Appeal: Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for the installation of a 22.5 monopole telecommunications mast with 3no. antennas, 1no. dish, 1no. cabinet and ancillary equipment.
   Withdrawn
   28 June 2005

DECISIONS

5. P/04/0989/VC
   Appellant: Milbury Care Services
   Site: 22 Kiln Road, Fareham
   Decision Maker: Officers’ Delegated Powers
   Recommendation: Refuse
   Council’s Decision: Refused
   Date Lodged: 07 December 2004
   Reason for Appeal: Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for the variation of condition 3 of P/98/1024/FP (to convert garage to residential use Class C3)
   Decision: Allowed
   Inspector’s Reason: The Inspector concluded that the change of use of the garage to C3 and the removal of condition 3, attached to the earlier permission, would comply with the objectives of development plan policies, provided such use was solely in connection with 22 Kiln Road.
   Date of Decision: 4 July 2005

6. P/04/1821/AD
   Appellant: LA Leisure Limited
   Site: 1 Pulheim Parade, Fareham
   Decision Maker: Officers’ Delegated Powers
   Recommendation: Refuse
   Council’s Decision: Refused
   Date Lodged: 27 April 2005
   Reason for Appeal: Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse to consent to the display of 1no. internally illuminated flexface sign to front elevation.
   Decision: Allowed
   Inspector’s Reason: The Inspector concluded that the display of the internally illuminated flex face sign would not be detrimental to amenity.
   Date of Decision: 05 July 2005
7. P/05/0006/OA
   Appellant: Vivienne Properties Ltd
   Site: Land to rear of Portsdown House, 175/177 West Street, Fareham
   Decision Maker: Planning Development Control Committee
   Recommendation: Permission
   Council's Decision: Refused
   Date Lodged: 16 March 2005
   Reason for Appeal: Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for the erection of a building for use as a Dentist Surgery.
   Decision: Allowed
   Inspector's Reason: The Inspector did not consider that the site would prejudice the comprehensive development of the area.
   Date of Decision: 6 July 2005

8. P/04/1579/FP
   Appellant: Merry Hall Nursing Home
   Site: 30 Kiln Road, Fareham
   Decision Maker: Planning Development Control Committee
   Recommendation: Permission
   Council's Decision: Refused
   Date Lodged: 25 February 2005
   Reason for Appeal: Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for the erection of a single storey side/rear extension to increase number of beds from 27 to 32 including additional day space and provision of 2no. parking spaces.
   Decision: Allowed
   Inspector's Reason: The Inspector concluded that the extension would not be harmful to the character of the area nor would it be overbearing to the neighbouring properties.
   Date of Decision: 12 July 2005

9. P/04/1541/FP
   Appellant: Mr N Price
   Site: 10 Kestrel Close, Stubbington
   Decision Maker: Officers' Delegated Powers
   Recommendation: Refuse
   Council's Decision: Refused
   Date Lodged: 7 April 2005
   Reason for Appeal: Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for the erection of a first floor side/rear extension.
   Decision: Dismissed
   Date of Decision: 27 July 2005
10. P/05/0064/OA
Appellant: Captain Estlin
Site: Land adjacent to 34 Thornton Avenue, Warsash
Decision Maker: Planning Development Control Committee
Recommendation: Refuse
Council's Decision: Refused
Date Lodged: 11 May 2005
Reason for Appeal: Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for the erection of a detached dwelling (Outline Application).
Decision: Dismissed
Date of Decision: 28 July 2005

11. P/05/0204/FP
Appellant: Mr A W Newberry
Site: 79 Celadine Avenue, Locks Heath
Decision Maker: Planning Development Control Committee
Recommendation: Refuse
Council's Decision: Refused
Date Lodged: 18 May 2005
Reason for Appeal: Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for the provision of a new access to rear garden.
Decision: Dismissed
Date of Decision: 28 July 2005

12. P/04/1583/FP
Appellant: Mr & Mrs S Khatkar
Site: The Moorings, Nelson Lane, Portchester
Decision Maker: Officers' Delegated Powers
Recommendation: Refuse
Council's Decision: Refused
Date Lodged: 11 April 2005
Reason for Appeal: Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for the erection of a two storey/first floor side extension incorporating balcony & single storey front extension.
Decision: Allowed
Inspector's Reason: The Inspector considered that the scheme had been designed to respond appropriately to the scale, form and proportions of the existing house and the characteristics of the plot.
Date of Decision: 28 July 2005

Enquiries:

For further information on this report please contact Alan Wells. (Ext 2431)
PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

UPDATES

10th AUGUST 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZONE 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/05/0858/VC – COLDEAST HOSPITAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Letter dated 9 August 2005 received from the applicant confirming that they are happy to accept the principle of a condition to provide affordable housing. A number of points are being clarified which will be updated at the meeting.

| 3    | 13   |
| P/05/0853/OA – LAND AT YEW TREE DRIVE        |

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Policy) -

The site proposed for the new surgery at Yew Tree drive is allocated for housing in the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review. It is safeguarded under Policy H1 which states that such allocations are protected from all other development.

Whilst doctors’ surgeries should generally be located within town or local centres the temporary surgery has been located on the site for the past 6 years. It has been a popular location for the surgery and it has not been possible to identify an alternative location where the new surgery could be located.

The suitability of the site and the fact that all other appropriate sites have been fully explored, and no alternatives have been identified, justifies a departure from Policy H1.

| 5    | 20   |
| P/05/0790/VC – 25 PURSLANE GARDENS           |

The relevant planning history for the above site is as follows:-

- P/04/0637/FP Erection of Two Storey Side and Rear Extensions and Detached Garage following Demolition of Outbuildings - Permission 25-06-2004

This current application has been submitted to vary condition 3 of this application.

| 6    | 22   |
| P/05/0959/FP – 181 SEGENSWORTH ROAD           |
Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – no objections subject to conditions

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – no objections subject to conditions.

7  24  P/05/0864/FP – 11-15A HUNTS POND ROAD
Amplified plans received 22nd July 2005

Third paragraph, third line within Comments should read ‘Preclude’ rather than ‘prelude’

8  26  P/05/0960/FP – 19 LYNDALE ROAD PARK GATE
Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – no objections

9  29  P/05/0838/FP – 42-44 WARSASH ROAD
Amended/amplified plans received 3 August 2005 showing increased parking provision. (Following comments from the CP&TO (Highways) – see below).

Following discussion with the applicants regarding bin storage provision for proposed flats a further condition is recommended to require submission of a revised bin stores.

46 additional letters of objection received from local residents. The points of objection made coincide with those relating to the previous application as summarised in the main report.

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) – points out that the proposed scheme has 18 car spaces less than the maxima assessed for a location of low/medium accessibility. The figure of 18 largely reflects the fact that 15 proposed four bed properties are provided with 2 spaces each rather than 3 spaces each.

10  33  P/05/0839/OA - 9 OSBORNE ROAD WARSASH
Plans have been received showing the reconfiguration of the existing dwelling.

11  36  P/05/0879/FP – WYNSDALE PITCHPOND ROAD
Drainage details have been received. The details will be sent to Southern Water Services, The Environment Agency and the Council’s Drainage Engineer for comment.

Amplified by email from the applicant dated 9 August 2005 confirming that the open area in front of plots 4 – 6 would be conveyed to the respective properties.

12 39 P/05/0916/FP – 111A BROOK LANE, WARSASH

Two further letters have been received raising the following objections;
- The extension would extend to far in relation to the site and neighbouring properties
- The style of the extension is not in keeping with neighbouring properties
- Loss of car parking
- Access problems and containment of building operations within the site
- Visually intrusive and overbearing
- Poor design
- Overdevelopment of site
- Overlooking
- Distance from the extension to the road appears to be less than distance shown on plan

ZONE 2

16 50 P/05/0926/FP – FUNTLEY HILL FUNTLEY COURT (REAR OF)

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – concerned at proximity of trees and requesting conditions as recommended, plus control over surfacing construction to safeguard tree roots.

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – No objection

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) - No objection

20 58 P/05/0898/FP – 1 FAYRE ROAD

Remove condition: ‘No five year’

21 59 P/05/0941/FP – 93 REDLANDS LANE

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) confirms the adequacy of parking provision for an area of Medium/High accessibility noting that the site is on the boundary of an area
assessed as Medium/Low accessibility. Also ask for a financial contribution towards implementation of the Neville Lovett School Travel Plan. In the view of officers this cannot “fairly and reasonably” be related to the proposed development and has not been pursued in discussion with the applicants.

Southern Water – Are now satisfied that the proposed development and layout does not prejudice the pre-existing easement through the site.

Chief Strategic Housing Officer – supports the application.

A Petition with 80 signatures – making points which may be summarised as:

- Density not in keeping with area, predominantly bungalows, absence of amenity area – particularly after loss of Redlands PH;
- Inadequate parking provision, parked vehicles will overspill onto surrounding roads, Redlands Lane is a “rat run” and additional traffic will exacerbate the situation;
- Height and overbearing impact on neighbouring properties, loss of privacy and light
- The building line to Redlands Lane has been ignored.

Copy of a Petition – sent to the Chief Constable asking for speed checks and possible traffic calming on Redlands Lane.

42 additional letters of objection, making broadly similar points to the petition summarised above plus:

- Location of social housing close to Highfield Avenue
- Adequacy of water and sewerage services
- Asking for speed, parking and traffic calming on Redlands Lane
- Asking for condition requiring no work on Sundays (as recommended)
- Precedent for future development of Cams Alders playing Field

Three further letters have been received raising the following objection:

- How is the long term welfare of the tree compromised by having low branches
- The whole purpose of a T.P.O is to prevent the unnecessary lopping of such trees
- The trees are sited in an area identified as an area of special residential character
- I do not believe there are any environmental or arboricultural
reasons to undertake crown lifting

- Crown lifting will visually permanently & detrimentally change the overall appearance and character of the trees and that of the surrounding area.
- Crown lifting will also open up the current tree canopies to visually expose, in certain locations, the current development to the detriment of the adjacent home owners
- The proposals will also have a potentially long term detrimental impact on the existence of the resident and migrating wildlife such as squirrels and birds
- Trees protected under a T.P.O and planning decisions should remain protected and not be interfered with for the benefit of the developer.

The word "Branches" is missing from the top of page 66 after the word overhanging.

22A 2 (supp) P/05/0817/FP – 27 GOSPORT ROAD/4-6 ELMHURST ROAD

Amended plans received 29 July 2005 in respect of levels, privacy and overlooking.

A petition received 9th August (thus outside the normal consultation period) with 17 signatures in favour of the proposal and making the following points:

- Design is improvement on existing and will complement the Town Quay Conservation Area,
- Will provide for first time buyers,
- Building is of a high standard and will “enhance the general area”.

ZONE 3

24 69 P/05/0911/OA – 10 SEAMEAD STUBINGTON

Hampshire County Council – The County Council enjoys legal rights of way across the access and raises concerns about the creation of additional accesses and the loss of part of the beech hedge.

25 72 P/05/0921/FP – 57 OLD STREET HILL HEAD (LAND ADJACENT)

Three further letters have been received raising new objections:

- Proposed dwelling would over look and spoil privacy.
- The area is the last pocket of countryside left on the west side of Hill Head and is inhabited with many species of wildlife including badger, deer and foxes.
- Would exacerbate on-street parking problems.

Correction: Page 73 – bullet point 6 should read …new dwelling does not seem…
Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – No objection

Further Information

The desk study should be in accordance with British Standards Institute BS 10175: 2001 Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites - Code of Practice and should be carried out by or under the supervision of a suitable qualified competent person. This person should be a chartered member of an appropriate professional body and have experience in investigating contamination sites.

Please note that commercial property searches available over the internet are not considered to be sufficiently detailed enough to constitute a desk study in the context of the above condition. These desk studies do not formulate a conceptual model for the site neither do they qualitatively risk assess the site. They should not be used. Please do contact Wendy Harrison, Contaminated Land Officer to discuss this in more details.

Investigations have been concluded in respect of the use of the workshop area to the rear of the building, currently used for servicing and repair of vehicles. There would appear to have been a repair garage on site as long ago as 1950 at least. Subsequent planning history indicates continuation of a workshop use there, including for the repair of vehicles and use as a MOT station. In essence it would appear that a lawful use exists for this purpose.

26  75  P/05/0662/OA -125 MAYS LANE

A Supplementary Planning Statement has been received dated 4 August 2005 from the applicant addressing the following:

- The net developable area and density of development proposal;
- Safeguarding or resident badgers on site and definition/adequacy of safeguarded area;
- Indicative site layout considerations.

28  83  P/05/0849/FP – 9 WICOR MILL LANE

Remove condition: ‘Timescale for reduction in fence’

29  85  P/05/0860/CU – UNIT 6 CASTLE TRADING ESTATE

The comments from the Health & Safety Executive should read - No Comments

One additional condition:-
No stock/equipment to exceed over 2.75 metres in height along a 4
metres stretch along the south-west boundary.

Within the first paragraph on the fourth line the word south should be Self

30 87 P/05/0900/FP – 27 BAYLY AVENUE

Fax received 10 August 2005 stating that no part of the dormer will overhang the boundary.

31 88 P/05/0917/FP – 1 SEAVIEW AVENUE PORTCHESTER

Director of Planning and Transportation (Highways) – no objections subject to an amended plan showing the re-siting of the parking spaces on the frontage of the site.

Chief Health and Regulatory Services Officer – no objections

32 90 P/05/0851/FP – 300 DORE AVENUE PORTCHESTER

Satisfactory amended plans relocating the bin and cycle stores received 5 August 2005.

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – no objections subject to conditions.

Misc 2 97 20 SHRUBBERY CLOSE PORTCHESTER

One letter has been received with concerns that the fence is not very stable and at a total height of 7½ ft. is overbearing. A bamboo structure has also been attached to the trellis.