Date: 3 September 2008

Report of: Director of Regulatory Services

Subject: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

SUMMARY

This report recommends action on various planning applications

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendations are detailed individually at the end of the report on each planning application
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAREHAM EAST</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0770/TO</td>
<td>Consent 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 PALLANT GARDENS, WALLINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARRY OUT WORKS TO OAK TREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVERED BY FTP014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0842/FP</td>
<td>Permission 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 RIVERSIDE AVENUE, WALLINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAISE ROOF TO PROVIDE ROOMS IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOF AND SIDE DORMER AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTENSION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAREHAM NORTH-WEST</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0815/FP</td>
<td>Permission 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 FAREHAM PARK ROAD, FAREHAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUNGALOW ON REAR GARDEN AND RE-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL EXISTING UNIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0872/CU</td>
<td>Permission 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216 GUDGE HEATH LANE, FAREHAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE OF USE FROM FINANCIAL +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES (CLASS A2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO HOT FOOD TAKEAWAY(CLASS A5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAREHAM SOUTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0695/FP</td>
<td>Permission 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 &amp; 42 WESTLEY GROVE, FAREHAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOLITION OF 42 WESTLEY GROVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND ERECTION OF 13 (2 BED)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APARTMENTS WITH ASSOCIATED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS, PARKING &amp; LANDSCAPING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HILL HEAD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0796/FP</td>
<td>Permission 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 MONKS WAY, HILL HEAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERECT TWO STOREY/SINGLE STOREY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRONT &amp; FIRST FLOOR REAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOF INCLUDING GABLE ENDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

dc-080903-r04 -Ism
P/08/0816/FP 4 LITTLE GAYS, FAREHAM
DEMOLISH GARAGE & EXTENSION & ALTERATIONS TO CREATE ACCOMMODATION WITHIN ROOF & ATTACHED GARAGE WITH ROOM OVER

Permission 18

P/08/0823/FP 33 CUCKOO LANE, HILL HEAD
ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION INCORPORATING GARAGE

Permission 19

P/08/0901/FP 4 SOLENT ROAD, HILL HEAD
RETENTION OF TIMBER PERGOLA AND CONSERVATORY

Permission 20

PARK GATE

P/08/0800/FP 108 BADGERS COPSE, PARK GATE
ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION (ALTERNATIVE TO P/07/1117/FP)

Permission 1

P/08/0906/FP BROOK LANE - 192-194 -, SARISBURY GREEN, - LAND TO REAR OF - ERECTION OF DETACHED BUNGALOW WITH PARKING

Permission 2

PORTCHESTER WEST

P/08/0779/FP PORTCHESTER ROAD - 34-36 -, FAREHAM
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLINGS AND ERECTION OF 12 DWELLINGS ASSOCIATED GARAGES,PARKING & LANDSCAPING

Permission 21

STUBBINGTON

P/08/0821/FP 14 FAY CLOSE, FAREHAM
ERECTION OF TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION & PROVISION OF SIDE DORMER

Permission 22
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Permission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0825/FP</td>
<td>32 ANKER LANE, STUBBINGTON</td>
<td>ALTERATIONS TO ROOF TO PROVIDE FIRST FLOOR ACCOMMODATION AND ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0848/FP</td>
<td>42 BURNT HOUSE LANE, STUBBINGTON</td>
<td>ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND REAR EXTENSIONS AND PROVISION OF FRONT DORMERS</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0873/FP</td>
<td>27 ERIC ROAD, STUBBINGTON</td>
<td>DEMOLITION OF CONSERVATORYATORY AND ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0876/CU</td>
<td>2 ALBERT ROAD, FAREHAM</td>
<td>CHANGE OF USE FROM RESIDENTIAL DWELLING TO HOSTEL LINKED TO PEEL HOUSE NURSING &amp; RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TITCHFIELD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0911/FP</td>
<td>29 CATISFIELD ROAD, FAREHAM</td>
<td>DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND ERECTION OF FIVE DWELLINGS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0917/CU</td>
<td>309 SOUTHAMPTON ROAD, TITCHFIELD</td>
<td>CHANGE OF USE TO MIXED RESIDENTIAL BUSINESS USE (CATTERY), ERECT 10 DOUBLE &amp; 1 SINGLE PENS &amp; TIMBER OUTBUILDING</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TITCHFIELD COMMON</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0749/FP</td>
<td>PRIMATE ROAD - ST ANTHONYS R C,</td>
<td>PRIMARY SCHOOL -, TITCHFIELD COMMON ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY FOUR CLASSROOM TEACHING BLOCK WITH REPLACEMENT PLAYGROUND &amp; PATHS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0828/FP</td>
<td>103 WHEATLANDS, TITCHFIELD COMMON ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR AND TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION (ALTERNATIVE TO P/07/0319/FP)</td>
<td>Permission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0843/FP</td>
<td>12 NUTASH, TITCHFIELD COMMON ERECTION OF TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION</td>
<td>Permission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0862/CU</td>
<td>10 HUNTS POND ROAD, PARK GATE CHANGE OF USE FROM BED &amp; BREAKFAST ACCOMMODATION TO MIXED RESIDENTIAL/ BUSINESS USE (HAIRDRESSERS)</td>
<td>Permission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WARSASH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0865/FP</td>
<td>112 GREENAWAY LANE, WARSASH ERECTION OF REPLACEMENT DWELLING</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0879/FP</td>
<td>SOLENT BREEZES HOLIDAY PARK, HOOK LANE, WARSASH, - SWIMMING POOL COMPLEX - RETENTION OF TIMBER TRELLIS TO EXISTING FENCE PANELS ON SOUTH &amp; EAST SIDES OF SWIMMING POOL COMPLEX</td>
<td>Permission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/08/0910/FP</td>
<td>200 WARSASH ROAD, WARSASH RETENTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, ALTERATIONS TO REAR FENESTRATION &amp; PROVISION OF ROOF TERRACE ABOVE</td>
<td>Permission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ZONE 1 – WESTERN WARDS

Locks Heath
Park Gate
Sarisbury
Titchfield
Titchfield Common
Warsash
OFFICERS REPORT - Simon Thompson Ext 4815

Site Description

108 Badgers Copse is a two storey semi-detached house situated at the south western cul-de-sac end of Badgers Copse in Park Gate. It is within the urban area of the Borough and forms part of a recently built housing estate built west of Telford Way, Park Gate, which is shown as a housing allocation on the Proposals Map of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

To the north and east of this property are other dwellings at Badgers Copse and to the south and west rear gardens of residential properties on Botley Road and Lower Duncan Road, Park Gate respectively.

Description of Proposal

This application seeks planning permission for a two storey side extension to the house at 108 Badgers Copse.

It would accommodate a new garage, kitchen extension and covered passageway at ground floor level and a new bedroom and en-suite at first floor level.

It should be noted that at the time of Officer's site visit, this development had commenced.

Policies


Relevant Planning History

P/07/1117/FP - Erection of two storey side extension - Permission October 1997.

Representations

One email has been received making the following points:

- No objection in principle, but concerned over two large yew trees in the neighbour's garden to the south west of the new build which are covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO);
- Unsure over the neighbour's responsibility over these trees registered to that property if they are harmed, the understanding being that the roots can not be disturb within a canopy radius of the trunks.
Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) - There are no arboricultural grounds for refusal.

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) - No highway objection subject to meeting full FBC parking requirements.

Comments

A similar planning application to the current one was approved in October 1997. That permitted scheme was three metres wide. The current proposal is 1.3 metres wider and incorporates a new covered passageway at ground floor with wider bedroom and en-suite above.

In terms of the representation received from the member of the public, the Council's Arborist has been consulted on the application and raises no objection to the latest proposal whilst being aware of the TPO trees next door. The grant of planning permission applied for would override the TPO protection to any tree roots directly affected by the development proposal.

The development would result in three car parking spaces within the application site which is over and above the Council's expected standard.

In street scene terms, Officers view the proposal as acceptable, bearing in mind for example its similarity to the already consented scheme and the fact it is somewhat hidden, situated at the very end and in the corner of a cul-de-sac.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: Materials to match; Remove permitted development rights for windows at first floor level south west elevation.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: Files P/07/1117/FP and P/08/0800/FP

(2) P/08/0906/FP PARK GATE
MR A BROWN Agent: MR DAVID NEWELL
ERECION OF DETACHED BUNGALOW BROOK LANE - 192-194 -
WITH PARKING SARISBURY GREEN
- LAND TO REAR OF -

OFFICERS REPORT - Susannah Chaplin Ext 2412

Site Description

This application relates to land to the rear of 192-194 Brook Lane which is on the corner of Brook Lane and Cumber Road.
**Description of Proposal**

Permission is sought to erect a detached 2-bed bungalow with access off Cumber Road. Two car parking spaces would be provided on the frontage.

No.192 Brook Lane currently has an access off Cumber Road to a parking area and garage, which would be demolished. Replacement parking would be provided off Cumber Road.

**Policies**


**Representations**

The neighbour notification period expires 26 August 2008. At the time of writing this report no letters had been received. Any letters subsequently received will be reported at the committee meeting.

**Consultations**

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) - No objection.

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

Director of Regulatory Services (Environmental Health) - No objection.

**Comments**

The site 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.

The existing dwellings would each retain a garden measuring 11 metres in length which is considered to be an acceptable size amenity area. The proposed dwelling would occupy a plot not dissimilar in size to others in the surrounding area. It is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

The proposed dwelling would be 11 metres from the neighbouring property to the south (No.1 Cumber Road). Officers do not consider that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on that property.

A Tree Preservation Order was recently placed on an Oak tree within the rear garden of No.194 Brook Lane following pre-application discussions relating to this site. The proposal would facilitate the retention of this tree. The Council's Arborist has advised
that tree loss on the site has been kept to a minimum and restricted to those poorer quality trees.

The proposal complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review and is considered acceptable.

**RECOMMEND:**

Subject to the applicant/owner first entering into a planning obligation pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on terms drafted by the Solicitor to the Council to secure a financial contribution towards off-site public open space and/or facilities and highway infrastructure improvements by the 22 September 2008.

**PERMISSION:** Materials to be agreed, Parking, Boundary Treatment, Remove PD: roofslope, Works in accordance with method statement & tree protection plan, Pre-commencement site meeting, Details of service routes, No Mud on Road, Constructions Hours, No Burning on Site.

**OR:** In the event that the applicant/owner fails to complete the required Section 106 by 22 September 2008.

**REFUSE:** Contrary to Policy; inadequate provision for public open space and highway infrastructure.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** File P/08/0906/FP

(3) P/08/0911/FP

COUNTRY HOMES (SUSSEX) LTD

TITCHFIELD

Agent: MR JASON CLEMONS

DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLINGS AND ERECTION OF FIVE DWELLINGS

29 CATISFIELD ROAD

FAREHAM

**OFFICERS REPORT** - Joanne Wilson Ext 2679

**Site Description**

The application site is situated on the southern side of Catisfield Road on the junction with Cherrygarth Road. The eastern boundary comprises of No.27b Catisfield Road and No’s 2b and 2c Larches Gardens whilst the southern boundary comprises of No.26 Cherrygarth Road.

The site is located within the urban area and there is currently a detached chalet bungalow on the site.

**Description of Proposal**
Permission is sought for the erection of five detached houses, three would be five bedroomed and the other two would have four bedrooms;

The proposed dwellings are of a variety of styles and heights, four of the dwellings would have accommodation within the roof and the remaining dwelling would be two storeys;

Four of the dwellings would have integral garages and an additional two parking spaces, whilst the remaining dwelling would have a detached garage and one additional parking space.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies – DG1; DG3; DG4; DG5; DG9; H2; R5 and T5.

**Relevant Planning History**


P/08/0233/FP - Demolition of Existing Dwelling and Erection of Six Dwellings - Refused 17 April 2008 - Appeal Lodged - not yet determined.

**Representations**

At the time of writing this report Nine letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Yet again the application is cramming too many properties into a small space which is out of character with the area;
- Three storeys has become common in Fareham and has changed the character of the area;
- Catisfield Village has managed to retain its charm, the proposal will result in Catisfield turning into another piece of sprawl;
- Inadequate parking spaces for the size of dwellings proposed; inevitably resulting in cars having to park on the road;
- Three storeys so close to Catisfield Road will be out of character with the area which is mainly two storey houses and bungalows;
- Insufficient car parking spaces which will result in parking on the surrounding roads;
- There is already very restricted visibility exiting from Cherrygarth Road, cars parking on the road will make the situation worse;
- The large nursing home on the opposite side of the road is a candidate for redevelopment and will be developed if this is allowed;
• Loss of wildlife;
• Existing drainage is inadequate and the proposal will increase flooding;
• The houses would be overdominant and as a result of their bulk, size and height detract from the streetscene;
• The gardens are too small and would not meet the minimum back garden sizes;
• Impact on the outlook and privacy of neighbouring properties.

The application has been publicised by a site notice and notifying neighbours; the publicity period expires on 29th August 2008. Any letters subsequently received will be reported to members at the meeting.

Consultations

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

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – the arboricultural method statement is sufficient to ensure the safe and healthy retention of the retained trees affected by the scheme. The tree management report should be conditioned and only discharged prior to the submission of Arboricultural supervision and site monitoring records upon completion of the scheme.

Director of Regulatory Services (Environmental Health) – no adverse comments.

Comments

The previous application was refused as it was considered that the proposed dwellings, by virtue of their number, site coverage, limited space between them and close proximity of Plot 4 to the junction of Catisfield Road and Cherrygarth Road, the proposal would appear unduly cramped upon this site, out of character and keeping with the immediate area to the detriment of the visual amenities of the streetscene; and finally no contribution towards the off site provision of public open space or highway infrastructure was secured.

In the opinion of officers the main issues which need to be considered in the determination of the application are:

• Principle of Development;
• Impact on the Character of the Area;
• Impact on the Amenities of Neighbouring Properties;
• Highways.

Principle of Development

The site 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 proposal has been amended by reducing the number of units by one; the width of the dwellings has been increased, but the loss in a unit has enabled the space about the buildings to be increased. The dwellings fronting Catisfield Road would now have a separation of 3 metres between them, an increase of 1.2 metres from that previously shown.

The proposed dwelling on the corner of Catisfield Road and Cherrygarth Road has been reduced by 0.4 metres to 8.8 metres high and would have a dual frontage to both roads, the scheme has been designed to ensure that there would be a transition from the existing houses which would rise up to the corner plot; as a result the dwellings do not appear to be out of keeping in terms of scale/height than the neighbouring properties; and in addition the plot on the corner of the road would still be 2.2 metres lower than the dwelling that is situated on the opposite corner of the road.

Due to the wide range of densities, dwelling types, heights and spaces between buildings in the surrounding area; it is considered that the amendments have overcome the concerns previously raised and the proposal would no longer result in a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

**Impact on the Amenities of Neighbouring Properties**

The closest neighbouring properties to the application site are No’s 27b and 33 Catisfield Road, No.26 Cherrygarth Road and properties within Larches Gardens. There would be a separation of 3 metres between the closest plot and No.27b Catisfield Road; No.27b has a bathroom window within its side elevation, this is not classed as a habitable room and the 3 metres shown would be acceptable.

With regard to No.27b Catisfield Road, this property has a lounge room window situated approximately 2.5 metres off the boundary, the proposed dwelling adjacent to this property would not infringe on a 45 degree angle taken from the centre of this window.

There would be a separation of 26 metres between the proposed dwellings and the properties to the rear in Larches Gardens and there would be a minimum separation of 16.4 metres between the first floor window and the private garden area of No.33 Catisfield Road, both distances are in excess of that required by Appendix 6 of the Local Plan.

Officers consider that the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

**Highways**

The representations received have raised concerns relating to highway safety and possible hazards created by on-street parking; the Council’s Highway Department has raised no objection to the proposals and considers that it would not result in danger and inconvenience to users of the adjoining highway.

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

Subject to the applicant/owner first entering into a planning obligation pursuant to section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on terms drafted by the Solicitor to the Council to secure a financial contribution towards off-site public open space and/or facilities and highway infrastructure by the 24 September 2008.

PERMISSION: Materials to be submitted; hard surface details; boundary treatment; landscaping; landscaping implementation; no openings within specified elevations; obscure glazing to specified windows; arboricultural method statement with site supervision; tree protection measures; no mud on road; hours of construction; no burning.

OR: In the event that the applicant/owner fails to complete the required section 106 by the 24 September 2008.

REFUSE: Contrary to Policy; inadequate provision to public open space and highway infrastructure.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0911/FP; P/08/0233/FP; P/07/1672/FP; P/07/0145/FP

(4) P/08/0917/CU
MR D & MRS N CALLAWAY
TITCHFIELD
CHANGE OF USE TO MIXED
RESIDENTIAL BUSINESS USE
(CATTERY), ERECT 10 DOUBLE
& 1 SINGLE PENS & TIMBER
OUTBUILDING

OFFICERS REPORT - Susannah Chaplin Ext 2412

Site Description

This application relates to a detached bungalow on the northern side of Southampton Road (A27) to the east of the Holiday Inn Hotel.

The site is located within the Countryside and a Strategic Gap. The site is adjacent to the Titchfield Abbey Conservation Area to the north.

The dwelling has one residential neighbour to the west but there are no neighbouring properties to the north or east.

The property has car parking space for three visitors to the front of the dwelling as well as residential parking to the side of the dwelling within the garage and on the drive.

Description of Proposal
Planning permission is sought to;

- Change the use of the dwelling to mixed residential/business use for use as a cattery.
- Erect a block of 10 double pens, 1 single isolation pen and a timber outbuilding to be used as a reception building.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies - DG1, DG3, DG5, C1, C3, C11 and T5.

**Relevant Planning History**

P/07/0572/FP  Erection of Twelve Double Pens and One Single Isolation Pen for Boarding Cattery Business  
Permission 22 June 2007

**Representations**

The neighbour notification period expires 29 August 2008. At the time of writing this report one letter has been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Adjacent to residential property and conservation area;
- Should be away from other residences such as 'Stubbington Ark' and 'Hounds Hill';
- Effluent disposal;
- Customers and tradesmen parking on the footpath;
- Loss of privacy;
- Noise.

Any letters subsequently received will be reported at the committee meeting.

**Consultations**

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) - No objection

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Conservation Officer) - No objection

Director of Regulatory Services (Environmental Health) - No Objection.

**Comments**

An application for the erection of cattery pens on this site was permitted in June 2007. The use has not yet commenced and the applicant wishes to make alterations to the size and positioning of the pens. It was previously proposed to erect 12 double pens in two separate blocks of 7 and 5 at the end of the rear garden. It is now proposed to erect 10 double pens in one block positioned on the western boundary at the end of the rear garden. The single pen would be the same size as previously permitted and would remain in the same location on the eastern boundary. A reception building
incorporating a food preparation area which would resemble a timber garden building
would be erected to the rear of the property's garage on the eastern boundary where
there is currently a workshop.

The site is located within the countryside. The Fareham Borough Local
Plan Review includes catteries within development or uses that may have an
overriding need for a countryside location. It is considered necessary to impose a
condition restricting the use of the site to a cattery only as any other animal boarding
home such as a kennel may generate higher levels of noise.

The application site and neighbouring property to the west have large rear gardens
and with the existing screening and separation between the pens and the
neighbouring property officers do not consider that the proposal would have a
detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupiers of that property.

There is sufficient space for three customer vehicles to park and turn on the site.
Customers would drop off and collect cats by appointment only to allow sufficient time
for consultation with each customer; this would reduce demand for parking at any one
time. The existing access will need to be widened to ease movements to and from the
site and this would be subject to a condition.

It is considered that the proposed change of use would be relatively ‘low-key’
and would not be detrimental to the character of the area.

It should also be stressed that the scale of the use proposed is virtually identical to that
already permitted at the site and which is still capable of being implemented. In light
the changes to the proposal since the previous permission was given officers consider
that the proposal is acceptable and consider that it complies with the Fareham
Borough Local Plan Review.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: Cattery Only; Parking; No employees other than those residing at 309
Southampton Road; Details of turning space and widening of access to be provided

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0917/CU
OFFICERS REPORT – Richard Wright Ext.2356

Introduction

Members will recall that this application was reported to the previous meeting on the 6th August. At that meeting Members raised concerns about the impact upon highway safety if the extensions enabled an increase in pupil numbers. Members deferred the application to enable officers to obtain more information about the school intentions and to seek legal advice about limiting pupil members and the implementation of a level 3 travel plan. The following report provides an update on these elements.

Site Description

- The application site is situated on the western side of Primate Road to the south of Ascot Close, The Hurdles and Stables Close. It is identified in the Local Plan Review as being an Education Establishment within the Countryside as well as providing existing open space. Land owned by Hampshire County Council abuts the south eastern edge of the site.
- Access to the school is via a pedestrian/vehicular main access from Primate Road and a secondary pedestrian access in the north western corner of the site from Ascot Close/The Hurdles.
- The school has one large building in the centre of the site with parking to the south by the main access. To the north of the school building are playing fields and a playground.
- Numerous large mature trees line the boundary of the playing fields including the boundaries backing on to dwellings in Ascot Close, The Hurdles and Stables Close. There are no Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) on any of these trees.

Description of Proposal

- Permission is sought for the erection of an extension to the north west of the school building to accommodate four additional classrooms along with an enlargement of the existing tarmac area to provide a larger playground and access paths.
- The proposed extension would measure 21 metres deep by 18 metres wide, and would feature a shallow pitched roof measuring 2.2 metres high to the eaves and 5.5 metres high to the pitch to match the height of the existing school building.
- Access to the extension would be via a set of double doors in the south east
elevation facing the existing building. Various windows and emergency exit doors are proposed also. The extension is proposed to be constructed of matching red multi facing brick and the roof with sheer finished profile metal. The north western gable end is proposed to be clad in Trespa or similar cladding panels.

- The proposed extension would be approximately 57 metres at its nearest point from the boundary of the school grounds to the north west, 55 metres from the south west and 80 metres from the boundary abutting Primate Road.
- The proposed additional tarmac area will be located to the north west of the existing area and would measure 13 x 24 metres.
- Additional tarmac footpaths are proposed to run around the perimeter of the extension.

Policies
Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies – FS3, R3, C1, DG3, DG5 and T5

Relevant Planning History
P/01/0461/FP – Erection of single storey extension to provide new computer suite and tutorial room – Permission 31 May 2001.

P/03/0749/FP – Erection of extensions to provide additional teaching areas and office space – Permission 17 June 2003.

P/03/1734/FP – Erection of single storey office extensions to south east elevation – Permission 18 December 2003.

Representations
Two letters have been received objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Increased pupil capacity exacerbating existing traffic congestion and parking problems on Primate Road.
- The effect this may have on the school’s efficiency to deal with neighbourhood issues to do with trees, fencing and boundaries.
- It will bring the levels of disturbance to properties in The Hurdles and Ascot Close that much closer.
- Concerns over the cumulative effect on traffic at certain times of the day of Hampshire Fire Authority setting up its Emergency Control Operations in this area.
- A lay-by is needed set into the grassed area west of the carriageway outside the school gates.

Consultations

Chief Planning & Transportation Officer (Highways) – As there is no increase in staffing nor pupils, it would be difficult to raise a highway objection or seek a transport contribution. We are aware of the pick-up problems arising from this site and will monitor the future situation.

Chief Planning & Transportation Officer (Arborist) – There are no arboricultural grounds for refusal and I therefore raise no objections – subject to conditions.
Comments

This application is in respect of a proposed extension to the school building at St Anthony’s R C Primary School, Titchfield Common, as well as associated works including the provision of a larger playground and footpaths. Policy FS3 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review states that extensions to existing institutions for educational purposes at existing schools outside the defined urban area will be permitted provided they are in accordance with relevant policies of the Plan.

Members will recall that this application was deferred from August’s meeting after concerns were raised about the potential for the school to use this proposed extension to increase pupil numbers in the future. Any increase in pupil numbers would have potentially significant traffic and parking implications. Officers were requested to investigate the feasibility of restricting pupil numbers or a pupil ceiling limit which when exceeded would necessitate the production of a school travel plan.

Since the last committee meeting the applicant has provided further information on their proposals and the overall context with regards to pupil numbers and traffic issues.

Firstly, the school have confirmed that they have had a travel plan in place since 2002. This has been reviewed on several occasions and is currently being reviewed with an expected completion date of December 2008.

Secondly, the school have reiterated the content of their Design & Access statement which accompanied the planning application to confirm that there is no intention to increase pupil numbers at the school. The school is currently overcrowded and falls short of providing the County and National guideline space of 37-38 sq metres per classroom. The extension is intended to bring the available teaching space up to the standard required.

Further information explains that the school is bound by the government’s class size policy and has a Published Admissions Number (PAN) which restricts pupil numbers to a maximum of 222 pupils. It is not within the remit of the school’s Governing Body to increase class sizes without consultation and approval from the Catholic Diocese of Portsmouth, Hampshire County Council (Education) and the Department of Children, Families and Schools. The school had a total of 203 pupils in 2007-2008 and has a total of 205 pupils for the 2008-2009 academic year. Notwithstanding this, should an increase in pupil numbers be proposed in the future and an increase in the PAN be sought, it is unclear whether wider considerations of a planning nature would be taken into account, for example the traffic implications of such an expansion. With the extension clearly providing the scope for this in the future, despite the statutory and non-statutory reassurances, officers are of the opinion that a condition restricting pupil numbers at the current PAN would be reasonable and necessary.

The extension itself is relatively modest in size in relation to the existing school site. Policy C1 of the Local Plan Review states that limited extensions to buildings in the countryside will be permitted provided they do not have an adverse effect on the character of the building or surrounding area. Given the appropriate design, location
and usage of the proposal officers consider this extension to accord with this policy. Given the distance from any boundary of the school to the development Officers so not consider the proposal would impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties.

The loss of this small area of existing open space to an extension of an educational establishment is considered acceptable within Policy R3 (para 8.32) of the Local Plan Review given the large amount of open space on site which would remain and the presence of the adjoining designation for Community/Education/Recreational use.

In conclusion, the proposal is deemed to accord with the policies of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review subject to the conditions, including a restriction on pupil numbers, set out below.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: materials to match, tree protection plan, school capacity not to exceed 222 pupils at any one time

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0749/FP

Site Description

This application relates to an end of terrace property on the south side of Wheatlands which is to the east of Hunts Pond Road.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension which measure:-

Two storey – 3.7 metres in width, 5.9 metres in depth with an eaves height of 4.8 metres and a ridge height of 6.5 metres

Single storey rear extension – 3.7 metres in width, 2.1 metres in depth with an eaves height of 2.2 metres and a ridge height of 3.2 metres.

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review – DG3 and DG5.
Relevant Planning History

P/06/1577/FP  Erection of Two Storey Side and Single Storey Rear Extension – Withdrawn 22-01-2007


Representations

One letter has been received objecting on the following grounds:

- The building is too high;
- There is always a ladder against the scaffolding which is dangerous;
- There is no ground in front for parking 4 cars and vans always in the road.

Consultations

Chief Planning & Transportation Officer (highways) - No objection

Comments

This application relates to an end of terrace property on the south side of Wheatlands. The proposal in principle was granted permission on the 20th April 2007 for the construction of a two storey side and single storey rear extension to the property. The extension would be used as an annexe for a relative of the family but with a shared stair well.

The alteration to the application is only to the roof design which links the single storey rear extension to the existing garage. The garage roof was originally proposed to be amended so that it was hipped the same as the roof on the single storey extension but the applicants are now proposing to keep the garage roof as existing and alter the extension roof so they tie up.

The two storey extension has been designed with a subordinate roof line and is set a total distance of 3.5 metres back from the front of the property. The extension is also set a minimum of 0.5 metres off the boundary with a public footpath to the east.

There are houses to the east of the site with the front elevations of their properties looking on to the proposed extension the closest being 13.28 metres away. Officers are of the view that as the extension meets the recommended 12.5 metres front to side relationship combined with the subordinate design of the extension, a detrimental impact would not be created either for neighbours or upon the street scene.

A resident of a neighbouring property raised the issue of parking on site but the Council's Highway Engineer was consulted on the application and raises no objection subject to the two spaces on site being secured by a condition.
The concern raised regarding the ladder encroachment on the footpath would be an issue taken up by the Council’s Highways section and is not a material planning consideration.

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

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: Materials to match, withdraw PD rights on the east elevation other than those expressly authorised, two parking spaces on site shall be retained

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0828/FP, P/07/0319/FP, P/06/1577/FP

Site Description

This application relates to an end of terrace property to the east of Nutash which is accessed via Longacres.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought to erect a two storey extension measuring 5 metres in depth, 6.5 metres in width with a ridge height of 6.3 metres.

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies - DG3 and DG5.

Relevant Planning History

P/08/0393/FP Erection of Two Storey Rear Extension
Refused 30 April 2008.

Representations

Two letters has been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Loss of light and overshadowing;
- The property would be disproportionately large;
- Loss of property value and impact on saleability.

dc-080903-r04 -lsm
Comments

An application for a two storey rear extension to this property was refused in April this year. The reason for refusal stated that the proposed extension would give rise to the unacceptable overlooking of the neighbouring properties to the rear to the detriment of the amenities of their occupants. The application property has a fairly small rear garden. The Fareham Borough Local Plan Review states that new windows that overlook adjacent dwellings must be a minimum of 11 metres from adjacent private garden areas. This distance of separation was not met and therefore the application was refused.

The current application indicates that there would be two high level windows at first floor level on the rear elevation of the proposed extension. Officers consider that this would prevent overlooking of the properties to the rear. An escape window can be provided on the side elevation which would only overlook a communal car parking area.

The application property does not currently extend as far back to the rear as the adjoining property to the south. The proposed extension would therefore extend 2.3 metres beyond the neighbouring property. The extension would be set 0.8 metre off the boundary. A line drawn at an angle of 45 degrees from the nearest windows of the neighbouring property to the south would not be breached by the proposed extension. Officers consider that in light the orientation of the two properties, the current stagger and the setting back of the extension behind the 45 degree line the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring property in terms of loss of light.

Loss of property value and the impact on saleability are not material planning considerations.

The proposal complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review and is considered acceptable.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: Materials to match, High Level Windows first floor rear elevation

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0843/FP
Site Description

This application relates to a detached bungalow to the west of Hunts Pond Road close to the roundabout at the junction of Hunts Pond Road, the A27 and Botley Road in Park Gate.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought to change the use of the property from a B&B to mixed residential/business use for use as a hairdresser’s.

Policies


Relevant Planning History

P/05/0050/CU Change of Use from Residential to B&B Permission 17 March 2005.

Representations

One letter has been received objecting on the following grounds:

- The property is too near the top of Hunts Pond Road to be a business;
- Cars turning in and out will cause a problem for pedestrians;
- The top of Hunts Pond Road looks like a ghetto without any more rubbish from another business owned by Kams.

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) - No objection.

Director of Regulatory Services (Environmental Health) - No objection.

Comments

The property currently has permission for use as a bed and breakfast. This application proposes to revert the majority of the property back to residential use with a small area
of the property used as a hairdressing business. The business would be operated by the residents of the property.

The property has a hard surfaced frontage with adequate room for at least 7 vehicles. It is not considered that the proposed use would generate significantly more traffic movements than the current use.

The proposal complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review and is considered acceptable.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION:

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0862/CU

(9) P/08/0865/FP WARSASH
MR R MEGGINSON Agent: MISS CAROLYN JENKINS
ERECTION OF REPLACEMENT DWELLING 112 GREENAWAY LANE
WARSASH

OFFICERS REPORT - Susannah Chaplin Ext 2412

Site Description

This application relates to land on the northern corner of Greenaway Lane and Brook Lane.

The site is currently occupied by a detached bungalow.

The site is located within the countryside and a local gap.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought to demolish the existing bungalow and erect a detached replacement two storey dwelling.

The replacement dwelling would be of a modern design with a timber frame, cedar clad and rendered walls and the roof would be clad in matt grey zinc. The building would have a curved design.

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies - DG1, DG3, DG5, DG9, H2, H11, R5 and T5.


Representations

Eleven letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Out of character with surrounding area;
- The proposal is for a house while all the surrounding properties are bungalows;
- The demolition of the existing property is unnecessary;
- The existing property could be extended;
- Setting a precedent for all types of development;
- Height and size of dwelling would be intrusive and unacceptable;
- The building would be more suitable for an industrial estate;
- Visual intrusion;
- Proposal to raise the height of the neighbouring property was refused;
- Overlooking;
- Plans do not show neighbouring property accurately;
- Reference to Dreamfields is not appropriate;
- The building is supposed to be a modern equivalent to a barn but has no features relating to a barn;
- Prominent corner position;
- The property would become a blot on the landscape;
- Contrary to policy;
- The owners have only purchased the site to make money.

One letter of support has also been received

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) - No objection.

Director of Regulatory Services (Environmental Health) - No objection.

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 site is located within the countryside. Policy H11 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review states that residential development in the countryside will not be permitted unless it is of an appropriate design and does not adversely affect the landscape and it replaces an existing permanent dwellinghouse with one, which by appropriate siting and design would not result in increased visual intrusion.

Impact on the Amenities of Neighbouring Properties
The proposed dwelling would have only bathroom windows at first floor level within the rear elevation. These windows could be conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed shut to 1.7 metres to prevent overlooking. It is therefore not considered that the proposal would result in loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties.

The proposed dwelling would have a single storey garage attached to the eastern side. The neighbouring property to the east (No.110 Greenaway Lane) has only one habitable room window within the side elevation; a secondary lounge window which would be over 6 metres from the single storey garage. Officers do not consider that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on this property in terms of loss of light or outlook. It is not considered that the proposal would have an overbearing impact on the garden area of this property.

The property to the north (No.76 Brook Lane) is set 6 metres off the boundary with the application site. A single storey extension to this property extends to within 1 metre of the boundary. The rear windows of the neighbouring dwelling would face the rear of the proposed dwelling. Officers are concerned by the proximity of the two dwellings and the impact that that the proposed dwelling would have on the neighbouring property as a result of the increased height and bulk. It is considered that the proposal would be unneighbourly and would have a detrimental impact on the outlook from No.76 to the detriment of the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupants of this property.

Impact on Character of the Area

The area is semi-rural in character particularly along Greenaway Lane where the road is narrow, unmarked and there are no pavements. The immediately surrounding properties are either bungalows or have been extended up into the roofspace to form chalet bungalows. There are a number of two storey properties including a newly constructed dwelling on the opposite corner of Greenaway Lane and Brook Lane but it is not considered that the application site relates to these properties. The heights of the neighbouring properties to the north along Brook Lane and to the east along Greenaway Lane should therefore be taken into account. The proposed dwelling would be 6.3 metres in height compared to the existing bungalow which is 5.8 metres. Although this only represents a height increase of 0.5 metre the bulk and visibility of the dwelling would be greatly increased.

The design of the proposed dwelling is modern. The building is two storey with curved lines and a low curved roof. The building is described as the modern equivalent of the traditional barn. The building is in close proximity to the neighbouring properties to the north and east and the site is located on a prominent corner position. It is considered that the design concept would be out of character with the surrounding area detrimental to the visual amenities of the area.

In summary, although the principle of erecting a replacement dwelling in this location is acceptable, officers have concerns regarding the impact on the character of the area and the impact to the neighbouring property to the north. The proposal is considered contrary to the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review and is considered unacceptable.

RECOMMEND:
**REFUSE:** Contrary to Policy; Detrimental to character of the Area; Detrimental to amenities of neighbouring property to the north (No.76)

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** File P/08/0865/FP

**OFFICERS REPORT** - Richard Wright ext 2356

**Site Description**

This application relates to the swimming pool complex located within Solent Breezes Holiday Park, Hook Lane. The complex comprises a toilet block, two sheds, and a pool plant building/entrance verandah on the northern side of the complex and the open air swimming pool itself. There is also a large amount of patio area surrounding the pool and newly erected decking to the south of the pool for various outside furniture.

The swimming pool area is bordered by a caravan unit to the east and surrounded on the other three sides by single width vehicular access roads. Across the road to the west lies the park's clubhouse, and to the south are caravan units. Across the road to the north is the park's reception building.

The pool complex's various finished floor levels are approximately 0.25 - 0.4 metres higher than the ground level outside of the perimeter fence.

**Description of Proposal**

Permission is sought for the retention of trellis attached to the top of a perimeter fence surrounding the pool complex on the southern and eastern sides. The fence is 24.5 metres in length along the southern perimeter and a further 21 metres in length along the eastern perimeter. The fence measures 1.94 metres high to the top of the close boarded fence. The trellis adds another 0.32 metres of the height of the structure. Softwood posts approximately 2.3 metres high support the structure at various points around the perimeter.

**Policies**

Relevant Planning History

None relevant to this specific proposal.

Representations

Four letters of representation have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The visual appearance of the fence;
- The fence has been erected without the knowledge of local residents and without the benefit of planning permission.

One letter of representation has been received supporting the proposal with the following comments:

- The fence is a great improvement;
- It acts as a solid windbreak;
- Parents with young children and teenage girls are much happier now it is screened from neighbouring properties.

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) - No objections.

Comments

Due to the differences in ground levels between the swimming pool complex site and the surrounding ground level outside of the perimeter fence, an additional section of trellis on top of the fence was erected to in an attempt to provide privacy for users of the pool. It is also intended to act as a more effective windbreak.

A shorter fence in a slightly different location was previously in place to a height of approximately 1.4 metres and was similar to that which remains on the western and northern perimeters of the complex. This fence was replaced in March/April of this year and was originally erected to a height of under 2 metres. A fence up to 2 metres in height in this location could be erected under permitted development rights and would not need express planning permission. However, the addition of a further 0.32 metres of trellis on top required planning permission to be sought as it raised the total height of the structure above 2 metres.

Officers are conscious of the fact that as a “fallback” position a fence up to 2 metres in height can be erected here. Officers are of the opinion that the additional section of trellis would not result in an obtrusive or unsympathetic addition harmful to the visual amenity of the area. It is noted that sections of open boarded perimeter fencing and vertical trellising are present at the swimming pool complex elsewhere and that in light of this such trellising is not out of keeping with the character of the area. Similarly, the addition of the trellis is not considered to have a material impact on the amenity of occupiers of nearby caravans which are some 8 - 9 metres away across the service road.
In conclusion officers are of the opinion that the proposal accords with the policies of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION:

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0879/FP

(11)  P/08/0910/FP  WARSASH
     MR J SUMMERS  Agent: MCANDREW MARTIN
     RETENTION OF SINGLE STOREY 200 WARSASH ROAD
     REAR EXTENSION, ALTERATIONS WARSASH
     TO REAR FENESTRATION &
     PROVISION OF ROOF TERRACE
     ABOVE WITH PRIVACY SCREENING

OFFICERS REPORT - Susannah Chaplin Ext 2412

Site Description

This application relates to a detached chalet bungalow to the south of Warsash Road located between the junctions with Harvey Crescent and Highfields.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for;

- Retention of an existing single storey rear extension measuring 3.5 metres in depth, 7.4 metres in width with a flat roof at a height of 3.5 metres
- Provision of a first floor roof terrace over part of the single storey extension with privacy screens
- Alterations to the rear fenestration including retention of a french door for access to the roof terrace

Policies


Relevant Planning History

P/07/0953/FP Alterations to Roof to Provide First Floor Accommodation and Erection of Front Extension
Permission 5 October 2007.
P/08/0002/FP Alterations to Roof to Provide First Floor Accommodation and Erection of Front and Rear Extensions (Alternative to P/07/0953/FP) Refused 13 February 2008.

Representations

The neighbour notification period expires 27 August 2008. At the time of writing this report no letters had been received. Any subsequent letters will be reported at the committee meeting.

Comments

Planning permission was granted for alterations to the property in October 2007 to provide first floor accommodation. In February this year an application was submitted to authorise a number of amendments to the approved plans which had been carried out during the construction. This application included the retention of a single storey extension and alterations to the rear fenestration to include a French door at first floor level leading onto the flat roof of the extension. This application was refused on the grounds that in the absence of any details of balcony screening to the roof terrace the proposal would result in the unacceptable overlooking of the neighbouring properties to the east and west.

The current application indicates that the roof terrace would not extend across the whole of the flat roof to the extension. An area measuring approx 11.5 square metres would be enclosed by 1.8 metre high privacy screens to either side and low railings to the front. A condition would be imposed to retain the privacy screens to protect the privacy of the neighbouring properties.

The property has a long rear garden measuring approx 33 metres in length. The Fareham Borough Local Plan Review states that new windows that overlook adjacent dwellings must be a minimum of 11 metres from adjacent private garden areas. This principle is also applied to balconies and officers therefore consider that the proposed roof terrace would not have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring property to the rear in terms of overlooking.

The proposal complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review and is considered acceptable.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: Privacy screens 1.8 metres in height

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0910/FP
MISCELLANEOUS ITEM

(1) Planning Application No.P/05/0858/VC - Variation of Condition 1 of P/97/0053/OA (To extend time limit for commencement of development)
Coldeast Hospital Site, Park Gate

Officer Report: Kim Hayler - Ext.2367

A Section 106 Agreement was completed and dated 13\textsuperscript{th} February 2006 in relation to the above planning application. It has come to light that a plan attached to the Agreement included parts of the Coldeast site outside of the red line planning application site. The Council have been asked to deal with this matter by way of a Deed of Variation substituting a corrected plan for the incorrect one.

RECOMMEND:

That Members authorise a Deed of Variation in relation to the above Legal Agreement substituting a corrected plan for the incorrect one.
ZONE 2 – FAREHAM

North
North West
West
East
South
OFFICERS REPORT - Emma Betteridge Ext 2677

Site Description

This application relates to a linked attached property on the south side of Pallant Gardens which is off Wallington Shore Road.

Description of Proposal

Planning consent is sought to carry out works to an oak tree covered by F.T.P.O 14. The works consist of reducing the crown by cutting back to previous pruning points (<2.5m) and remove epicormics from stem up to a height of 5 metres.

Policies


Relevant Planning History

P/03/0075/TO Crown Reduce Oak Tree by 10% Subject to F.T.P.O 14 – Consent 13/03/2003.


P/94/0986/TO Crown Lift to Height of 3 Metres on Oak Tree Covered By F.T.P.O 14 – Consent 02/11-1994.

Representations

No letters of representation received on this application.

Consultations

Chief Planning & Transportation Officer (Arborist) – No objection.

Comments

This application has been submitted to carry out works to one oak tree covered by F.T.P.O 14. The oak tree is located within the rear garden of 31 Pallant Gardens and
the works consist of a crown reduction by cutting back to previous pruning points (2.5m) and remove epicormics from stem up to a height of 5 metres.

The Council's arborist comments are as follows:-

_The proposed tree works will not be detrimental to the health and vigour of the oak and will have no significant adverse impact on local public amenity._

Officers are of the view the proposed tree works are acceptable and comply with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

RECOMMEND:

**CONSENT:** Works in accordance with BS 3998 (1989); 2 years, replacement tree.

**Further information:** Five day notice before work comments, care must be taken not to disturb wild animals and plants.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** File P/08/0770/TO

---

P/08/0842/FP
as amended by plans received 15th August 2008
MR NEIL GOMERY
Agent: THORNS-YOUNG LTD

RAISE ROOF TO PROVIDE ROOMS IN
ROOF AND SIDE DORMERS AND
ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE
EXTENSION

11 RIVERSIDE AVENUE
WALLINGTON

OFFICERS REPORT - Susannah Chaplin Ext 2412

*Site Description*

This application relates to a detached bungalow to the south of Riverside Avenue.

The property is sited at the junction of Riverside Avenue and The Heights.

Riverside Avenue is located on a steep slope. The application site rises in level to the rear so that the internal floor level of the property is approx 1.1 metres above ground level at the front of the property.

*Description of Proposal*

Permission is sought to;

- Raise the height of the roof from 6.3 metres to 7.9 metres to provide first floor accommodation;
- 36 -

- Install two small pitched roof dormers in the eastern side elevation;
- Erect a flat roofed single storey extension to the eastern side of the dwelling measuring 3 metres in width, 4.7 metres in depth with a maximum roof height of 3.3 metres above ground level.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies - DG3 and DG5.

**Relevant Planning History**

P/08/0519/FP  Raise Height of Roof to Provide Rooms in Roof Space & Side Dormer and Erection of Two Storey Side Extension

**Representations**

Four letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Disruption to road junction;
- There has been enough building in this area already;
- Damage to wall has not been repaired;
- Area is prone to subsidence;
- Alterations to foundations will be asking for trouble;
- Is the existing garage and drive to be retained?;
- Additional vehicles parking on the road;
- Out of proportion with neighbouring properties;
- Building would be too large for the plot;
- Out of keeping;
- Loss of privacy;
- Loss of daylight.

An amended plan has been received and the consultation period has been extended until 1 September 2008. Any further letters received will be reported at the committee meeting.

**Comments**

An application to extend this property was refused in May earlier this year. The application included raising the height of the property to provide first floor accommodation, the erection of a two storey side extension and one side dormer. The application was refused on the basis that by virtue of the height, width, bulk, and design, the proposed front gable build-up and two storey side extension would result in unsympathetic additions to this dwelling, out of character with other dwellings within Riverside Avenue to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene.

Since the previous application the proposal has been amended replacing the front gable with a barn hip. The two storey side extension has been replaced with a single storey flat roof extension and an additional dormer within the eastern roof plane. The
flat roof extension would be set back 4.7 metres from the front of the property so would not be prominent within the streetscene.

The surrounding properties are a mixture of bungalows and chalet bungalows with dormer windows. Officers were previously concerned by the introduction of a gable end to the front of the property as this would have been an alien feature within the streetscene and the property is within a prominent location. The proposed barn hip is considered to be more in character with the surrounding properties. It is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the streetscene or character of the area.

The proposed first floor dormer windows would not directly face into any of the neighbouring properties or overlook private amenity areas. It is therefore not considered that the proposal would result in loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties. Officers do not consider that the height increase would result in significant loss of light to the properties on the opposite side of the road.

The proposed extensions would not increase the number of bedrooms within the dwelling. The property currently has a detached garage and off-street parking for one vehicle. The Fareham Borough Council Residential Parking Standards suggest that the maximum number of car parking spaces that could be required for a property of this size in this location would be two. Officers therefore consider the parking provision satisfactory.

Subsidence is not a material planning consideration in the context of this planning application.

The proposal complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review and is considered acceptable.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: Rooflights to have min cill height 1.7m (west elevation), Remove PD roof slope (west elevation), Roof Tile to be agreed

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0842/FP

(14) P/08/0815/FP
MR MALCOLM BARTON
FAREHAM NORTH-WEST
Agent: MR DEREK LINDSAY
ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY BUNGALOW ON REAR GARDEN AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING PROPERTY
19 FAREHAM PARK ROAD
FAREHAM

OFFICERS REPORT - Susannah Chaplin Ext 2412
Site Description

This application relates to a detached bungalow to the north-east of Fareham Park Road close to the junction with Coppice Way.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought to;

- Erect a detached 3-bed bungalow to the rear of the existing property to be accessed via a driveway between the existing property and No.17 Fareham Park Road.

- Alter the roof of the existing property including the installation of front and rear dormers to increase first floor accommodation following the demolition of a number of existing rear extensions and outbuildings.

Policies


Relevant Planning History

P/00/0624/FP Erection of Detached Bungalow
Refused 3 August 2000

P/08/0355/FP Alterations to Roof to Provide Additional Rooms and Provision of Front and Rear Dormers
Refused 28 April 2008.

P/08/0356/FP Erection of Two Detached Dwellings
Withdrawn 24 April 2008.

Representations

Seven letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Overlooking;
- Loss of light and outlook;
- Overbearing;
- Noise and disturbance through use of access;
- Drainage;
- A previous application has been refused and lost on appeal;
- High screening on boundary will result in loss of light;
- Overdevelopment;
- Large emergency vehicles would be unable to access the site;
• Visually intrusive;
• How will refuse collection and recycling take place?
• Adverse impact on character and appearance of the area;
• Who will be responsible for the boundary fence?

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) - No objection.

Director of Regulatory Services (Environmental Health) – No objection.

Comments

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

• Principle of Development;
• Planning History;
• Impact on the Amenities of Neighbouring Properties;
• Impact on the Character of the Area.

Principle of development

The site 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.

Planning History

An application for the erection of a detached bungalow was refused in 2000. A subsequent appeal was dismissed. The Planning Inspectorate concluded that the proposal would introduce a cramped and overbearing form of development into the garden of No.19 which would be particularly harmful to the occupiers of adjoining properties in Coppice Way and Iron Mill Close. It was also considered that the access drive, parking and manoeuvring areas would result in noise and disturbance to Nos. 17 and 21 Fareham Park Road and 7 Coppice Way.

Since the dismissal in 2001 of the appeal relating to the proposed erection of a bungalow in the rear garden of no.19 Fareham Park Road, Planning Policy Statement 3 has been published. This Government statement reinforces the requirement for housing density policies to have regard to the desirability of using (urban) land efficiently. This should be taken into account as a material planning consideration.

Impact on the Amenities of Neighbouring Properties

The previous proposal featured a large area of hardsurfacing to the front of the proposed bungalow extending from boundary to boundary. The parking for both the existing dwelling and the proposed bungalow was proposed to be on the frontage of the bungalow. This would have resulted in vehicles from both properties utilising the
access drive. The current proposal provides a hardstanding to the front of the existing property for the parking of the existing property's vehicles. As a result only one property would use the access drive and the hard standing area has been greatly reduced in area with a buffer strip to each side boundary.

The proposed bungalow has been reduced in size since the previous application and rather than extending down almost the entire length of the site would now have a rear garden measuring in excess of 12 metres. The properties to the rear of the site are on Iron Mill Close. Officers do not consider that the proposed bungalow would overlook these properties as there are no windows at first floor level. Permitted development rights can be removed within the roofslope to prevent any windows being inserted at a later date without planning permission.

The properties on Coppice Way would back onto the side of the proposed bungalow. The distance from the rear windows of No.7 Coppice Way and the flank wall of the bungalow would be 12.8 metres. The Fareham Borough Local Plan Review states that a minimum separation distance of 12.5 metres would be required between the rear windows of a dwelling and a two storey wall. In this case this distance is exceeded however it should be noted that the proposed dwelling is only single storey. Officers do not consider that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties on Coppice Way in terms of loss of light or outlook.

The access drive to the proposed bungalow would be located between the existing property and No.17 Fareham Park Road. The internal layout of the existing dwelling would be modified to remove a sole bedroom window which would have faced directly onto this access. The two windows proposed within the side elevation of the existing property would be a secondary bedroom window and a bathroom both of which would be obscure glazed. The neighbouring property No.17 Fareham Park Road has secondary kitchen and lounge windows within the side elevation. The distance between the access drive and the neighbouring property would be 2 metres at its closest point tapering away to 3 metres at the rear of the property. There is a 1.8 metres fence on the boundary. In light of the reduced traffic movements and separation distance officers do not consider that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property in terms of noise and disturbance.

Impact on the Character of the Area

There are two very large commercial buildings to the rear of 23 and 25 Fareham Park Road so the proposal would not be the first backland development within the vicinity. It is not considered that the proposal would represent a cramped form of development in comparison to many other backland developments that have taken place across the Borough. Officers do not consider that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

Drainage has been raised as a concern as it has been reported that the area experience difficulties with flooding. This is not a material planning consideration in the context of this planning application. The ownership and maintenance of boundaries is a private legal matter between the parties involved.
Officers consider that the proposal complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review and National Planning Policy and consider the proposal acceptable.

RECOMMEND:

Subject to the applicant/owner first entering into a planning obligation pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on terms drafted by the Solicitor to the Council to secure a financial contribution towards off-site public open space and/ or facilities and highway infrastructure improvements by the 2 September 2008.

PERMISSION: Materials to be agreed, Parking, Boundary Treatment, Landscaping, Landscaping Implementation, Remove PD: roofslope, Obscure glaze and fix shut to 1.7m ground floor windows (south-east elevation of existing property), No Mud on Road, Constructions Hours, No Burning on Site

OR: In the event that the applicant/owner fails to complete the required Section 106 by 2 September 2008.

REFUSE: Contrary to Policy; inadequate provision for public open space and highway infrastructure.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0815/FP

Site Description

This application relates to a vacant unit last used as an insurance brokers office (Class A2) on the corner of Gudge Heath Lane and Highlands Road.

The site is located within the Highlands Road District Centre.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought to;

- Change the use of the unit to A5 for use as a Hot Food Takeaway;
- Install an external extractor flue to the side of the building.
Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies - DG1 and S7.

Relevant Planning History

P/93/1398/CU  Change of Use from A1 to A2
Permission 3 February 1994.

Representations

The neighbour notification period expires 19 August 2008. At the time of writing this report ten letters and one petition signed by 12 people had been received objecting on the following grounds:

- There are already 5 hot food takeaways in the precinct;
- There are other takeaways within a 2-3 minute drive;
- Local businesses are facing difficulty in the current economic situation;
- Other businesses may be forced to close;
- If this application is permitted one quarter of the shops will be fast food;
- Fareham Borough Council should support local businesses;
- Limited parking;
- Youths loitering and causing problems;
- Noise, heat and smells from extractor fans.

Any letters subsequently received will be reported at the committee meeting.

Consultations

Hampshire Constabulary - No objection.

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) - No objection.

Director of Regulatory Services (Environmental Health) - No objection.

Comments

There are a number of hot food takeaways within the Highlands Road shopping precinct including; a fish and chip shop, a chinese takeaway, an indian restaurant with ancillary takeaway and a kebab shop/pizza house. There are twelve A1 (retail) units including the large Somerfield's store and Co-op at opposite ends of the precinct; three empty units including the application site and one other A2 use.

The Fareham Borough Local Plan Review contains a policy relating to non retail uses in the local centres and parades. Policy S7 states that changes of use of the ground floor from Class A1 retail to non retail will be permitted, provided that the use would not extend or consolidate existing non retail uses so that they would dominate the character of the area and shoppers would be discouraged from using the centre or parade. This policy has been used in the past to refuse applications for changes of use to hot food takeaway where it is considered that the appropriate balance of retail
and non-retail was threatened. However this policy does not relate to the current situation which is for a change of use from A2 not A1. There are no other relevant planning policies within the Local Plan.

Whilst some other traders and local residents believe it is unfortunate that another takeaway is proposed, officers consider it would be difficult to argue the harm that this proposal would have on the retail function of the shopping centre as it would not result in the loss of any retail floorspace. The impact on the other takeaway businesses cannot be taken into account as a material planning consideration.

There is a large car parking area to the front of the shops on Highlands Road which should provide ample parking for the proposed use particularly during the evening period when the use of the proposed takeaway would be at its highest.

Environmental Health has raised no objection to the proposed flue and advised that provided the specification is fully implemented and maintained the amenity of neighbouring premises should not be adversely affected by reason of noise and smells.

The proposal complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review and is considered acceptable.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: Opening Hours 08:00-23:30 Monday - Thursday, 08:00-24:00 Fridays & Saturdays and 10:00-23:00 Sundays & Bank Holidays.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0872/FP
The grounds of Fareham College form the western boundary; Bishops Wood forms the northern boundary; No.44 Westley Grove forms the eastern boundary whilst No.38 Westley Grove would form the southern boundary.

The site is situated within the urban area and would involve demolishing No.42 Westley Grove and an extension on No.40 Westley Grove.

**Description of Proposal**

- Permission is sought for the demolition of an existing dwelling and for the erection of thirteen two bedroom apartments;
- The building would be 'L' shaped and will run parallel with the north and west boundaries; the building would be two stories adjacent to the neighbouring properties rising to 2 ½ stories up to the rear corner;
- A new access road would enter the site on the corner within Westley Grove, between No's 40 and 44 that would serve a central parking court with 13 car parking spaces;
- A detached building is proposed adjacent to No.40 which would be to store the refuse bins along with a detached garage for No.40; and detached cycle store building adjacent to the boundary with No. 44 is proposed;
- The garden area would be to the rear of the building adjacent to Bishops Wood along with additional landscaping.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies - DG1; DG3; DG4; DG5; DG9; H2; T5 and R5.

**Relevant Planning History**


**Representations**

Seventeen letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Recently the area has been destroyed by developers trying to push more houses into this small area and the area has been saturated with flats which are not selling;
- There is already insufficient parking around the area to accommodate the existing residents, the proposed number of parking spaces would be insufficient for the amount of residents and there is nowhere else for them to park;
- Redlands Lane is one of the most polluted roads in the Borough, this will only make things worse;
- The proposed building is totally out of keeping with the surrounding area which comprises of 1930's houses;
- The access to the grove is already a problem as it is a single track, this will essential double the amount of cars, worsening the situation;
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- The current drainage system is already overloaded; an additional 13 flats could cause significant health hazards;
- The application site floods when we have excessive rain, the proposed development would alter the water table and the potential for flooding would increase to other gardens;
- Loss of privacy and overlooking of neighbouring properties;
- The amount of people will result in a significant rise in the areas carbon footprint;
- The location of the buildings will detract from the current open views from peoples gardens
- Devalue neighbouring properties;
- Disruption to neighbouring properties during construction from all the noise, dust etc and furthermore there is nowhere for contractors to park;
- It must be unwise to build so close to the existing large trees; this will inevitably result in damage to the health of the trees;
- The proposal would result in the loss of trees to the detriment of the area;
- The green in the middle of Westley Grove is essential and should not be destroyed as it is one of the few areas that children can play, furthermore children often play around the square and the increase in cars will make this dangerous;
- The proposed layout and form of the building is out of character with the area;
- The creation of these additional residential units would lead to greater pressure on existing open space, play areas and sport pitches;
- There are currently newts living in the garden pond of No.40 Westley Grove and their habitats as well as other wildlife would be destroyed by the development;
- The amount of bins shown appears inadequate for the number of units, who would put the bins out and does the Council have a vehicle small enough to access the development, the bins would also attract vermin and smell in the summer;
- Loss of light to surrounding properties;
- We do not need more affordable smaller units, the proposal only benefits the developer and the Council through the extra rates;
- Other properties have suffered from subsidence, we want assurances that other homes will not suffer when No.42 is demolished;
- There is no useable garden or amenity space within the development area, such limited amenity is out of keeping with the area.

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) - subject to minor changes including the provision of footpaths and the alteration to the entrance, no objections.

Director of Regulatory Services (Environmental Health) - no adverse comments.

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) - in my opinion the proposed scheme will have no adverse material impact on the significant trees to the west and north of the application site, provided the development is undertaken strictly in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statements. This is a viable and fully supportable scheme in arboricultural terms subject to conditions.

dc-080903-r04 -lsm
Hampshire Constabulary - the applicant should be forwarded a copy of the memo and should take into account the points raised to ensure that the scheme is in accordance with Secure by Design.

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Ecologist) - there are woodland and hedgerow habitats close to the application site and the Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre hold records of bats within 100m of the site. A condition should be imposed for assessments and mitigation plans to be submitted to ensure that protected species are not affected, directly or indirectly by the development. The inclusion of larger gardens or open areas would provide for some mitigation for loss of gardens and reduce the impact on wildlife.

Comments

In the opinion of officers 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.

Principle of Development

The site 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. Furthermore outline consent has already been granted on this site for the erection of 12 two bedroomed flats so the principle for redevelopment has already been established.

Impact on the Character of the Area

The properties within Westley Grove comprise of two-storey terraced properties which run along the north and west sides of Westley Grove. The application site is situated in the north-west corner and the proposed ‘L’ shaped building form has been designed to continue the linear terraced form. The proposed building would be two storey adjacent to the existing properties, rising to 2 ½ storeys at the rear corner.

The siting of the proposed building would be behind the current terraced properties building line, this approach has been taken in order to provide the access and car parking facilities within the site frontage and furthermore the proposed layout is similar to that approved on the outline proposal.

It is considered by officers that the proposed design, in particular that the building has been designed to be two-storeys adjacent to the adjoining properties, has ensured that the proposed building would not be out of character with the prevailing pattern of development around the area. Concerns have been raised that 2 ½ storeys would be out of character; however, this element would be set within the rear corner of the site; it is considered that in light of its position and the transition between the existing properties up to the corner; the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on the character of the area.
Impact on the Amenities of Neighbouring Properties

The main impact from the proposal would be on the occupants of No's 40 and 44 Westley Grove. The impact on No.44 has been carefully considered, at the moment it is a mid-terrace property. The design of the building has ensured that the main living windows would look onto Fareham College, Bishops Wood or the central parking area. The windows that would look onto the rear garden area of this property would have a minimum separation distance of 20 metres. This distance is in excess of the 11 metres as required by the local plan.

With regard to No.40, due to the positioning of the building any impact from overlooking would be from windows in the side flank wall. There are two windows shown at each level, one would be a secondary living room window and the other would serve an en-suite; as a result both can be conditioned to be obscure glazed. It is considered by officers that the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Highway Safety

The representations received have raised concerns relating to highway safety and possible hazards created by further on-street parking from the new occupiers; the Council's Highway Department has raised no objection to the proposals and considers that the parking is in accordance with the Council's Parking Standards and the proposal would not result in danger and inconvenience to users of the adjoining highway. Furthermore, the outline consent has already granted permission for twelve dwellings each with one parking space.

Notwithstanding the objections that have been received, officers consider that the proposal is acceptable and complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

RECOMMEND:

Subject to the applicant/owner first entering into a planning obligation pursuant to section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on terms drafted by the Solicitor to the Council to secure a financial contribution towards off-site public open space and/or facilities and highway infrastructure by the 7 September 2008.

PERMISSION: Materials to be submitted; hard surface details; boundary treatment; landscaping; landscaping implementation; no openings within specified elevations; obscure glazing to specified windows; arboricultural method statement with site supervision; tree protection measures; protected species surveys and mitigation plans; no mud on road; hours of construction; no burning.

OR: In the event that the applicant/owner fails to complete the required section 106 by the 7 September 2008.

REFUSE: Contrary to Policy; inadequate provision to public open space and highway infrastructure.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0695/FP; P/07/0108/OA
ZONE 3 – EASTERN WARDS

Hill Head
Portchester West
Portchester East
Stubbington
Site Description

Number 14 Monks Way is a large detached house situated on the southern side of Monks Way, approximately 70 metres from the eastern end of this cul-de-sac road off Seafield Park Road, Hill Head.

This two storey house has long front and rear gardens to the north and south respectfully with two neighbouring dwelling houses close by to the east and west. Salterns Road bounds the property's southern boundary beyond which is a significant drop in levels to a public car park and then the esplanade beside the Solent to the south.

Number 14 Monks Way is in the urban area of the Borough as defined in the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review and is within the South-West Hill Head Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC) and the Coastal Zone of the Borough as also defined in the Local Plan Review.

Description of Proposal

This planning application seeks permission to alter 14 Monks Way by:

- Adding single, two storey and first floor extensions to the front of the house;
- Raising the height of the roof towards the front of the house, adding gable ends to the roof’s sides and roof lights to provide new second floor accommodation; and
- Replacing an existing section of balcony with a first floor extension and providing an additional balcony area on the southern side of the property.

Amended plans have been received since this application was submitted. The present plan shows a reduction in the number of roof lights proposed on the rear elevation, reduced down to four in number from 12.

These latest revised plans also specify that certain side windows, at first and second floor level, are to be glazed with obscure glass and fixed shut to 1.7 metres above internal floor level.

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review - Policies DG3, DG5, C5 and T5.
Relevant Planning History

14 Monks Way, Hill Head

FMU.3074/5 - Erection of house and garage - Permission May 1958.


P/06/0022/FP - Retention of rear conservatory - Permission February 2006.

P/07/1540/FP - Erect two storey/single storey front extensions and alterations to roof with provision of front and rear dormers - Withdrawn January 2008.

18 Monks Way, Hill Head

P/05/1333/FP - Erection of two storey front and side extensions and single storey rear extension and increase in roof height - Refused November 2005 - Allowed on appeal May 2006.

Representations

One letter has been received objecting on the following grounds:

- The multiple velux windows at the rear, reduced from 12 to 7 in number, would spoil the view of this and the adjacent row of buildings from Salterns promenade, be unsympathetic to local character contrary to Policies DG3 (A) and H3 (ASRC), detract from the street scene against Policy DG3 (A) and harm the special character of the coast when viewed from land and sea (Policy C5 (B))(Officers note: the plans have been amended further since this comment was received);

- For the above policy reasons, this part of the application should be refused. A more preferable solution would be to either have the windows restricted to the north side of the building, or for there to be a matching second dormer.

One letter and an email have been received from two different parties stating they have no reason to object and support the application.

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) - No highway objection.

Comments

This application seeks permission for some quite large changes at the front of this property. However, set back as it is from the road and with the existing boundary treatment at the front and side of this property's curtilage, the impact on the local environment, street scene and neighbours will be significantly mitigated with the design considered to be in character with the nature of development existing and being carried out in this locality.
In terms of the alterations to the front for example, the extent of the proposed single and two storey front extensions should be seen for in the context of development underway and permitted at 18 Monks Way two doors along to the east. At 18 Monks Way, a two storey extension is being built projecting over 5 metres in front of its eastern neighbour. At 14 Monks Way, the proposed two storey front element would not project as far, being proposed up to four metres in front of its eastern neighbour. A flat roof, (2.8 metres high), single storey element is proposed to project an additional four metres in front of this, which is softened and screened by a 2.3 metre high hedge on the boundary between 14 Monks Way and its immediate eastern neighbour.

In terms of the alterations to the roof, the main ridge would rise in height by approximately a metre, but this would still be 0.5 metre below the top ridge of its immediate neighbour to the east (Number 16), and only 0.2 metres higher than that permitted in 2006 at 18 Monks Way.

Objection has been received in respect of the roof lights to the rear. Certainly the initial proposal for 12 such roof lights on the south elevation facing the shoreline appeared overly intensive. The applicant, though keen to retain an opportunity to enjoy sea views from the proposed second floor accommodation, has responded to concerns over the number of these rear roof lights and has now proposed that they be reduced to four, located almost as one block of windows, centrally above first floor balcony doors. The result is a much more simplified and sympathetic arrangement which is not as extensive for example as that now being implemented at 18 Monks Way two doors along to the east.

Another consideration in respect of the four proposed rear roof lights is that three of them are proposed to be inserted into the existing roof slope of the dwelling. As a result, three of these roof lights could be installed under permitted development rights without the need for planning permission.

Taking the above factors into account, the rear roof light arrangement now proposed is considered acceptable despite the concerns raised by the objector.

In conclusion, this application is recommended for permission by Officers, subject to the conditions summarised below, and subject to a further amended plan making the cross section A:A, consistent with the latest revised loft plan and rear elevation plan received on 18 August 2008.

RECOMMEND:

Subject to an amended plan in respect of submitted cross section A:A to remove its illustrated south facing roof lights:

**PERMISSION:** Materials to match; First floor east facing bedroom and bathroom windows, and east and west facing second floor windows, to be obscure glazed and fixed shut to 1.7 metres above internal first floor level; Remove permitted development rights for further east facing windows at first and second floor level and further west facing windows at second floor level.
BACKGROUND PAPERS: Files FMU.3074/5, FMU.3074/15, P/06/0022/FP, P/07/1540/FP, P/08/0796/FP

(Hill Head)
P/08/0816/FP
MR & MRS MUSCROFT
Agent: SPACE & STYLE HOME DESIGN

Demolish Garage & Extension & Alterations to Create Accommodation Within Roof & Attached Garage with Room Over

Officer's Report - Susannah Chaplin Ext 2412

Site Description

This application relates to a detached bungalow which lies at the eastern end of Little Gays on the southern side.

The site is located within an Area of Special Residential Character.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought to:

- Raise the height of the roof to provide first floor accommodation;
- Replace a flat roof over a single storey element to the western side of the property with a pitched roof;
- Erect an attached garage to the eastern side of the dwelling following demolition of the existing detached garage.

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies - DG3 and DG5.

Relevant Planning History


Representations

Two letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- The building will be too large for the plot;
- Adverse impact on the surroundings;
- Not in keeping with this part of Hill Head;
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- Overbearing and oppressive to smaller buildings nearby;
- The scale of the house is too large and will be domineering;
- Insufficient space between dwelling and No.5 at first floor;
- Loss of visual gaps;
- Forward of the building line;
- Increased demand for parking;
- The tree in the centre of the road should be protected;
- If permitted construction hours should be limited by condition;
- Vehicles should be restricted from blocking entrances/exits.

**Consultations**

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) - No objection.

**Comments**

A previous planning application for a replacement dwelling was refused earlier this year. The reason for refusal stated that by virtue of the height, width, bulk and close proximity to the site boundaries the proposed dwelling would appear excessive in scale and out of keeping with the character of the Area of Special Residential Character. There was also an additional reason for refusal relating to overlooking from the first floor rear windows. This application was for a very large two storey property extending across much of the site frontage.

The current application proposes a number of alterations to the existing bungalow to provide first floor accommodation. The proposed dwelling would be chalet style with the majority of first floor accommodation accommodated within the roofspace. A small element would be fully two storey height to eaves but this element would be centrally positioned within the plot away from the boundaries with the neighbouring properties. The bulk of the proposed dwelling has been greatly reduced and the height has been reduced from 9 metres to 7.3 metres.

Little Gays is characterised by a variety of different house types and design styles. There are bungalows, chalet bungalows and two storey dwellings. Concerns have been raised regarding the size of the dwelling and the loss of visual gaps between properties. There would be 3.2 metres between the dwelling and the eastern boundary and there is no neighbouring property directly to the east. A single storey element of the dwelling is currently set on the western boundary adjacent to No.5 Little Gays and it is proposed to replace the flat roof over this with a pitched roof. A gap at first floor level would still be maintained. The first floor element of the dwelling would be set 2.8 metres off the western boundary. Officers do not consider that the proposed dwelling would be out of character with the area nor would it have a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the streetscene.

The rear garden is triangular in shape resulting in varying garden lengths when measured from the first floor rear windows. The nearest window to the boundary would serve a bathroom and would be conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed shut to 1.7 metres. The nearest of the two bedroom windows on the rear elevation would be a minimum of 11 metres from the garden boundary which meets the requirements of the Local Plan in terms of overlooking.
The proposal complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review and is considered acceptable.

RECOMMEND: Materials to be agreed, Remove PD first floor (east & west elevations), Obscure glaze and fix shut to 1.7m bathroom window (rear elevation).

PERMISSION:

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0816/FP

(19) P/08/0823/FP
MR & MRS KANJI
HILL HEAD
Agent: MR BARRY VERNON

ERECITION OF SINGLE STOREY
FRONT EXTENSION
INCORPORATING GARAGE

33 CUCKOO LANE
HILL HEAD

OFFICERS REPORT - Richard Wright ext 2356

Site Description

This application relates to a dwelling on the western side of Cuckoo Lane, Hill Head within the urban area. The application site borders the curtilage of a Grade II listed property, 27 Cuckoo Lane.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of a single storey front extension. The extension would incorporate a single garage, a small porch and a dining room.

The extension would extend to the front of the dwelling and would project 0.9 metres nearer to the boundary with 27 Cuckoo Lane than the existing bungalow. The extension comprises a number of elements and features various ridged roofs, the highest being 3.5 metres in height, all with hipped ends. At its greatest extent the proposal would measure 7.45 metres deep by 11.25 metres wide.

The submitted plans show a conservatory to the rear of the property. This element is not stated on the application form and therefore has not been considered as part of the application.

Policies


Relevant Planning History
P/07/1665/FP - Erection of single storey front extension incorporating double garage - Refused.

P/08/0343/FP - Erection of single storey front extension incorporating double garage - Refused.

**Representations**

Two letters of representation have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- Loss of outlook to occupiers of 27 Cuckoo Lane;
- The property would be far too large among the surrounding properties;
- Concerns over the property becoming a guest house or nursing home;
- Loss of view of the listed cottage;
- Multi-height roof will be harmful to the visual aspect of the dwelling.

**Consultations**

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Conservation Officer) –

This is an unlisted building sited adjacent to 27 Cuckoo Lane, a timber framed grade II listed property.

This application is a resubmission following the previous refusal of planning application P/08/0343/FP for a front extension close to the southern boundary and adjacent to the curtilage of the listed building.

This revised proposal has moved the proposed extension away from the boundary and has also reduced it in depth and height. The impact on the setting and views of the adjacent building have been reduced. No objection is raised to this revised scheme.

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) - No objections, subject to provision of a new crossing under licence from HCC, with 2m sightlines either side of the exit, maintained clear of all obstructions above 0.6m high, and signage to indicate "in/out" operation.

**Comments**

This planning application is a resubmission following the refusal of two previous proposals under delegated powers.

The first proposal (P/07/1665/F) which was refused in February of this year proposed a front extension incorporating a double garage. The garage was to be sited along the boundary with the neighbouring property at 35 Cuckoo Lane. Due to the excessive depth of the proposal, the application was refused on the unacceptable adverse impact which would be caused to the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring property. Officers also considered the design to be an obtrusive and unsympathetic addition to the property harmful to the visual amenities of the street scene.
A resubmission (P/08/0343/FP) which was determined in April of this year proposed an exact mirror image of the first with the depth of the garage along the boundary with the grade II listed building 27 Cuckoo Lane. This proposal was again refused on design grounds, but also on the harm that would be caused to the setting and character of the adjacent grade II listed building, 27 Cuckoo Lane.

This new proposal reduces the depth of the extension and the height of the various roof ridges. A further improvement is the relocation of the proposed garage element to the centre of the extension. By doing so the applicant has sought to address the reasons for refusal in the previous two applications.

The design is improved by reducing the size and bulk of the proposed roofs. There is a clear attempt also to avoid creating an unacceptable impact on the nearest window in the front of 35 Cuckoo Lane in terms of outlook and light. To the other side of the proposal, the depth of the extension along the boundary with the Grade II Listed adjacent building has been reduced by means of a cut away section and the proposed garage relocated into the centre of the frontage.

Officers have carefully assessed the impact of the current proposal upon the setting of the adjacent listed cottage. A gap of some 17 metres would be maintained between the flank wall of the listed building and the proposed extensions. The design of the proposed extension coupled with the relationship with the listed building would ensure that the views of the building would be retained when travelling southwards along Cuckoo Lane. Officers do not believe the setting of the listed building would be materially harmed, a view shared by the Council's Planning and Transportation officer (Conservation).

In conclusion officers are of the opinion that the proposal accords with the policies of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: materials to match;

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0823/FP
OFFICERS REPORT - Emma Betteridge Ext 2677

Site Description

This application relates to a recently constructed bungalow which fronts Solent Road to the north of 60 Hill Head Road.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the retention of -

i) Conservatory which measures 3.8 metres in depth, 3.8 metres in width with an eaves height of 2.2 metres and ridge height of 3.2 metres.

ii) Timber pergola measuring 5.5 metres in depth, 4.9 metres in width with a height of 2.7 metres.

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review - DG3 and DG5.

Relevant Planning History


Representations

No letters of representation received on this application at the time of writing this report. The application has been publicised by a site notice and notifying neighbours; the publicity period expires on 27 August 2008. Any letters subsequently received will be reported to members at the meeting.

Introduction

This application has been submitted on a detached bungalow which has recently been construction and was completed on the 8 August 2008. The bungalow was built on land which previously formed part of the rear garden of 60 Hill Head Road. Permission was granted on the 8 January 2007 through an appeal and the Planning Inspector attached a condition to the decision removing the permitted development rights on the site due to its size and constraints (as the site is an ‘L’ shape) giving the Council control over any future development.
Comments

This application is seeking retention of a pergola and conservatory which have been constructed on the site. The pergola has been erected at the front of the property which faces Solent Road thirteen metres from the back edge of the footpath, positioned over two car parking spaces and constructed from timber which is stained the same colour as the close boarded fence immediate adjacent to the structure. Officers are of the view that the location and design of the pergola is acceptable and does not have a detrimental impact on the character of the street scene or dwelling.

As the site is an 'L' shape, the private garden area is to the side of the property were the conservatory has been constructed. The conservatory is 20 metres away from the closest neighbour dwelling and therefore no loss of light or outlook have been caused and with the site being enclosed by a 1.8 metres close boarded fence the conservatory does not result in any overlooking. Officers are of the view that the conservatory retains the neighbour's amenities currently enjoyed and due to its modest size an acceptable amenity area is retained on site.

The application is considered acceptable and complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION:

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0901/FP

(21) P/08/0779/FP PORTCHESTER WEST
BARGATE HOMES Agent: WHITE YOUNG GREEN P.L.C.
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING PORTCHESTER ROAD - 34-36 -
DWELLINGS AND ERECTION OF 12 FAREHAM
DWELLINGS ASSOCIATED GARAGES,
PARKING & LANDSCAPING

OFFICERS REPORT - Joanne Wilson Ext 2679

Site Description

The application site is situated on the northern side of Portchester Road and comprises of two large plots currently occupied by two dwellings. To the west of the site is a recent residential development completed by Kings Oak and to the east of the site is 'Carleen' Nursing Home whilst properties within The
Spinney are to the north of the site.

The site is within the urban area and there are a number of protected trees around the boundaries of the site.

**Description of Proposal**

- Permission is sought for the demolition of the existing dwellings and the erection of 12 houses;
- The dwellings would provide five three bedroomed and seven four bedroomed properties within a variety of styles and heights;
- Each dwelling would have a garage and one additional parking space;
- Access to the site would be gained from utilising the existing road network within the Kings Oak development and the two existing vehicular accesses onto Portchester Road will be stopped up.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies - DG1; DG3; DG4; DG5; DG9; H2; R5 and T5.

**Relevant Planning History**

P/05/1686/FP - Demolition of 2No. Dwellings and Erection of 9No Houses and 13No Apartments - Refused 3 March 2006 - Dismissed on Appeal - 31 July 2006

P/06/1166/FP - Demolition of Existing Dwelling and Erection of 7No Houses and 16No Apartments - Refused 30 October 2006

P/07/0601/FP - Demolish Existing Dwellings and Erect Fourteen Dwellings with Associated Garages, Car Parking and Landscaping - Refused 7 August 2007 - Dismissed - 4 January 2008

P/08/0431/FP - Demolish Existing Dwellings and Erect Twelve Dwellings with Associated Garages, Car Parking and Landscaping - Withdrawn

**Representations**

Five letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- The access road is very narrow and visibility is restricted by a number of buildings, additional traffic will make the situation worse;
- Access to the site will result in the loss of visitor parking spaces,
- Parking around the area in already a problem and an increase in traffic will exacerbate the health and safety risk;
- Construction access should not be through the Oysell Gardens;
There is currently two accesses from Portchester Road which serve the existing houses, this should be reduced to one and this should then serve the proposed houses;

Nothing has changed since the previous application that was dismissed at appeal;

The Council should stop allowing continual applications and refuse the proposal;

The access road is always blocked by private and commercial vehicles, this should be dealt with before any more properties are allowed, as they restrict access and parking;

Noise and disturbance from the additional vehicle movements;

There is currently inadequate infrastructure and this will exacerbate the situation;

Loss of privacy and overlooking of neighbouring properties;

Disturbance to neighbouring properties during construction.

A letter from the Portchester Society has been received raising the following objections:

- This application is similar to one made earlier and some of the reasons urging a rejection then, are still pertinent today;
- A number of schemes have recently been granted permission and they all deposit vehicular traffic onto the A27, increasing traffic congestion;
- As the access to the neighbouring site is being utilised the two schemes should be considered as one and some of the houses should be allocated as affordable housing;
- Improvements to the transport infrastructure need to be made as stated in the South East Plan;

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) - no objections subject to amended plans being submitted showing the access being slightly modified to accommodate a turning head and the relocation of two visitor parking spaces.

Director of Regulatory Services (Environmental Health) - no adverse comments

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) - in my opinion tree loss has been kept to a minimum and their loss will have no significant adverse impact on the amenity and character of the area. I therefore consider that this is a viable and fully supportable scheme in arboricultural terms subject to conditions.

Hampshire Constabulary - the applicant should be forwarded a copy of the memo and should take into account the points raised to ensure that the scheme is in accordance with Secure by Design.

Director of Regulatory Services (Building Control) – A memo should be attached to the decision advising the applicant of the requirements of Part M of the Building Regulations.
Comments

There have been a number of planning applications on this site for a variety of schemes; the scheme for 14 dwellings was similar to that proposed, albeit at a higher density and was dismissed at appeal for the following reasons (P/07/0601/FP refers):

1. the access into the site would be flanked by houses and back gardens with limited window openings, this would provide an unattractive and unwelcoming entrance to the development and the effect would be overbearing;
2. the relationships of properties within the site would appear awkward and result in a cramped appearance and parts of the site would be dominated in car parking;
3. a number of dwellings would have limited gardens and would be sited close to the retained/protected trees, the size and proximity of the trees would result in inconvenience or fear of danger to future occupiers of the dwellings, as a result of shading, an overbearing presence and leaf or branch fall. It is likely that there would be requests to fell trees or to lop them in a way which could harm their appearance and amenity value or represent a significant longer term threat to their survival.

In the opinion of officers 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;
- Access and Highway Safety.

Principle of Development

The site 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

Within the surrounding area there is a variety of ages, sizes and designs of dwellings, Carleen Nursing Home and detached houses in large plots are situated to the east; two storey dwellings are to the north whilst the recently built flats and houses are to the west.

The scheme has been amended by reducing the number of units by two and completely redesigning the layout. The amended layout has resulted in the removal of the houses flanking the access road and there would now be a row of dwellings facing onto the access road as you enter the site. The loss in units has resulted in space about and between the buildings and the site would no longer be dominated by car parking.

With regard to the concerns raised about the proximity of dwellings to the existing trees, the depths of all the gardens have been increased and where there are trees in gardens, there would now be a useable garden area outside of the canopy of the trees. The Council's Arborist has been consulted and considers that the scheme
would no longer result in a detrimental impact on the health and wellbeing of the trees and the scheme is viable and supportable.

It is considered by officers that the changes to the scheme have overcome the concerns of the Planning Inspector and it would no longer result in a detrimental impact on the character of the area or on the protected trees.

Impact on the Amenities of Neighbouring Properties

The main impact from the proposed dwellings would be upon Carleen Nursing Home, dwellings within The Spinney and those units within Nile House. Along the boundary with Carleen Nursing Home there is tall row of conifer trees which screen the nursing home from the site and furthermore the proposed dwellings would look onto the flank wall of the nursing home at a separation of 19 metres at its closest point.

With regard to the properties in The Spinney, the proposed dwellings which would back onto these properties would all have a minimum garden depth of 12 metres and at its closest point and there would be a separation of 30 metres between the first floor windows; both of these distances are greater than those specified in Appendix 6 of the Local Plan.

There are no windows shown within the side elevation of Nile House (flats to the west) and the screening is shown to be retained along the boundary. Officers consider that the proposed dwellings would not result in a detrimental impact on the occupiers of the adjoining properties.

Access and Highway Safety

A number of concerns have been raised by the occupants of the properties to the west about the use of the access road. Access to the current application site was secured by a Section 106 Agreement preventing a ransom strip being created across the access road constructed by Kings Oak so as not to discourage development of this adjacent land.

Notwithstanding the objections that have been received, officers consider that the proposal is acceptable and complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

RECOMMEND:

Subject to the applicant/owner first entering into a planning obligation pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on terms drafted by the Solicitor to the Council to secure a financial contribution towards off-site public open space and/or facilities and highway infrastructure by the 30 September 2008.

PERMISSION: Materials to be submitted; hard surface details; boundary treatment; landscaping; landscaping implementation; no openings within specified elevations; obscure glazing to specified windows; works in accordance with arboricultural method statement with site supervision; tree protection measures; no mud on road; hours of construction; no burning.
**OR:** In the event that the applicant/owner fails to complete the required Section 106 by the 30 September 2008.

**REFUSE:** Contrary to Policy; inadequate provision to public open space and highway infrastructure.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** File P/08/0779/FP; P/08/0431/FP; P/07/0601/FP; P/06/1166/FP; P/05/1686/FP

---

**Site Description**

14 Fay Close is a bungalow on the western side of Fay Close approximately 80 metres south of this road's junction with Eric Road, Stubbington. It is just to the north west of the cul-de-sac end of Fay Close and is within the urban area of the Borough as defined in the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

This dwelling has an integral garage and existing space for at least two more cars to the front of the property.

To the north, east and south of this bungalow are other bungalows and chalet bungalows of Fay Close and to the west are the rear gardens of residential properties fronting Stubbington Lane.

**Description of Proposal**

This planning application seeks permission to add a 2.7 metre deep two storey rear extension to 14 Fay Close together with a small flat roof dormer approximately midway along the existing southern side roof of this property.

The rear extension would provide a lounge and kitchen extension and new utility room at ground floor and part of a new third bedroom at first floor with the dormer providing headroom for stairs to the first floor.

Within the existing roof space at first floor on the northern side of the dwelling, a new bathroom, second bedroom and the rest of the new third bedroom would be created.

**Policies**

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review - Policies DG3, DG5 and T5.

**Relevant Planning History**

**Representations**

One letter has been received making the following points:

- No further objection to this project so long as the privacy of the neighbouring residential property to west is maintained through the provision of completely obscure glazed windows to those windows that would look towards that property to the west's own gardens/windows, with an opening facility above eye level only.
- It is assumed some monitoring of this development will take place and measures would be in place to ensure the restrictions are adhered to.

**Comments**

This application is a similar proposal to that refused planning permission in July 2008. That earlier proposal was refused as contrary to Policy DG5 (B) of the Local Plan Review and the Council's Extension Design Guide in that the then proposed windows at first floor level in the west and north elevations of the proposed rear extension would give rise to unacceptable overlooking of adjoining properties to the detriment of the amenities of their occupants.

The latest application has addressed these concerns by proposing that the west facing first floor window of the rear extension be frosted and fixed shut to a height of 1.7 metres above internal floor level, and by relocating the first floor north facing window from forming part of the rear extension to being part of the existing dwelling. The relocated window, as a result, can be inserted under permitted development rights, the existing dwelling having been built in the early 1960s with no apparent conditions restricting such a window insertion. This relocated window could then be clear glazed and would provide amenity and light to the new third bedroom in mitigation of the fact that this bedroom's only other window would be the first floor west facing one of the rear extension that is now proposed to be obscure glazed and fixed shut to 1.7 metres.

In terms of the sole representation received from a member of the public, it is recommended below that the development be approved subject to a condition requiring the west facing first floor window that would otherwise overlook the neighbour's property be obscure glazed and fixed shut to a height of 1.7 metres above internal first floor level. This would overcome the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy.

In other respects the proposed development is considered to accord with the policies of the Local Plan Review and Extension Design Guide, with the only really visible change in the street scene being the introduction of the side dormer. The side dormer should be considered in the context that there are other properties in the road with side dormers, and the fact that it would be relatively well set back from the road frontage, is small and would be seen only really from the cul-de-sac end of Fay Close and not from the main vista when walking down this road. It is considered by Officers to be an acceptable addition to this dwelling. The side dormer's window is though recommended to be conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed shut to 1.7 metres, to
prevent the opportunity for overlooking from it towards side windows within 12 Fay Close to the south.

Overall, this revised application is recommended for approval subject to the planning conditions summarised below.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: Materials to match; First floor window in west elevation of the rear extension and of the side dormer to be obscure glazed and fixed shut to 1.7 metres above internal first floor level; Remove permitted development rights for further windows at first floor level in the north, west and south elevations of the rear extension.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: Files P/08/0602/FP and P/08/0821/FP

(22) P/08/0825/FP
MR & MRS K SEARLE
STUBBINGTON
Agent: SPACE & STYLE HOME DESIGN

ALTERATIONS TO ROOF TO PROVIDE 32 ANKER LANE
FIRST FLOOR ACCOMODATION AND STUBBINGTON
ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

OFFICERS REPORT - Susannah Chaplin Ext 2412

Site Description

This application relates to a detached bungalow on the eastern side of Anker Lane.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought to;

- Raise the height of the roof by 1.4 metres and build up the hipped roof of the bungalow to form first floor accommodation;
- Erect a single storey side extension to the north of the dwelling measuring 2 metres in width and 6.8 metres in depth.

Policies


Relevant Planning History

P/07/0979/FP Alterations to Roof to Provide First Floor Accommodation, Erection of Single Storey Side/Rear Extensions and Detached Double Garage

P/07/1337/FP  Erection of Detached Double Garage
Permission 29 November 2007.

Representations

Three letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Loss of light;
- Overlooking;
- Impact on outlook;
- Cramped form of development;
- Out of character;
- Inconvenience during building;
- Setting a precedent for further development in the Lane;
- Height and bulk are excessive;
- There has already been development at this property;
- Further development would be excessive for a small plot.

Two letters have been received in support of the application provided access to neighbouring properties is maintained during construction.

Comments

A previous application to provide first floor accommodation was refused in 2007. There were two reasons for refusal. The first reason for refusal stated that the proposed first floor rear windows would give rise to the unacceptable overlooking of the neighbouring property to the east to the detriment of the amenities of its occupants. The second reason for refusal stated that by virtue of its siting and resultant bulk, the building as extended to create a full two storey house would appear out of character with the area and would be harmful to the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

The current proposal differs to the previous application in that the previous application was for a full height two storey dwelling with two storey brick work up to eaves height. The current proposal is for a chalet style property with the majority of the first floor accommodation contained within the roofspace. The dwelling would have a gable ended front projection with full height walls to the south side of the dwelling. The dwelling has been designed in this manner to reduce any detrimental impact to the neighbouring properties and reduce the bulk of the dwelling.

The only first floor habitable room window on the rear elevation of the dwelling would be to the south side of the dwelling where the garden is the longest. This window would serve a bedroom and would be a minimum of 11.5 metres from the garden boundary with the properties to the rear. The Fareham Borough Local Plan Review states that new windows that overlook adjacent dwellings must be a minimum of 11 metres from adjacent private garden areas. The landing and bathroom window can be conditioned to prevent overlooking. Officers therefore do not consider that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the properties to the rear in terms of overlooking.
The height of the dwelling has been reduced from 7.8 metres to 7.35 metres. The overall floor space of the dwelling has been reduced from 202 square metres to 161 square metres. The bulk of the dwelling has therefore been greatly reduced. There are a variety of house types in the lane. The property immediately to the north is a chalet bungalow and the proposed dwelling would be of a comparable height. The properties to the south and on the opposite side of the lane are two storey. Officers do not consider that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the streetscene or character of the area.

The property to the north (No.34) has secondary kitchen and lounge windows within the side elevation. The Fareham Borough Local Plan Review states that a two storey wall containing no windows should be no closer than 4 metres to a secondary window within the side elevation of a neighbouring dwelling. In this case there would be in excess of 5.5 metres from the secondary lounge window and 7.5 metres from the secondary kitchen window. In addition the flank wall of the proposed dwelling does not represent a true two storey wall. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring property to the north in terms of loss of light or outlook.

Officers are of the opinion that the previous reason for refusal has been overcome and consider the proposal acceptable.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: Materials to match garage, Remove PD windows first floor (north, east & south elevation), Obscure glaze and fix shut to 1.7m first floor bathroom window (east elevation), Rooflight to have min sill height 1.7m above internal finished floor level (east elevation)

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0825/FP
Permission is sought for the erection of single storey front and rear extensions and the provision of two front dormers.

The front extension would extend from where the integral garage is currently positioned, at the front southernmost corner of the house. It would extend out to the side of the house by 1.6 metres to the boundary with the adjacent property and beyond the existing front elevation of the property by 5 metres. In all the front extension would measure 8.1 metres deep by 4.8 metres wide including some of the existing garage space. It would accommodate a new garage and a ground floor bedroom. The extension would feature a ridged roof measuring 2.65 metres high to eaves and 3.7 metres high to the ridge. The section of the extension to the side of the existing house would appear like a lean-to roof continuing the slope of the ridged roof. A garage door is proposed in the front elevation and a double paned window in the rear elevation. The resulting space between the front extension and lounge currently covered over by the main roof would be filled in to enlarge the hall and provide a new entrance door and small window in the front elevation.

The two proposed dormers would each measure 5 metres wide and feature a roof ridge 6.1 metres deep from the main roof plane and 3.5 metres high from the bottom of the dormer window's front elevation. Each would feature one triple-paned window in the front elevation. The southernmost dormer window would also feature a small window in its side elevation.

The rear extension would simply consist of a sideways extension of the existing lean-to extension. It would measure 1.8 metres wide by 3.4 metres deep with roof eaves at a height of 2.45 metres rising to 3.4 metres where it adjoins the rear elevation of the house. A further small extension is proposed to the rear of the existing extension also. This would measure 2.5 metres wide by 0.7 metres deep and would feature a flat roof to a height of 2.45 metres.

A small balcony is shown on the submitted plans. On the basis of the details shown the balcony could be created under permitted development rights without the need for planning permission.

**Policies**


**Relevant Planning History**

P/08/0561/FP - Erection of single storey front and rear extensions and provision of front dormers - Withdrawn.

**Representations**

Two letters of representation have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- Obstruction of views and change the "feel" of the whole lane;
- Limitations on light to adjacent property;
- Knock on effect to local parking;
• Would effectively make no. 40 and 42 appear a pair of semi-detached properties;
• Would open up the front gardens for building work throughout the local area and have an extremely detrimental effect on the local properties;
• Massing effect at the front;
• Close proximity of the proposal to the boundary;
• Concern over potential overhanging of boundary and access requirements for building work;
• Loss of neighbouring properties' kerbside appeal;
• Loss of privacy into home and garden caused by balcony.

**Consultations**

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Arborist) – No objections

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) - No objections

**Comments**

A planning application made earlier this year (P/08/0561/FP) sought permission for a similar set of additions to the property. However, officers had concerns that the front extension, which was originally proposed to be deeper, would have had an unacceptable impact on the light into and outlook from the nearest window serving a habitable room in the neighbouring property. Concerns were also raised about the proposal's potential adverse impact on the visual amenity of the streetscene, notably its positioning far forward of the street's building line. Following officer feedback to the applicant that the proposal would be unlikely to result in a favourable officer recommendation the application was withdrawn.

This new proposal addresses officers' earlier concerns over loss of light into and outlook from the nearest front window of the adjacent property at 40 Burnt House Lane. By reducing the projection in front of the house by almost 2.5 metres, the front extension has been brought behind a line of 45 degrees taken from the centre of the window concerned in the neighbouring property. In doing so the new proposal satisfies the guidance provided in the council's adopted Extension Design Guide which serves to amplify policy DG5 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review. There are also two windows in the side elevation of 40 Burnt House Lane serving non-habitable rooms (a ground floor WC and a utility room). Officers do not believe there would be a material impact upon these windows justifying the refusal of planning permission. In short, officers are of the opinion that due to the reduced depth of the proposed extension it would no longer create an unacceptable form of development to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring property.

At the same time this amendment has also mitigated concerns about the previous proposal's impact on the visual amenities of the streetscene. The reduction in depth of the front extension has brought the proposal parallel to front additions to the neighbouring property at 44 Burnt House Lane. During the case officers' site visits, other attached garages were noted in the frontages of properties further south along Burnt House Lane. Notwithstanding the presence of these garages much of Burnt House Lane is mainly of an open, spacious character with relatively little or low landscaping. However, properties close to the street's bend shortly before becoming Windermere Avenue are characterised by substantial hedging, trees and other
landscaping in front gardens. At the application site, this also serves to shield the property from view when approaching from the north and soften its massing and appearance from the south.

The proposal to extend at the front adjacent to the boundary with 40 Burnt House Lane would not, in the opinion of officers, be detrimental to the appearance of the two dwellings by virtue of its single storey height. A suitably designed ridge roof raking away from the neighbouring dwelling is proposed. Appropriate space would be retained between the dwellings and the two properties would still appear as two separate detached houses in the view of officers.

In conclusion officers are of the opinion that the proposal accords with the policies of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: window in south-western elevation of front dormer to be obscure glazed and fixed shut; materials to match; withdraw PD rights for windows in south-western elevation of front extension;

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0848/FP

Site Description

This application relates to a dwelling on the northern side of Eric Road, Stubbington. The property is a bungalow with a detached garage to the side and rear of the property in the north-western corner of the site. A small lean-to conservatory currently exists attached to the rear of the bungalow.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought to erect a single storey rear extension following the intended demolition of the existing conservatory.

The new rear extension would be 3.65 metres deep by 8.4 metres wide, and set in from the boundary by around 1.1 metres. Added to this would be a further section to the rear which would be set in further from the boundary by around 2.05 metres and
would measure an additional 1.7 metres deep by 6.4 metres wide. This second section would feature a dwarf wall to a height of 1 metre with the remainder of the elevations glazed and including a set of French doors. The extension would feature a short ridged roof measuring 1.7 metres long at the ridge, 2.6 metres high to eaves and 5 metres high to the ridge.

**Policies**


**Relevant Planning History**


**Representations**

One letter of representation has been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- Out of keeping with the front building line of Eric Road;
- Dampness in neighbouring property will be exacerbated;
- Obscure glazed window at side may be replaced in the future;
- The rear extension is unsightly;
- It will cause darkness along the side of 29 Eric Road.

**Consultations**

None

**Comments**

An earlier planning application this year (P/08/0605/FP) resulted in a split decision. Permission was granted for a proposed front extension to the property and a replacement single garage in the rear garden. A proposed rear extension was refused due to it being considered an unneighbourly form of development detrimental to the outlook available from and light to the adjoining property at 29 Eric Road.

It should be noted that some of the comments raised by the objector relate to the inclusion on the submitted plans of other proposed elements. For example, the submitted plans show the provision of a front extension which had been previously given approval under planning permission P/08/0605/FP and also the proposed insertion of a new obscure glazed window in the existing side elevation of the bungalow which could be carried out under permitted development rights. As such the proposal hereby being determined is taken to include only the proposed rear extension.

This new proposal for a rear extension at the property appears to have successfully overcome the prior reasons for refusal under planning application P/08/0605/FP. The excessive depth of the original proposal close to the boundary with the adjoining
property has now been reduced. The new proposal now falls behind a line drawn at 45 degrees from the centre of the nearest window in the rear elevation of 29 Eric Road thus satisfying the guidance of the council’s adopted Extension Design Guide. Potentially unacceptable overlooking of neighbouring properties on either side from side facing windows can be sufficiently addressed by condition by means of screening erected along each boundary.

With the above considerations in mind, officers are of the opinion that the proposal would not present an unacceptable form of development detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining property. By satisfying Policy DG5 Fareham Borough Local Plan Review the proposal is considered acceptable.

RECOMMEND:

PERMISSION: screening at a height of no less than 1.7 metres to be erected between the points marked XX on the approved plan; withdraw PD rights for windows in eastern elevation.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: File P/08/0873/FP

(26) P/08/0876/CU STUBBINGTON
MR & MRS AFGHAN Agent: PLANNING DEVELOPMENT
CHANGE OF USE FROM RESIDENTIAL REGENERATION
DWELLING TO HOSTEL LINKED TO 2 ALBERT ROAD
PEEL HOUSE NURSING & FAREHAM
RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME

OFFICERS REPORT - Susannah Chaplin Ext 2412

Site Description

This application relates to a detached dwelling on the northern corner of Albert Road and Newgate Lane.

Description of Proposal

Retrospective planning permission is sought to change the use of the dwelling from residential to a hostel for staff employed at Peel House Nursing and Residential Care Home which is on the opposite side of Newgate Lane.

Policies

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review Policies - C1 and H11.

Relevant Planning History

P/08/0315/CU Change of Use from Dwelling House to House of Multiple Occupancy - Refused 24 April 2008.
Representations

The neighbour notification period expires 20 August 2008. At the time of writing this report one letter had been received objecting on the following grounds:

- There are three families living within the property;
- It is not who occupies the property but how;
- The occupants have cars despite claims they can not afford them.

Any letters subsequently received will be reported at the committee meeting.

Consultations

Chief Planning and Transportation Officer (Highways) - No objection.

Director of Regulatory Services - No objection subject to condition restricting number of occupants to 7.

Comments

A planning application for the change of use of the property to multiple occupancy was refused in April this year. The reason for refusal stated that the proposal would be unacceptable in that the subdivision of a single residential property in the countryside to provide a house for multiple occupancy would be contrary to countryside policies which seek to prevent additional residences in the countryside for which there is no justification or overriding need.

The change to the application description since the last application is considered to be more appropriate for the proposed use. A house in multiple occupation could be occupied by anyone and landlords invest in this type of accommodation as a business venture. The current application is for use as a hostel to be directly tied with Peel House Care Home by a legal agreement so that the hostel could only be used in connection with the Care Home.

The application property is currently being used by the applicant as a place to accommodate a number of staff who are employed at the care home. These staff are generally not from the UK and are housed at the property for a temporary period on arrival in the UK until more permanent accommodation can be found.

Concerns were previously raised as to why it was necessary to employ staff from outside of the local area. The applicant advises that it is not always possible to employ staff locally due to the low paid nature of the work. Although this is a common problem in the public services generally there is no key worker status available to care home staff which might otherwise provide a competitive edge. Regardless of the differences in opinion expressed on this matter this is not a material planning consideration.

The property has recently had a number of improvements carried out to bring the accommodation up to satisfactory standard. General maintenance to the outside of the property has also been carried out including fence repairs. Environmental Health have
inspected the property and have advised that provided no more than 7 people are accommodated within the property at any one time there would be no objection.

The property has on-site parking for three vehicles. Being staff accommodation for use by Peel Lodge only, the property is considered to have adequate car parking provision. The property is on a regular bus route between Fareham and Gosport and within walking distance of local amenities including ASDA supermarket. Albert Road does have parking problems resulting from a lack of off-street parking however officers do not consider that this proposal would exacerbate the current situation.

Although this is a countryside location the proposal does not involve any building works which may have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the area. The location is considered to be the most appropriate for such a use being in such close proximity to the place of work. If the application were refused an alternative location within the urban area would only be likely to generate more traffic movements.

The proposal complies with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Review and is considered acceptable.

**RECOMMEND:**

Subject to the applicant/owner first entering into a planning obligation pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on terms drafted by the Solicitor to the Council to secure the use of the property as a hostel in association with Peel House Nursing and Residential Care Home by 15th September 2008.

**PERMISSION:** No more than 7 occupants at one time.

**OR:** In the event that the applicant/owner fails to complete the required Section 106 by 15 September 2008.

**REFUSE:** Contrary to countryside policies which seek to prevent additional residences in the countryside for which there is no justification or overriding need.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** File P/08/0876/CU
PLANNING APPEALS

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

APPEALS LODGED

1. **P/07/1501/FP**
   - **Appellant:** Mr Andrew Vincent
   - **Site:** 37 Botley Road, Park Gate
   - **Decision Maker:** Committee
   - **Recommendation:** Refuse
   - **Council's Decision:** Refusal
   - **Date Lodged:** 31st July 2008
   - **Reason for Appeal:** Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for the demolition of existing house and erection of 10 flats and associated external works including car parking.

2. **P/08/0334/FP**
   - **Appellant:** Mr Scott D Lemon
   - **Site:** 137 Brook Lane, Sarisbury Green
   - **Decision Maker:** Officer's Delegated Powers
   - **Recommendation:** Refuse
   - **Council's Decision:** Refusal
   - **Date Lodged:** 14th August 2008
   - **Reason for Appeal:** Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for the replacement of etched glazed window to south west elevation with clear glazed window.

3. **P/08/0712/OA**
   - **Appellant:** K Rose
   - **Site:** Land adj. to Windruff, Brownwich Lane, Titchfield, Fareham
   - **Decision Maker:** Officer's Delegated Powers
   - **Recommendation:** Refuse
   - **Council's Decision:** Refusal
   - **Date Lodged:** 14th August 2008
   - **Reason for Appeal:** Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for the erection of two detached dwellings.

4. **P/08/0621/AD**
   - **Appellant:** Mrs Lesley-Ann Ings
   - **Site:** 34 Stubbington Lane, Fareham
   - **Decision Maker:** Officer's Delegated Powers
   - **Recommendation:** Refuse
   - **Council's Decision:** Refusal
   - **Date Lodged:** 14th August 2008
   - **Reason for Appeal:** Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning consent for the retention of a non-illuminated sign.
HEARINGS

5. P/07/1636/OA
   Appellants: Mr Limburn and Mr & Mrs Bishop
   Site: Solent Road - 26 - 28 – Hill Head Fareham
   Decision Maker: Planning Development Control Committee
   Recommendation: Permission
   Council's Decision: Refusal
   Date Lodged: 27TH March 2008
   Reason for Appeal: Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse outline planning permission for the erection of two detached bungalows, garaging and new access.
   Hearing: 14TH October 2008

WITHDRAWN

6. P/07/0977/FP
   Appellant: CPI Active Retail Management
   Site: Centre Way – Locks Heath Centre – Locks Heath
   Decision Maker: Planning Development Control Committee
   Recommendation: Permission
   Council's Decision: Refusal
   Date Lodged: 18TH January 2008
   Reason for Appeal: Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for the erection of a new retail terrace with full mezzanine and re-configuration of car park and external areas.
   Withdrawn: 14TH August 2008

DECISIONS

7. P/07/1208/VC
   Appellants: Bensam Homes
   Site: 57 Old Street Hill Head – land adjacent to -
   Decision Maker: Planning Development Control Committee
   Recommendation: Permission
   Council's Decision: Refusal
   Date Lodged: 28th April 2008
   Reason for Appeal: Against the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for the variation of condition 13 of P/06/1618/FP (To enable provision of new pedestrian access gate in existing gap in hedgerow).
   Decision: Dismissed
   Date of Decision: 18TH August 2008

Enquiries:
For further information on this report please contact Lee Smith (Ext 2427).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZONE 1 – 2:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>P/08/0906/FP - LAND TO REAR OF 192-194 BROOK LANE, SARISBURY GREEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One letter has been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Visually unacceptable;
- Devaluation;
- Loss of natural drainage;
- Loss of natural environment;
- Additional noise.

| 3 10 | P/08/0911/FP - 29 CATISFIELD ROAD, TITCHFIELD |

Twenty-three additional letters of objections including a letter from the Catisfield Village Association has been received raising the additional following comments:

- Infilling within the immediate area has already changed the character of the road quite dramatically;
- If permission is allowed the following conditions should be imposed: existing mature trees and shrubs should be protected during and after development work, no construction after 17.00 hours or at all on weekends, contractors parking should be kept off Catisfield and Cherrygarth Road and the visibility at the junction should be improved;
- The dwellings would be considerably higher than the immediate neighbouring properties and would be in front of the building line;
- The loss of trees and shrubs would be detrimental to the streetscene;
- Plot 3’s position forward of the building line would be visually dominant and exacerbate the existing traffic hazard at the junction;
- The gardens do not comply with the minimum standards;
- Spaces about the buildings are too small and would be cramped;
- In the event that development is permitted the following conditions should be imposed: protection of existing planting, construction traffic and storage of materials should be accommodated on the site, remove pd rights and double yellow lines;
- There are covenants related to neighbouring properties that
prevents buildings being erected within 25 feet of the south-eastern boundary;
- A density of 33 dph would be totally out of character with the area.

Three letters of support have been received stating that ‘they will be directly affected by the proposed development and they are in support of the proposal as the developer has made considerable concessions in the design to ameliorate the impact. The developer has also removed dormer windows, proposed new trees and reduced the height of buildings. If the development is permitted can the Council condition the landscaping scheme and the retention of existing screening’

10  28  P/08/0879/FP - SOLENT BREEZES HOLIDAY PARK, WARSASH - SWIMMING POOL COMPLEX

One further letter has been received objecting to the proposed retention of the trellis on the following grounds:
- Out of character for the open plan site;
- Loss of outlook / very obtrusive;
- Dangerous to pedestrian access past chalets 10 to 16;
- Will set a precedent for similar fences in the future.

11  30  P/08/0910/FP - 200 WARSASH ROAD, WARSASH

This application has been withdrawn from the agenda

32  Miscellaneous Item - P/05/0858/VC - COLDEAST

Having sought further legal advice the recommendation should read:

That Members authorise a Deed of Variation in relation to the Legal Agreement stating that the covenants in the Agreement only relate to the land within the application site.

ZONE 2 - 4:00

13  35  P/08/0842/FP - 11 RIVERSIDE AVENUE, WALLINGTON

One further letter received objecting on the following grounds:
- Bungalows are still needed by elderly and handicapped;
- Noise, mess and pollution from builders;
- No site notice was put up;
The amended plan was submitted tactically at the last minute.

P/08/0815/FP - 19 FAREHAM PARK ROAD

The neighbouring property No.17 Fareham Park Road has secondary kitchen and lounge windows at ground floor level within the side elevation adjacent to the proposed access drive as stated within the report. The occupants of this property have requested that it is drawn to the attention of the committee that there is also a first floor bedroom window within this elevation.

P/08/0872/FP - 216 GUDGE HEATH LANE, FAREHAM

Six further letters of objection received raising the following additional objections;

- Traffic at this junction is bad and would be worsened.

ZONE 3 - 5:00

P/08/0796/FP - 14 MONKS WAY, HILL HEAD

An amended plan has been received on 26 August 2008 for cross section A:A removing its south facing roof lights as required

Officers have spoken to the author of the letter of objection (that is the chairman of the Hill Head Residents Association) and he has stated that, on the basis of the proposal now having been amended to show four roof lights on its rear elevation, their objection is withdrawn.

P/08/0901/FP - 4 SOLENT ROAD, HILL HEAD

Two letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- The Planning Inspector imposed detailed conditions restricting permitted additional development to an already cramped plot size;
- The Planning Inspector's decision states that no fences, gates walls shall be erected in front of the northwest elevation of the dwelling;
- The Planning Inspector's decision states that no extensions, porches, outbuildings or additional hard surface area shall be constructed;
- The conservatory will reduce the garden to below the requirements of any new property, particularly one within an Area of Special Residential Character;
- Overdevelopment of a very small site.
Thirty-two further letters received raising the following additional objections:

- The use of the hostel for workers brought into the UK does not address the local plans desire to stimulate the local economy or help develop the social well being of local people;
- A hostel still equates to a multiple occupancy dwelling;
- Planning permission for a mobile home for staff accommodation has previously been refused;
- No change has been made to the area's countryside location;
- This application would set a precedent for other business uses;
- Accommodation for families is required to contribute to the wider local strategic aim of providing housing for local family needs;
- Increased traffic on Newgate Lane;
- No safe crossing to Peel House;
- Lack of parking;
- No turning for vehicles on Albert Road;
- Overloading services ie. refuse collection;
- Potential strain on local health services;
- Will the neighbouring property be sold off as a hostel for people working in McDonalds?
- It has not been established that all occupants of the property will work at Peel house;
- There has been no change in legislation since the previous refusal and the application is the same in all but description
- If disposable incomes are sent home they will not benefit the local economy;
- Families of those working at Peel House should not be allowed to stay at the hostel;
- Other care homes have not had to employ staff from abroad probably by offering above minimum wage and other benefits;
- Is this not a breach of fire safety, overcrowding, health regulations?
- It has not been suggested that occupation of the hostel will be limited which would place strain on local services;
- Peel House has a two star rating not three.