

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: Wednesday, 23 May 2018
Time: 2.30 pm
Venue: Collingwood Room - Civic Offices

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

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

(11) UPDATE REPORT (Pages 1 - 4)



P GRIMWOOD
Chief Executive Officer
Civic Offices
www.fareham.gov.uk
23 May 2018

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

for Committee Meeting to be held on 23 May 2018

ZONE 1 - WESTERN WARDS

- (1) **P/17/0998/OA** **WARSASH**
LAND TO THE EAST OF BROOK LANE AND WEST OF LOCKSWOOD ROAD
WARSASH SOUTHAMPTON SO31 9FG

Further concerns have been raised in respect of the loss of trees; impact on pedestrians and the need to view all developments together.

Since the publication of the report, 3 further representations have been received which raise the following concern:

The proposed highway mitigation works (mini roundabout at the bottom of Barnes Lane) will create a traffic hazard.

The cumulative effect of this planning application and all other planning applications for sites in and around Brook Lane and Lockwood Road must be considered. It cannot be considered in isolation. There needs to be a master plan bringing all aspects of highways and access for all sites together.

That we must be approaching a thousand new dwellings for Warsash now, concern over process and that arguments not taken into account.

In respect of trees and as advised within the officer report, the Tree Officer has raised no objection to the proposal; and the landscaping of the site will be the subject of a future reserved matters application.

In respect of the proposed highway mitigation works and that there needs to be a master plan to bring all aspects of highways and access for all sites together; the impact as a result of this development and others within Warsash has been considered. The Highway Authority is satisfied that the impact of the development can be mitigated.

Officers recommend no change to the recommendation as set out in the report.

- (2) **P/17/1500/FP** **TITCHFIELD**
CONIFER RISE THE AVENUE FAREHAM PO14 3QR

The proposed development would increase the number of bedrooms in this property to seven rather than six, as stated in the officer report.

- (5) **P/18/0235/FP** **SARISBURY**
LAND TO SOUTH OF ROOKERY AVENUE/ADJACENT TO 112 BOTLEY RD
SWANWICK SOUTHAMPTON

One further letter of objection has been received reiterating several of the issues already raised by other residents and also mentioning that the site is too small to accommodate six luxury houses. Concern is also raised over the potential for development on adjacent land in the future.

(7) **P/18/0317/OA** **SARISBURY**
LAND OFF SOPWITH WAY SWANWICK SOUTHAMPTON SO31 7AY

One additional objection has been received, however it does not raise any concerns not already summarised in the report.

The previous application reference P/17/0895/OA was refused for the following reasons:

The development would be contrary to Policies CS2, CS4, CS5, CS6, CS9, CS14, CS16, CS17, CS18, CS20 and CS21 of the Adopted Fareham Borough Core Strategy 2011 and Policies DSP6, DSP13, DSP14, DSP15 and DSP40 of the adopted Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies Plan;
And, Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework;
and is unacceptable in that:

(a) The provision of dwellings in this location would be contrary to adopted local plan policies which seek to prevent additional residential development in the countryside which does not require a countryside location. Furthermore, the development would not be sustainably located adjacent to or well-integrated with neighbouring settlements;

(b) The density of the proposed development would fail to respond positively to and be respectful of the key characteristics of the area, particularly its predominantly undeveloped nature, which would be out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in the area;

(c) insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the development could provide adequate north-south connectivity for wildlife including protected species;

(d) had it not been for the overriding reasons for refusal the Council would have sought details of the SuDS strategy including the mechanism for securing its longterm maintenance;

(e) had it not been for the overriding reasons for refusal the Council would have sought to secure the on-site provision of affordable housing at a level in accordance with the requirements of the local plan;

(f) had it not been for the overriding reasons for refusal the Council would have sought ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures to ensure that all protected species are taken into account during and after construction. These would include alternative provision for habitats, including networks and connectivity and future management and maintenance arrangements;

(g) in the absence of a legal agreement to secure such, the proposal would fail to provide satisfactory mitigation of the 'in combination' effects that the proposed increase in residential units on the site would cause through increased recreational disturbance on the Solent Coastal Special Protection Areas;

(h) in the absence of a legal agreement securing provision of open space and facilities and their associated management and maintenance, the recreational needs of residents of the proposed development would not be met;

(i) in the absence of a legal agreement to secure such, the proposal fails to mitigate against the adverse effects of the development on the safety and operation of the strategic and local highway network in the form of a financial contribution towards a Traffic Regulation Order;

(j) in the absence of a legal agreement securing provision of a financial contribution towards education; the educational needs of residents of the proposed development would not be met.

Note for information:

Had it not been for the overriding reasons for refusal to the proposal, the Local Planning Authority would have sought to address point d) above through the imposition of a suitably worded planning condition and points e) - j) above by inviting the applicant to enter into a legal agreement with Fareham Borough Council under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

The application is supported by a SUDS maintenance strategy, however the maintenance of the SUDS hasn't been secured via a completed s106, therefore a reason for refusal (part c) relating to securing the maintenance of SUDS is included in the recommendation.

The proposed updated recommendation is:

Recommendation

The development would be contrary to Policies CS2, CS4, CS5, CS6, CS9, CS14, CS16, CS17, CS18, CS20 and CS21 of the Adopted Fareham Borough Core Strategy 2011 and Policies DSP6, DSP13, DSP15 and DSP40 of the adopted Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies Plan; And, Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework; and is unacceptable in that:

(a) The provision of dwellings in this location would be contrary to adopted local plan policies which seek to prevent additional residential development in the countryside which does not require a countryside location. Furthermore, the development would not be sustainably located adjacent to or well-integrated with neighbouring settlements;

(b) The density of the proposed development would fail to respond positively to and be respectful of the key characteristics of the area, particularly its predominantly undeveloped nature, which would be out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in the area;

(c) had it not been for the overriding reasons for refusal the Council would have sought to secure the long term maintenance of the SUDS;

(d) had it not been for the overriding reasons for refusal the Council would have sought to secure the on-site provision of affordable housing at a level in accordance with the requirements of the local plan;

(e) had it not been for the overriding reasons for refusal the Council would have sought ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures to ensure that all protected species are taken into account during and after construction. These would include alternative provision for habitats, including networks and connectivity and future management and maintenance arrangements;

(f) in the absence of a legal agreement to secure such, the proposal would fail to provide satisfactory mitigation of the 'in combination' effects that the proposed increase in residential units on the site would cause through increased recreational disturbance on the Solent Coastal Special Protection Areas;

(g) in the absence of a legal agreement securing provision of open space and facilities and their associated management and maintenance, the recreational needs of residents of the proposed development would not be met;

(h) in the absence of a legal agreement to secure such, the proposal fails to mitigate against the adverse effects of the development on the safety and operation of the strategic and local highway network in the form of a financial contribution towards a Traffic Regulation Order;

(i) in the absence of a legal agreement securing provision of a financial contribution towards education; the educational needs of residents of the proposed development would not be met.

Note for information:

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

ZONE 3 - EASTERN WARDS

(8) **P/16/0557/DP/K** **STUBBINGTON**

NATIONAL GRID IFA2 LTD ROOM 25/26 FAREHAM INNOVATION CENTRE MERLIN HOUSE, METEOR WAY PO13 9FU

REPRESENTATIONS:

Officers and Members have been sent a further comment from the Hill Head Residents Association:

- The CAA has not answered the question put to their Head of Safety.
- The questions have, therefore, been put again.
- The point to Committee is that whilst you may approve this on the planning criteria, your approval does not rule out the CAA being very concerned about air operations at Daedalus after IFA2 is fully operational.

CONSULTATIONS:

Airport Manager, Regional and City Airports:

- By way of thorough processes I am content that the planning and testing has satisfied the airports requirements.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

Members will be aware, via the Officer Report, that Aerodrome safeguarding responsibility rests with the aerodrome licence holder/operator according to the CAA Guidance on Planning Consultation requirements. The Aerodrome Licensing regime is separate to the Planning Assessment of the proposal.

In this case the condition, the subject of this application, requires a deviation not more than 1 degree when 12 metres or more away from the Direct Current cables, measured at 1.5m above ground level. The condition sets no minimum deviation at distances less than 12m from the cables. As such the requirements of the condition are met. Members of the Committee will also note that the Airport Operator is content with the testing that has been undertaken and the results that have been provided to address the condition.
