

**SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Date: Wednesday, 15 September 2021

Time: 2.30 pm

Venue: Collingwood Room - Civic Offices

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

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

(10) Update Report (Pages 1 - 4)



P GRIMWOOD
Chief Executive Officer
Civic Offices
www.fareham.gov.uk
14 September 2021

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

UPDATES

for Committee Meeting to be held on 15/09/2021

ZONE 1 – WESTERN WARDS

(3) P/21/0148/FP [Locks Heath]

Locks Heath Shopping Centre, Centre Way, Locks Heath, SO31 6DX

An additional 123 objections have been received from local residents and 1 support comment has been received from Waitrose.

The representations received do not raise any new issues that have not already been addressed in the Officer's Committee Report.

(4) P/21/0693/FP [Park Gate]

Brookfield Community School, Sarisbury Green, Southampton, SO31 7DU

Representations:

One further letter has been received in response to the publication of the Committee agenda. The comments raised are:

- It is disputed that there will not be an adverse impact on neighbours (para 8.49) as we can already hear sports activity on the pitches behind the site at less frequent hours of use.
- Changing operating hours clearly acknowledges this will be a noisy venture.
- The construction schedule gives Brookfield Gardens residents far more consideration than the AGP.
- The pitch is too close to residential homes. There is so much room between this school and Sarisbury Infants.
- I'd have no objection if Everyone Active had made the application as no residents would be affected.
- Brookfield Gardens slopes down from the school so the site is actually higher than the neighbours. 2m high bunds will not offset the intrusive lighting on 5m tall stanchions or the noise from sport.

Recommendation:

Within the applicants Noise Impact Assessment it is recommended that a Noise Management Plan is implemented as part of the development. This can be included

with an adjustment to condition 11 in the main agenda to include “a noise management plan” as follows:

*11. Prior to first use of the Artificial Grass Pitch a community use agreement prepared in consultation with Sport England must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, The agreement shall apply to the Artificial Grass Pitch, any ancillary accommodation and the car park, and include details of pricing policy, hours of use, access by non-educational establishment users, management responsibilities, a **noise management plan** and a mechanism for review. The development shall not be used otherwise than in strict compliance with the approved agreement.*

REASON: To secure well managed safe community access to the sports facility, to ensure sufficient benefit to the development of sport and to accord with development plan policy.

(5) P/21/0942/FP [Titchfield Common]

8 Lower Church Road, Fareham, PO14 4PN

Further Information Provided:

Further information has been provided by the applicant in response to a third-party comment received in relation to the proposed plans. The points raised are:

- The proposed foundations have been assessed as suitable by the architect and have obtained building control approval.
- The proposed extension will be constructed wholly on the application property, and no part of the structure, including foundations or guttering, will project over the property boundary.
- As a result of building works at the adjoining property, the current structure has suffered from water ingress, which is causing damp in ground floor rooms.
- No access will be required across neighbouring properties in order to carry out any construction works.

ZONE 2 – FAREHAM

None

ZONE 3 – EASTERN WARDS

(6) P/21/1358/FP – **Consultation Only** [Portchester East]

Castle Street Conservation Area, Portchester

Since the publication of the Committee Report, an additional consultation comment from English Heritage has been received, stating:

Some of the works proposals are within the English Heritage Guardianship area of Portchester castle and full consultation with and approval by English Heritage is required here. Archaeological monitoring and recording is likely to be required, together with agreement on dates of access and works methodology. Replacement with a similar colour to the existing lampposts is likely to be preferred.

In addition, scheduled monument consent from Historic England for works within the scheduled monument area will be required.

Discussions are already underway with FBC officers and SSE on these aspects.

In addition, Historic England have updated their response to reflect the age of the existing columns. However, this amendment has not changed their view regarding the removal of the existing columns.

Further email correspondence has continued with SSEC and FBC since publication of the report, requesting the suitability of the root plated Norwich columns for fixing and the cost difference between the proposed Gainsborough and requested Norwich columns.

SSEC response to Norwich Column Option:

Following a contract review of the units to be replaced in Castle Street and Hospital Lane Portchester the view from the PFI responsibilities have been fulfilled with the proposal to replace the existing units with a standard tubular steel shaft and using one of two options of embellishment kit.

1. The Gainsborough embellishment kit, black or green in colour.
2. The Chandler embellishment kit, black or green in colour. This kit has been used to replace one unit already in Castle street as it had been RTC'd.

SSE Contracting have investigated your suggestion of the Norwich unit, and we have given this suggestion our full consideration. However, we have already removed and replaced many cast columns within the Hampshire PFI using one of our two proposed column embellishment kits, hence our proposal is deemed an equal equivalent, and a higher standard column is not required. The previously replaced columns on the Hampshire PFI have been replaced with either the Gainsborough kit or Chandler kit which are both of the correct standard and specification set out with in the Hampshire PFI contract with Hampshire County Council.

Please confirm which one of the two options you are happy to move forward with so that I may programme the units replacement.

If we do not hear from you by the 17th September 2021, we will proceed with the Chandler embellishment kit to match the unit 22 Castle Street that had been replaced under maintenance through the PFI.