

WRITTEN DEPUTATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE

These written deputations are to be considered in line with the Council's deputation scheme.

(1) WRITTEN DEPUTATIONS (Pages 1 - 5)

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

Written Deputation of the Fareham Society on P/23/1341/OA Land West of Fareham Park Road

As stated in its letter of 21st October 2023 the Farham Society object to this development on the grounds that being beyond the development boundary of the Local Plan and in an Area of Special Landscape Quality (ASLQ) it would be contrary to Local Plan Policies DS1 (Development in the countryside) and DS3 (protecting and enhancing ASLQs). It would also run counter to the objectives of the Strategic Gap.

I have the following observations on the Committee Report.

First. The Report refers to sub paragraph b of Policy DS1 which supports development in the countryside where it is on previously developed land (pdl) and says that the site is such land. However, this is clearly counter to the officer view on application P/16/1424/OA recommending refusal for 10 houses on part of the current application site. It states that “grass and vegetation cover significant areas of the site and is gradually reclaiming many of the hard surfaced areas”, and that the site is thus not (pdl). There are no substantial grounds to take a different view, for although the Inspector on the appeal on P/18/0363/OA referred to the site as pdl he provided no evidence to support that view.

Second. Even were the site considered pdl it would have, under Policy DP1, to be appropriate for the proposed use. This would not be the case given the site’s location in an ASLQ and the harm that would be caused to that area, a point clearly made by officers on the, albeit slightly larger proposal, on P/16/1424/OA. Moreover, not only would the current proposal be a significant intrusion in its own right but it would make it difficult to resist further development to the east, north and south. Although the inspector dismissed the appeal on P/18/0363/OA which included land to the south that was on the basis of things as they stand now. If the development before you were permitted then a different view could be taken in any future application to the south.

Third. Whilst the Committee report looks in isolation at the harm of this proposal on the Strategic Gap it is important too to look at the cumulative harm to the objective of the Gap that would arise from the proposed development making it difficult to resist further development on substantial parcels of adjoining land.

The Committee is urged to refuse permission.

The officers report tells us PREVIOUS appeal decisions are a material planning consideration, so P/18/0363/OA the INDEPENDENT inspector says “Located on the edge of the settlement, the appeal site is made up of previously developed land currently in use as a caravan storage facility and otherwise comprises a large field. Whilst the caravan storage has a somewhat unkempt appearance, there is no doubt that the undeveloped appearance of the field, with its gentle slope towards the adjacent woodland area, makes a very pleasant and important contribution to the open and spacious character. The extensive areas of hardstanding required for the provision of access and parking, would constitute an urbanising form of development which would extend the settlement further into the countryside. The development would erode the spacious and open nature of the site and greatly diminish its contribution to the character of its surroundings, which would be evident from various viewpoints, including nearby properties and public rights of way. Especially in winter months when the hedgerow/trees are not in leaf.

ECOSA Produce: 27th September 2023 Date of: Survey 20th July 2022 - 29th September 2022
Statutory designated sites lie within the Zone of Influence of the site and Iron Mill Coppice SINC is present directly adjacent to the southern site boundary. Previously stated 40 metres from proposed build not the 80 this report states. Also that updating survey work may be required, particularly if development does not commence within 18 months of the date of the most recent relevant survey , so march 2024!

Catherine Hester

Resident and Ex Councillor for area

Deputation Submission by Samuel Wright

Planning Committee meeting: 14 February 2024

Planning Application No: P/23/1341/OA – Land West of Fareham Park Road

Hope Lodge Close is a small residential development, predominantly occupied by families and provides a quiet and safe residential environment that allows families to enjoy the space without fear of danger from road traffic and other users. In a short, abridged summary, our principal objections are as follows:

1. Site resides within the Meon Strategic Gap (DS2) & countryside (DS1), two planning appeals APP/A1720/W/21/3271214 and APP/A1720/A/13/2203892 confirmed the site is Countryside and not suitable for development.
2. Proposal of more than 4 units lies outside of the defined Urban Area and does not comply with policy HP2 and HP4.
3. Significant wildlife activity (inc. protected species) on and next to site which will be lost/disturbed (contrary to DS3).
4. Site not identified as a housing allocation area in the Local Plan. Areas HA22, 49 & 50 allocated for housing within 1km of this site will meet local demand, these should be utilised first.
5. Approval would be contradictory to previous but still relevant planning refusals and appeal dismissals, namely those detailed in P/18/0363/OA; APP/A1720/W/21/3271214; P/13/0137/OA; PP/A1720/A/13/2203892; P/16/1424/OA; P/21/1943/FP; P/21/1943/FP.
6. Harm to the amenities enjoyed by residents including bridleways, valuable green space, privacy, and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe residential environment.
7. Insufficient and unsuitable access for construction vehicles to gain entry to the site without causing a highway hazard or inconveniencing neighbours.
8. Density of properties is far greater than the existing dwellings in Hope Lodge Close and design is not in keeping with the existing abutting development. (contrary to HP2).

Written Deputation – Peter Davies

P/23/1341/OA – land West of Fareham Park Road

1. It is clearly located outside of the urban boundary.
2. It is an environmentally sensitive areas, as it is adjacent to the Iron Mill Coppice SINC and possible run off to the River Meon.
3. It lies within a countryside strategic gap and officers confirm that none of the policies of HP1 apply in this case.
4. It is premature for the application to be granted, until outstanding issues are resolved, for example would there be at least nitrogen neutrality and is there potential contamination.

P/23/1445/VC – 53 Old Street

We wish to provide the Planning Committee with more details about our objections and show some photos to help appreciate the issues that will arise from allowing vehicular/pedestrian access to the front of the property.

The proposed off road entrance is directly opposite our drive which will add to the potential danger whilst exiting our properties. The new entrance is on an inside bend and the recommended visibility splays from the South are not available or possible within the owner's control, confirmed by Hampshire Highways.

The photos looking south and North along Old Street demonstrate normal parking on the Eastern side of Old Street and the narrowness of the road at this point.

A further photo of the rear parking that already exists for up to 4 cars is attached and furthermore the short access lane to the property has space for up to 2 visitor's cars.

Google Earth Photo shows the full screening of the property that existed before the owner removed it all breaching the Condition.

Street View Photo shows the property now FULLY exposed to Old Street and the gap in the fence is encouraging visitors to use this as an entrance to the property as we have witnessed on numerous occasions.

Vehicles drive past here at the 30mph speed limit and visibility is limited from the South with the risk of injury to a pedestrian using the new access or the current large gap created by the removal of trees and part of the fence.

The screening on revision 2 is not adequate and still leaves the property very exposed providing no privacy for us at all. The permission to build the property had Condition 4 put in for very good reasons, as the property was built much nearer Old Street than other properties to maximise land utilisation on the basis that no pedestrian or vehicular access would be allowed on this side of the property. It was a hard fought application for the developer to get planning permission for this property in the first place and we urge the council to uphold Condition 4 and to request that the frontage of 53 Old Street be fully restored.

Bernard Clarke-Lens