

## **UPDATES**

**for Committee Meeting to be held on 21 February 2018**

### **ZONE 1 - WESTERN WARDS**

- (1) **P/17/0984/FP** **SARISBURY**  
**123 BARNES LANE SARISBURY GREEN SOUTHAMPTON SO31 7BH**

One further letter of support has been received in relation to this application.

---

- (2) **P/17/1055/OA** **WARSASH**  
**LAND TO SOUTH WEST OF SOVEREIGN CRESCENT LOCKS HEATH SOUTHAMPTON**  
**HAMPSHIRE PO14 4LU**

#### **REPRESENTATIONS**

Twenty-three further letters of objection have been received since the committee report was published.

#### **FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS EDUCATION PROVISION**

Further to the advice contained in the Officer report regarding the effect of the proposed development on local infrastructure, at the Executive meeting on Tuesday 20th February it was resolved to amend the Council's CIL Regulation 123 List as recommended. With effect from 1st March 2018 reference to the funding of education provision will be removed from the revised Regulation 123 List. This will allow financial contributions towards education to be included in Section 106 agreements relating to current applications which have not been issued planning permission by 1st March.

Should Members resolve to grant planning permission for this development, Officers consider it is highly unlikely that the required Section 106 agreement would be completed before 1st March this year. Therefore, and in light of the above changes to the CIL Regulation 123 List, the Officer recommendation to the Planning Committee is that a financial contribution towards education provision be secured through an additional obligation in the suggested Section 106 legal agreement.

---

- (3) **P/17/1366/OA** **LOCKS HEATH**  
**LAND OFF HEATH ROAD LOCKS HEATH SOUTHAMPTON SO31 6SJ**

#### **FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS**

Since the publication of the Committee Report a further thirteen objections have been received from members of the public reiterating concerns already expressed.

#### **HIGHWAYS**

Officers have sought clarification from Hampshire County Council highways over the advice that no contribution towards off-site highway improvements would be required in this instance.

The application indicates that a number of the residential units on the site could be for retired people and therefore expect to generate less vehicle movements than usual. Notwithstanding, highways officers consider the applicant's transport assessment to be overly robust in estimating trip rates. They have clarified that, even if the development was for a conventional development with a mixture

of private and affordable units but no retirement flats, the difference in vehicle movements generated between that which was assessed and that which could reasonably be expected would not be significant and would not alter the conclusion of their assessment.

#### FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS EDUCATION PROVISION

Further to the advice contained in the Officer report regarding the effect of the proposed development on local infrastructure, at the Executive meeting on Tuesday 20th February it was resolved to amend the Council's CIL Regulation 123 List as recommended. With effect from 1st March 2018 reference to the funding of education provision will be removed from the revised Regulation 123 List. This will allow financial contributions towards education to be included in Section 106 agreements relating to current applications which have not been issued planning permission by 1st March.

Should Members resolve to grant planning permission for this development, Officers consider it is highly unlikely that the required Section 106 agreement would be completed before 1st March this year. Therefore, and in light of the above changes to the CIL Regulation 123 List, the Officer recommendation to the Planning Committee is that a financial contribution towards education provision be secured through an additional obligation in the suggested Section 106 legal agreement.

---

(5) **P/17/1514/FP** **SARISBURY**  
**LAND TO THE REAR OF 77 BURRIDGE ROAD BURRIDGE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 1BY**

There is a typographic error on the ninth paragraph on Page 70 of the report, where it refers to a 'self-build' dwelling. The application does not relate to a self build, and therefore the paragraph should state:

The application proposes the erection of only 1no. open market dwelling; the current shortfall is in the region of 660 dwellings. Officers are satisfied that bullet point (l) of DSP40 is satisfied.

---

(9) **P/17/0895/OA** **SARISBURY**  
**LAND OFF SOPWITH WAY SWANWICK SOUTHAMPTON HAMPSHIRE SO31 7AY**

#### ECOLOGY UPDATE

The Butterfly Survey has been amended to confirm the absence of the purple emperor butterfly and to include management of the buffer along the north of the site to improve its suitability for butterflies. The Ecologist has raised no objection to the ecology buffer along the north of the site.

In response to the Ecologist's concerns about lack of north-south connectivity through the site for reptiles and great crested newts, a revised layout plan has been submitted which incorporates a narrow ecology buffer along the west of the site.

The provision of an ecology buffer along the west of the site to improve north-south connectivity is acceptable in principle, however the buffer proposed is not acceptable for a number of reasons:

- Firstly, the buffer is not continuous and contains a number of gaps including several culverts;
  - Secondly, some of the land proposed as a buffer is located beyond the site and is therefore not in the control of the applicant;
  - Thirdly, there is nothing to separate the proposed buffer from the front of the adjacent dwellings. As there's insufficient space for these properties next to the buffer to have front gardens, this would put the buffer under additional pressure.
-

An ecology objection therefore remains, on the grounds that the buffer would not provide adequate connectivity though the site for reptiles and great crested newts. The proposed development would therefore fail to protect reptiles and great crested newts' habitat and would result in fragmentation of the biodiversity network contrary to Policy DSP13 and the NPPF paragraph 117.

#### FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS EDUCATION PROVISION

Further to the advice contained in the Officer report regarding the effect of the proposed development on local infrastructure, at the Executive meeting on Tuesday 20th February it was resolved to amend the Council's CIL Regulation 123 List as recommended. With effect from 1st March 2018 reference to the funding of education provision will be removed from the revised Regulation 123 List. This will allow financial contributions towards education to be included in Section 106 agreements relating to current applications which have not been issued planning permission by 1st March.

In light of the above updates, it is recommended that the reason for refusal part (c) is amended and that an additional reason for refusal part (j) is included as follows:

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

(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.

#### **ZONE 2 - FAREHAM**

#### **(10) P/17/0189/FP FAREHAM EAST SAWMILLS INDUSTRIAL PARK WICKHAM ROAD FAREHAM**

##### REPRESENTATIONS:

One further letter has been received:

- Support as this is brownfield and allocated in the Welborne Plan. This should be approved as part of Welborne as the failure to bring about the development has put villages in the western wards in particular in greater peril.
- I don't understand why it is recommended for refusal when hundreds of homes in Warsash on greenfield sites are being recommended for permission.

##### CONSULTATIONS:

Hampshire County Council: Highway Authority  
Objection:

- Revised speed survey data is required by HCC in order to confirm that the visibility splays being proposed are acceptable

##### HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS TO THE A32:

Speed Survey data was requested from the applicant in order to confirm that the proposed visibility splays for both access points - the A32 and Forest Lane - were suitable for the speeds of the road. The speed survey data that was provided was for the A32 only.

The A32 data was taken from the Buckland Developments Application (P/17/0266/OA) and the location that the Automatic Traffic Counter was carried out at was provided as 'A32 south of Knowle Road', a more specific location was not provided. For this reason, the Highway Authority cannot be certain that speed surveys were carried out in the vicinity of the site access. Therefore, the Highway Authority requires new speed surveys to be carried out within the vicinity of the site on the A32 to

---

address the above concern. In the absence of this information the Highway Authority are unable to confirm that the proposed visibility splays are appropriate and that the access would be safe.

Visibility splays have been provided in the amended plans for the planned dwellings on Forest Lane. Speed survey data was also requested for Forest Lane to confirm that the visibility splays proposed concurred with the speed of the road which is a national speed limit. The requested data has not been provided by the appellant and the Highway Authority therefore cannot confirm that the proposed visibility splays are acceptable and that the access to Forest Lane is safe.

#### RECOMMENDATION:

A further reason for refusal is added to those in the main agenda to reflect the Highway Authority advice. The additional reason for refusal is as follows:

6) Insufficient speed data has been submitted to validate the proposed highway visibility splays to the A32 and along Forest Lane. In the absence of appropriate speed survey data the Local Planning Authority cannot conclude that the proposed access can safely accommodate the development traffic proposed. As such the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact on the safety of users of the development and adjoining highway contrary to Policies WEL23 and WEL25 of the Welborne Plan and paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### Amended Informative:

Had it not been for the recommended overriding reasons for refusal to the proposal (reasons 1 and 2 above), the Local Planning Authority would have sought to, and will continue to in advance of the appeal being heard, address reasons 3), 4) and 6) through the receipt of additional information from the appellant and the consideration of suitably worded planning conditions following receipt of this further information; and reason 5) above by inviting the applicant to enter into a legal agreement with Fareham Borough Council pursuant to Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

### **ZONE 3 - EASTERN WARDS**

(13) **P/17/1170/RM** **PORTCHESTER EAST**  
**LAND TO NORTH OF CRANLEIGH ROAD/ WEST OF WICOR PRIMARY SCHOOL**  
**PORTCHESTER FAREHAM PO16 9NH**

Amended plans have been submitted to improve the relationship between plots 24, 25, 26 and the dwellings behind in Brenchley Close. The garden depths of plots 24, 25, 26 now range from 11.5 m to 12.3 m which meets the guidance set out in the adopted SPD. This has also improved the back to back distance between these properties, the minimum being approximately 20 metres.

Plots 51 and 52 which back on to properties in Quintrel Avenue have been located further away from the boundary to improve the garden sizes.

Condition 1: approved plans the following plan references should all be deleted:

Site Layout	A-02-06-LP Rev C
Tenure Plan	A-02-02-TP Rev C
Boundary Treatments	A-02-04-BT Rev C
Building Heights	A-02-05- BH Rev C
Materials Plan	A-02-03-MP Rev D
Planting Plan	2498-PP-01-P3
Planting Plan	2498-PP-02-P3
Planting Plan	2498-PP-03-P3
Planting Plan	2498-PP-04-P3
Planting Plan	2498-PP-05-P3

---

Trees 2498-TS-04-P3  
Trees 2498-TS-03-P3  
2498-TS-02-P3 Trees  
Trees 2498-TS-01-P3

the following approved plans references replace those referenced above:

Site Layout	A-02-06-LP Rev D
Tenure Plan	A-02-02-TP Rev D
Boundary Treatments	A-02-04-BT Rev D
Building Heights	A-02-05- BH Rev D
Materials Plan	A-02-03-MP Rev E
Planting Plan	2498-PP-01-P4
Planting Plan	2498-PP-02-P4
Planting Plan	2498-PP-03-P4
Planting Plan	2498-PP-04-P4
Planting Plan	2498-PP-05-P4
Trees	2498-TS-01 P4
Trees	2498-TS-02 P4
Trees	2498-TS-03 P4
Trees	2498-TS-04 P4
Materials Schedule - Rev J	

In addition Condition 1: should be altered (as a result of the amendments to plot 59 and 60) to read Corfe-1414-PL-01 plots 48, 60, 47. Chedworth-1222-PL-01 plots 59 instead of 60.

Condition 2 as set out in the report is no longer required as the landscaping for plots 59 and 60 is now shown on the revised plan and is acceptable.

Condition 4 as set out in the report is no longer required as details have been provided for planting in the front garden of plot 13 and repositioning of tree planting to the front of plots 11 and 12.

A further representation has received relating to wildlife and the proposed mitigation.