

# FAREHAM

## BOROUGH COUNCIL

### Minutes of the Planning Committee

**(to be confirmed at the next meeting)**

**Date:** Wednesday, 21 August 2019

**Venue:** Collingwood Room - Civic Offices

**PRESENT:**

Councillor N J Walker (Chairman)

Councillor I Bastable (Vice-Chairman)

**Councillors:** T M Cartwright, MBE, P J Davies, K D Evans, M J Ford, JP,  
Mrs K Mandry, R H Price, JP and Mrs C L A Hockley (deputising  
for F Birkett)

**Also  
Present:**



**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor F Birkett.

**2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 17 July 2019 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

**3. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no Chairman's announcements.

**4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In accordance with Standing Orders and the Council's Code of Conduct the following Councillors declared the following interest on the items identified.

Councillor M J Ford, JP declared a personal interest in Item 6 (1) 71-73 St Margarets Lane, Fareham as he is the Chairman of a local Theatre Group who pay to use the Titchfield Festival Theatre. He removed himself from the Committee for that item and took no part in the discussion or vote on the application.

Councillor I Bastable declared a personal interest in this item as his parents live in St Margarets Lane. He remained on the Committee for this item and took part in the discussion and vote on the application.

**5. DEPUTATIONS**

The Committee received a deputation from the following in respect of the applications indicated and were thanked accordingly.

Name	Spokesperson representing the persons listed	Subject	Supporting or Opposing the Application	Minute Application No/Page No
<b>ZONE 1 – 2.30pm</b>				
Mr I Donohue (Agent)		71-73 ST MARGARETS LANE FAREHAM PO14 4BG – REAR, SIDE & ROOF EXTENSIONS, CHANGE OF USE TO STORAGE AREA TO 567 SEATED THEATRE AND INDUSTRIAL UNIT TO ANCILLARY BACK STAGE & CHANGING	<b>Supporting</b>	6 (1) P/19/0510/FP Pg 13

		ROOMS		
Ms N Burchett		-Ditto-	<b>Opposing</b>	-Ditto-
Ms L Backshell		-Ditto-	<b>Opposing</b>	-Ditto-
<b>ZONE 2 – 2.30pm</b>				
<b>ZONE 3 – 2.30pm</b>				
Mr D Buczynskyj		LAND EAST OF CROFTON CEMETERY AND WEST OF PEAK LANE FAREHAM – DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING 261 DWELLINGS, ACCESS ROAD FROM PEAK LANE MAINTAINING LINK TO OAKCROFT LANE, STOPPING UP OF A SECTION OF OAKCROFT LANE (FROM OLD PEAK LANE TO ACCESS ROAD), WITH CAR PARKING, LANDSCAPING, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND ASSOCIATED WORKS	<b>Supporting</b>	6 (2) P/19/0301/FP Pg 31
Mr N John		-Ditto-	<b>Opposing</b>	-Ditto-
Cllr P Hayre		-Ditto-	<b>-Ditto-</b>	-Ditto-

## 6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS INCLUDING AN UPDATE ON PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted a report by the Director of Planning and Regeneration on development control matters, including information regarding new appeals and decisions.

### (1) P/19/0510/FP - 71-73 ST MARGARETS LANE FAREHAM PO14 4BG

The Committee received the deputations referred to in Minute 5 above.

Councillor M J Ford, JP declared a personal interest in this item as he is the Chairman of a local Theatre Group who pay to use the Titchfield Festival Theatre. He removed himself from the Committee for this item and took no part in the discussion or vote on the application.

Councillor I Bastable declared a personal interest in this item as his parents live on St Margarets Lane. He remained on the Committee for this item and took part in discussion and the vote on the application.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained the following information:-

*One further representation received supporting the proposal.*

Upon being proposed and seconded, the officer recommendation to refuse the application, was voted on and CARRIED.

(Voting: 8 in favour; 0 against)

RESOLVED that PLANNING PERMISSION be REFUSED.

#### Reasons for Refusal

The development is contrary to Policies CS5, CS14, CS15, CS17 and CS22 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Policies DSP1, DSP2 and DSP8 of the adopted Fareham Borough Local Plan Part2: Development Sites and Policies and is unacceptable in that:

- i. The proposal relates to development in an unsuitable location and would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the local road network;
- ii. The increase in theatre capacity will result in significant increase in noise from patrons arriving and leaving the building detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring residential properties. Furthermore, in the absence of details of acoustic insulation measures for the building officers consider noise emanating from the building will materially harm the living conditions of the neighbouring residential properties;
- iii. The proposal would result in inadequate provision of accessible available parking spaces resulting in unacceptable harm to the safety and convenience of users of the highway;
- iv. The scale and mass of the resultant building would adversely affect the landscape character and appearance of this countryside location. The proposal would significantly affect the integrity of the Meon Valley Strategic Gap. Furthermore, the proposed design and external materials do not respond to the immediate area, detrimental to the landscape and character and visual amenities of the area;
- v. Had it not been for the overriding reasons for refusal, an impact assessment would have been required to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on existing, committed and planned leisure facilities in the Town Centre and other local and district centres.

The decision relates to the following drawings/documents:

Existing site plan – 01

Existing ground floor – 02

Existing first floor – 03  
Existing second floor – 04  
Existing elevations – 05  
Proposed site plan – 06  
Proposed ground floor plan – 07 rev A  
Proposed first floor plan – 08 rev A  
Proposed second floor plan – 09 rev A  
Proposed roof plan – 10 rev A  
Proposed elevations – 11 rev A  
Proposed sections – 12 rev A

**(2) P/19/0301/FP - LAND EAST OF CROFTON CEMETERY AND WEST OF PEAK LANE FAREHAM**

The Committee received the deputations referred to in Minute 5 above.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the update report which contained the following information:-

*Further Comments Received from Natural England on the updated Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy and following the Council's consideration of the Air Quality Ecological Impact Assessment. In summary the comments state:*

***Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy sites***

*It is noted that further to our consultation response in May 2019, the Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy maps have been updated and this affects the application site. We advise that further information is obtained from the applicant on the proposed measures to mitigate and offset the impacts of the development on the network of supporting waders and Brent goose habitat.*

*The southern part of the site (F17D) is identified as a Low Use site in the Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy. The proposed development will lead to a permanent loss of this habitat. The northern part of the site that will be retained as public open space is identified as F17C, which is a Secondary Support Area and has records of golden plover, lapwing, snipe. Any change of use of this site will require detailed consideration.*

*It is Natural England's understanding that no detailed information has been provided on proposed measures to mitigate or offset the permanent loss of the F17D. It is noted that it was proposed to retain the southern part of F17C as public open space. However, consideration is now being given to the ecological enhancement of this area, although no detailed information has been provided at this stage.*

*Natural England advises that further information is provided on the proposed measures to mitigate the loss of F17D and impact to F17C to inform the Habitats Regulations Assessment. There is a preference for some on-site provision to maintain a network of sites across the region. However, detailed consideration will need to be given to the proposed design and management of any offsetting site to ensure its effectiveness. Where impacts cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated on-site, proportionate mitigation would compromise offsetting or enhancement measures via payment towards the*

*management and enhancement of the wider waders and Brent geese ecological network.*

**Air quality information**

*We note your comments with regard to the need for further consideration of westward bound traffic along the Titchfield Gyratory on A27 and then towards Segensworth, Junction 9 of the M27 or west through Park Gate or Lower Swanwick over the River Hamble. It is agreed that further consideration should be given to these links to ensure the in-combination effects have been addressed.*

Upon being proposed and seconded, the officer recommendation to refuse planning permission, was voted on and CARRIED.  
(Voting: 9 in favour; 0 against)

RESOLVED that PLANNING PERMISSION be REFUSED.

Reasons for Refusal

The development would be contrary to Policies CS2, CS4, CS5, CS6, CS14, CS15, CS17, CS18, CS20 and CS21 of the Adopted Fareham Borough Core Strategy 2011 and Policies DSP1, DSP2, DSP3, DSP5, DSP6, DSP13, DSP14, DSP15 and DSP40 of the Adopted Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies Plan, and is unacceptable in that:

- i. The provision of dwellings in this location would be contrary to adopted local plan policies which seek to prevent residential development in the countryside;
- ii. The development of the site would result in an adverse visual effect on the immediate countryside setting around the site;
- iii. The introduction of dwellings in this location would fail to respond positively to and be respectful of the key characteristics of the area, in this countryside, edge of settlement location, providing limited green infrastructure and offering a lack of interconnected green/public spaces;
- iv. The quantum of development proposed would result in a cramped layout and would not deliver a housing scheme of high quality which respects and responds positively for the key characteristics of the area;
- v. The proposed development involves development that involves significant vehicle movements that cannot be accommodated adequately on the existing transport network. In sufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the development would not result in a severe impact on road safety and operation of the local transport network;
- vi. The proposed access arrangement onto Peak Lane is inadequate to accommodate the development safely. This would result in an unacceptable impact on the safety of users of the development and adjoining highway network;

- vii. The proposal fails to demonstrate that the development would be accessible with regards to public transport links and walking and cycling routes to local services and facilities;
- viii. The development proposal fails to provide sufficient provision of, or support for, sustainable transport options. This would result in a greater number of trips by private car which will create a severe impact on the local transport network and the environment;
- ix. Inadequate information has been provided to assess the impact of the proposed works on water voles on site and any measures required to mitigate these impacts such as the provision of enhanced riparian buffers. In addition, there is insufficient information in relation to their long-term protection within the wider landscape by failing to undertake any assessment of the impact of the proposals on connectivity between the mitigation pond created as part of the Stubbington Bypass Scheme and the wider landscape. The proposal fails to provide appropriate biodiversity enhancements to allow the better dispersal of the recovering/reintroduced water vole population in Stubbington;
- x. Insufficient information has been submitted in relation to the adverse impacts of the proposals on the Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy Low Use Site and Secondary Support Area and any mitigation measures requires to ensure the long-term resilience of these support networks;
- xi. The development proposal fails to provide adequate wildlife corridors along the boundaries of the site to ensure the long-term viability of the protected and notable species on the site and avoidance of any future conflicts between the residents and wildlife (e.g. badgers damaging private garden areas) due to the lack of available suitable foraging habitat;
- xii. In the absence of sufficient information, it is considered that the proposal will result in a net loss in biodiversity and is therefore contrary to the NPPF which requires a net gain in biodiversity;
- xiii. The development would result in an unacceptable impact on a number of protected trees around the periphery of the site;
- xiv. The submitted flood risk assessment fails to assess the impact of climate change on the development and therefore fails to demonstrate that the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient;
- xv. The development would fail to preserve, and would result in less than substantial harm to, the historic setting of the Grade II\* Listed building Crofton Old Church;
- xvi. Had it not been for the overriding reasons for refusal the Council would have sought to secure the details of the SuDS strategy including the mechanisms for securing its long term maintenance;

- xvii. The development proposal fails to secure an on-site provision of affordable housing at a level in accordance with the requirements of the Local Plan;
- xviii. 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 disturbance on the Solent Coastal Special Protection Areas;
- xix. The development proposal fails to provide adequate public open space. In addition, in the absence of a legal agreement securing provision of open space and the facilities and their associated management and maintenance, the recreational needs of residents of the proposed development would not be met;
- xx. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure the submission and implementation of a full Travel Plan, payment of the Travel Plan approval and monitoring fees and provision of a surety mechanism to ensure implementation of the Travel Plan, the proposed development would not make the necessary provision to ensure measures are in place to assist in reducing the dependency on the use of the private motorcar; and
- xxi. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure such, the proposal would fail to provide a financial contribution towards education provision.

### **(3) Planning Appeals**

The Committee noted the information in the report.

### **(4) UPDATE REPORT**

The Update Report was tabled at the meeting and considered with the relevant agenda item.

(The meeting started at 2.30 pm  
and ended at 4.09 pm).