

FAREHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – Section 78

**Town and Country Planning Appeals (Determination by Inspectors) (Inquiries
Procedure) (England) Rules 2000**

**REBUTTAL PROOF OF EVIDENCE
ERRATRA SHEET**

Of

Ms Jane Parker BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI

On behalf of the Local Planning Authority

CO-JOINED INQUIRY

**Outline application with all matters reserved (except for access) for the demolition of
existing buildings and development of up to 75 dwellings, open space, vehicular
access point from Newgate Lane and associated and ancillary infrastructure**

**LAND AT NEWGATE LANE NORTH, FAREHAM
Appeal by Fareham Land LP**

Planning Inspectorate Reference: APP/A1720/W/20/3252180

Fareham Borough Council Reference: P/18/1118/OA

AND

**Outline Planning Permission For The Demolition Of Existing Buildings And
Development Of Up To 115 Dwellings, Open Space, Vehicular Access Point From
Newgate Lane And Associated And Ancillary Infrastructure, With All Matters Except
Access To Be Reserved.**

**LAND AT NEWGATE LANE SOUTH, FAREHAM
Appeal by Bargate Homes Ltd**

Planning Inspectorate Reference: APP/A1720/W/20/3252185

Fareham Borough Council Reference Ref: P/19/0460/OA

ERRATA IN MY REBUTTAL PROOF OF EVIDENCE

At paragraph 5.10 and 5.12 where I discuss 125 Greenaway Lane please replace the text as follows (all changes highlighted in red). I have included the whole of this section of my proof for context but the errata only relate to paragraphs 5.10 and 5.12.

125 and 79 Greenaway Lane

- 5.10 The site at 125 Greenaway Lane (para 12.41 of Mr Weaver's evidence) was recommended to the Council's Planning Committee for **refusal** in July 2019 (LPA ref. P/18/0482/OA). The Officer's report is included at Appendix 4 of Mr Weaver's evidence. The applicant was Bargate Homes Ltd (the appellant for the Newgate Lane South site). Paragraph 1.6 in the introduction of the Officer report reminds Members of the Planning Committee that at that time the Committee had already resolved to grant planning permission for a further five housing sites in the immediate surrounding area and another site nearby had been allowed on appeal. Those five housing sites are shown at Appendix H.
- 5.11 The first of these sites to receive a favourable resolution to grant planning permission from the Council's Planning Committee in January 2018 were those application references P/17/0752/OA and P/17/0845/OA. As can be seen, both of those sites lie adjacent to the existing urban settlement boundary. Following those decisions the site at application reference P/17/0998/OA received a resolution to grant planning permission in May 2018.
- 5.12 It is quite clear therefore that by the time Members of the Planning Committee **refused** the development at 125 Greenaway Lane in July 2019 the Planning Committee had already decided to approve housing development on the land between it and the urban settlement boundary to the south. Similarly, housing development had been approved by the committee on land between the site and urban area to the north. This was brought to the attention of Members and the quote from the Officer report given at paragraph 12.41 of Mr Weaver's proof clearly makes reference to other nearby development proposals which have

resolutions to grant planning permission when assessing the scheme against Policy DSP40(ii).

- 5.13 Mr Weaver's evidence attempts to portray the site at 125 Greenaway Lane as an isolated development far from the urban settlement boundary. However, as the Inspector will see, at the time the decision was made Members of the Planning Committee were informed, and would have been well aware of the fact, that previous resolutions to grant planning permission meant that this site would be immediately adjacent to new housing sites on its southern and eastern boundaries which linked back to the urban settlement boundary to the south, as well as development north of Greenaway Lane which integrated with the existing urban area to the north.
- 5.14. Mr Weaver proceeds to comment on the land immediately to the east of the application site at 79 Greenaway Lane (ref. P/18/0107/OA) which he must know physically abuts that site. The site at 79 Greenaway Lane (para 12.42 of Mr Weaver's evidence) was the subject of a favourable resolution to grant permission by the Council's Planning Committee after being recommended by Officers in a report to the October 2018 meeting (in actual fact the application had already received a favourable resolution to grant permission by the Planning Committee earlier that year in June 2018). The Officer report is included at Appendix 5 of Mr Weaver's evidence. Again, Appendix H shows the context of this site to surrounding development already having a resolution to grant planning permission.
- 5.15. In describing the site surroundings the Officer report explains that residential dwellings are located to the east, west and north. The officer's report does not consider whether the site is adjacent to an existing urban settlement boundary rather it looks at how the proposed development relates to "surrounding built form". The surrounding built form of development as shown on figure 1 shows that a number of developments in close proximity to the site already had a resolution to grant planning consent. Just a month prior to the June 2018 committee in May 2018 Members of the Planning Committee resolved to grant permission for 157 dwellings on a site very close by (P/17/0998/OA) which

effectively abuts the south-eastern corner of the site at 79 Greenaway Lane. The decision of the Council has therefore been taken having regard the exceptional circumstances of this particular case and the cluster of development already permitted around it which connect to and integrate with the existing urban settlement boundary. The same cannot be said for the appeal sites at Newgate Lane which would be an island of development that is not adjacent to, well related or integrated with the urban settlement boundary of Bridgemarky.