

## FBC.8 – Respective Positions on Deliverable Housing Supply

Source of supply categorised by status at the base date (with current status in brackets)	Position of the Council (taken from FBC.7 published Five Year Housing Land Supply Position paper 17 <sup>th</sup> February 2021 with base date 1 Jan 2021 – 31 Dec 2025)		Position of the Appellant (taken from Table A4.1 of Appendix 4 to Neil Tilley’s Supplementary Statement of Case)	
<b>Category A: sites which should be considered deliverable unless there is clear evidence to the contrary</b>				
Small permitted sites	69	The 69 dwellings are forecast to be built from outstanding planning permissions (small 1- 4 units) by 31 <sup>st</sup> December 2025. The Council has applied a 10% discount to allow for lapses in permission.	155	
Large permitted sites with detailed consent	408	Please note that this figure differs from that provided in the 5YHLS Feb 2021 position paper due to one site with full planning permission for 6 dwellings being moved from the category below headed “Large permitted sites with detailed consent”.	356	
<b>Category B: sites which should only be considered deliverable where there is clear evidence that completions will begin on site within five years</b>				
Large permitted sites with outline planning permission	260	Please note that this figure differs from that provided in the 5YHLS Feb 2021 position paper due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One site for 6 dwellings being moved to the category above “Large permitted sites with detailed consent”;</li> <li>• Two sites totalling 30 dwellings (Land East &amp; West of 79 Greenaway Lane and 18 Titchfield Park Road) being moved to the category headed “Resolutions to Grant Planning Permission”.</li> </ul>	14	

<p>Land east of Brook Lane (undetermined RM application P/19/0313/RM)</p> <p>Outline planning permission P/16/1049/OA granted May 2018</p>	<p>85</p>	<p>The reserved matters application for approval of details relating to landscape, scale, appearance and landscaping was submitted in March 2019. Since that date, discussions between the applicant and the case officer have been active and are ongoing.</p> <p>The applicant has agreed an extension of time for the determination of the application until 27<sup>th</sup> April 2021. Work is continuing on improving the overall quality of the scheme, as requested by the Council, and on nitrate mitigation proposals. The agent has also indicated that details of the SUDS required to discharge condition 18 attached to the OA are also to be submitted.</p> <p>The developer of the site, Taylor Wimpey, have provided updated information on delivery of the dwellings in a position statement received October 2020 (FBC.11, p2). The housing trajectory estimates that 35 dwellings will be completed on the site by 2022/23 and 50 dwellings by 2023/24. The planning conditions attached to the outline consent are standard and not especially onerous and the number of pre-commencement conditions is limited. Condition 3 requires the development to be begun before the expiration of 12 months from the date of the approval of the last reserved matter application to be approved. The current reserved matters application relates to the whole of the development up to 85 dwellings.</p> <p>It is considered that on this basis, even if the determination of the reserved matters application was to be delayed until later in 2021, it is realistic to anticipate that the site is capable of being delivered within the 5 year period.</p>	<p>0</p> <p><u>Suitability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England has identified that the proposal could have significant effects on the SPA, Ramsar sites and the SAC.</li> <li>• These effects had not and have not been assessed in an HRA/AA and so it could not and cannot be demonstrated that the site offered a suitable location for development either at the base-date or now.</li> <li>• The Council has indicated to the applicant that the current RM proposal is in need of improvement and the applicant requested an extension of time to 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2020 to submit revised plans.</li> <li>• These revised plans were not forthcoming and an additional extension of time has been agreed until 18<sup>th</sup> February 2021 for these.</li> <li>• The Council clearly did not and does not consider that the current proposal is acceptable as it has requested improvements.</li> <li>• There was not and is not an agreed nitrate solution that is necessary to make the proposed development acceptable.</li> </ul> <p><u>Clear evidence that completions will be achieved</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development has already been delayed as is evident from the additional extension of time.</li> <li>• The Council rely upon a pro-forma provided by the applicant.</li> <li>• This relies upon the submission of amended plans in November 2020 but these have still not been submitted on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2021.</li> <li>• It also identifies that the nitrogen load has yet even to be calculated let alone offsetting solutions identified.</li> <li>• It identifies that "Delivery would be postponed until a [nitrate] solution is found."</li> <li>• No evidence is available to demonstrate that the site will not have significant effects on the SPA, Ramsar sites and SAC which would be necessary to demonstrate that the site will achieve completions.</li> </ul>
--	-----------	---	---

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence is available to demonstrate that the Council will consider that with the improvements the scheme will be acceptable which would be necessary to demonstrate that the site will achieve completions.</li> <li>• No evidence is available to demonstrate that a satisfactory nitrate solution will be identified.</li> </ul>
<p>Burrige Lodge, 246 Botley Road</p> <p>Outline planning permission P/18/1413/OA</p>	7	<p>The conditions imposed are not onerous and an application seeking approval of details reserved by conditions relating to biodiversity enhancements, land contamination and site setup is currently under consideration.</p> <p>A reserved matters application has also been submitted in April 2021 and will shortly be registered and validated.</p> <p>The Council's projected delivery of 7 dwellings at this site is entirely deliverable within the 5 year period.</p>		
<p>Land South of Funtley Road, Funtley (outline planning permission)</p> <p>Outline planning permission P/18/0067/OA granted 2/9/2020</p>	55	<p>Applications for the approval of reserved matters are to be submitted to the Council within 24 months. Following approval of reserved matters, works are then to commence within 12 months of the final reserved matter application. The conditions and obligations are standard and not onerous.</p> <p>For this reason, the Council's projected housing delivery of 55 dwellings at the Land South of Funtley Road is entirely deliverable within the 5 year period.</p>	0	<p><u>Suitability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Such sites are not capable of being considered deliverable according to the NPPF, PPG, the overwhelming majority of s78 Inspectors, and the Secretary of State and have not been considered to be deliverable by every appeal decision of which I am aware.</li> <li>• The Council had resolved to grant planning permission providing planning obligations which are necessary to make the proposed development suitable were secured. In the absence of these having been secured at the base-date the Council presumably considered that the proposal was not suitable.</li> </ul> <p><u>Clear evidence that completions will be achieved</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no written evidence or similar from the</li> </ul>

				interested parties to demonstrate that this site is deliverable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence in support of the Council's trajectory or the milestones necessary to achieve this.</li> </ul>
Southampton Road, Titchfield (undetermined RM application P/20/1584/RM)  Outline planning permission P/18/0068/OA granted 16/7/2020	105	An application for approval of reserved matters was received on 18th December and is currently under consideration. Following approval of reserved matters, works are then to commence within 12 months of the final reserved matter application. The conditions and obligations are standard and not onerous.  For this reason, the Council's projected housing delivery of 105 dwellings at Southampton Road is entirely deliverable within the 5 year period.	0	<u>Suitability</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Such sites are not capable of being considered deliverable according to the NPPF, PPG, the overwhelming majority of s78 Inspectors, and the Secretary of State and have not been considered to be deliverable by every appeal decision of which I am aware.</li> <li>• The Council had resolved to grant planning permission providing planning obligations which are necessary to make the proposed development suitable were secured. In the absence of these having been secured at the base-date the Council presumably considered that the proposal was not suitable.</li> </ul> <u>Clear evidence that completions will be achieved</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no written evidence or similar from the interested parties to demonstrate that this site is deliverable.</li> <li>• There is no evidence in support of the Council's trajectory or the milestones necessary to achieve this.</li> </ul>
Egmont Nurseries, Brook Avenue (outline planning permission with undetermined RM application)  Outline planning permission P/18/0592/OA granted 1/10/2020	8	A reserved matters application is currently under consideration. The conditions and obligations are standard and not onerous. An application for approval of conditions relating to technical matters (ecology, trees, surface water drainage and land contamination) is under consideration.  For this reason, the Council's projected housing delivery of 8 dwellings at Egmont Nurseries are entirely deliverable within the 5 year period.	0	<u>Suitability</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Such sites are not capable of being considered deliverable according to the NPPF, PPG, the overwhelming majority of s78 Inspectors, and the Secretary of State and have not been considered to be deliverable by every appeal decision of which I am aware.</li> <li>• The Council had resolved to grant planning permission providing planning obligations which are necessary to make the proposed development suitable were secured. In the absence of these having been secured at the base-date the Council</li> </ul>

Reserved matters application P/20/1224/RM				presumably considered that the proposal was not suitable.  <u>Clear evidence that completions will be achieved</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no written evidence or similar from the interested parties to demonstrate that this site is deliverable.</li> <li>• There is no evidence in support of the Council's trajectory or the milestones necessary to achieve this.</li> </ul>
Other sites with outline planning permission	0		14	
<b>Allocations</b>	<b>733</b>	Please note that this figure differs from that provided in the 5YHLS Feb 2021 position paper due to two sites totalling 700 dwellings (Heath Road and Welborne) being moved from the category headed "Resolutions to Grant Planning Permission".	<b>0</b>	
Wynton Way, Fareham (no planning application)	13	<p>The adopted Local Plan estimates that this site has a capacity of 10 dwellings. The site is identified in the Council's adopted Affordable Housing Strategy (2019) for delivery within the next 5 years. This site is a top priority as it is in an area of high affordable need.</p> <p>The site is part owned by the Council and Hampshire County Council (HCC). Active and positive discussions are currently underway to bring the ownership entirely within the Council's control. HCC has recently agreed to dispose of the adjacent Kershaw Centre and the Council are in active negotiations to also acquire this part of this site. The larger site (including the Kershaw Centre) will provide in the region of 19 new affordable homes overall, a higher number of dwellings than anticipated by the adopted Local Plan. An architect, MH Architects, has already</p>	0	<u>Clear evidence that completions will be achieved</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no written evidence or similar from the interested parties to demonstrate that this site is deliverable.</li> <li>• There is no evidence in support of the Council's trajectory or the milestones necessary to achieve this.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that there are funding is available for this scheme as there is for other sites identified in the Affordable Housing Strategy.</li> <li>• The evidence of the Council relies upon the fact that the site is small which does not accord with the position of other Inspectors as set out above.</li> </ul>

		<p>been appointed with initial drawings provided and a planning application is expected in 2021. A nitrate solution is also in place.</p> <p>The Affordable Housing Strategic Lead at the Council has advised that recent Fareham housing projects typically see a start on site within approximately 12 months of a planning consent. Construction works would be expected to take approximately 18 months and delivery is therefore expected within 5 years. Please see paragraph 8.73 of the Council's Statement of Case for detailed examples of this.</p>		
Land off Church Road (no planning application)	20	<p>The adopted Local Plan indicates that site has an indicative capacity of 20 dwellings however the landowner has indicated that the site is capacity of delivering 26 dwellings. It is accepted that to date, no applications for planning permission have been submitted. However, information provided by the landowner in March 2020 stated that it anticipated delivery of the site in 2022/23 subject to a solution for nitrate mitigation. Since then two nitrate mitigation schemes have been made available as set out in the Council's Statement of Case at paragraph 8.21 – 8.25.</p> <p>The Council has adopted a more precautionary approach and identifies the delivery of the site in 2023/24. On the basis of discussions with the landowners, and the small number of dwellings estimated to be completed, the Council is confident in the yield and delivery of the site within the 5 year period.</p>	0	<p><u>Suitability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No nitrate solution had or has been agreed for this site such that it could not and cannot be demonstrated to be suitable.</li> <li>• The site is allocated for 20 homes and yet the Council include 26 in the deliverable supply notwithstanding that the suitability or otherwise of this scheme has not been tested for this scale of development.</li> </ul> <p><u>Clear evidence that completions will be achieved</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no written evidence or similar from the interested parties to demonstrate that this site is deliverable.</li> <li>• There is no evidence in support of the Council's trajectory or the milestones necessary to achieve this.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that the site was or is suitable for 26 homes.</li> <li>• This site has a significant record of non-implementation having been allocated in 2000 but with no planning applications having been received subsequently.</li> <li>• There is no evidence of development interest.</li> <li>• The evidence of the Council relies upon the fact that the site is small which does not accord with the position of other Inspectors as set out above.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence is available to demonstrate that a satisfactory nitrate solution will be identified.</li> </ul>
<p>Heath Road, Locks Heath (resolution to grant outline planning permission)</p> <p>Outline planning application P/17/1366/OA</p> <p>Shown in FBC 5YHLS Feb 2021 in category "Resolution to Grant Planning Permission"</p>	70	<p>The Council resolved to grant outline planning permission for 70 dwellings (P/17/1366/OA) subject to a Section 106 in February 2018. However, consent is likely to be delayed due to the need to carry out updated Phase II ecology surveys and a revised parameter plan/quantum of development accordingly given the time that has lapsed since the resolution to grant planning consent in February 2018. No decision is therefore anticipated until before August 2021 and the applicant has agreed an extension of time for determination of the application until the end of that month.</p> <p>The applicant Hampshire County Council has advised that they have developed a bespoke nitrate mitigation proposal using land within its ownership within Fareham Borough. Subject to approval being given at a forthcoming cabinet meeting the applicant intends to submit full details of the mitigation proposal by early summer 2021 to allow a decision to be issued within the agreed timescale.</p> <p>The conditions of the consent once issued require an application for approval of reserved matters applications is to be made to the local planning authority before the expiration of three years from the date of the permission. Work is to be commenced no later than two years from the approval of the final reserved matters. The conditions and obligations are standard and not onerous.</p> <p>Whilst some dwellings could be delivered in 2023/24, it is likely the scheme will not be substantially completed until 2024/25.</p>	0	<p><u>Suitability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No nitrate solution had or has been agreed for this site such that it could not and cannot be demonstrated to be suitable.</li> <li>• The Council requires an updated Phase II Ecology survey to be undertaken and recognises that the quantum of development may need to be identified as a result.</li> </ul> <p><u>Clear evidence that completions will be achieved</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no written evidence or similar from the interested parties to demonstrate that this site is deliverable.</li> <li>• There is no evidence in support of the Council's trajectory or the milestones necessary to achieve this.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that the site will be suitable for 70 dwellings in ecological terms.</li> <li>• The evidence of the Council relies upon the fact that the site is small which does not accord with the position of other Inspectors as set out above.</li> <li>• No evidence is available to demonstrate that a satisfactory nitrate solution will be identified.</li> </ul>

<p>Welborne (resolution to grant outline planning permission)</p> <p>Outline planning application P/17/0266/OA</p> <p>Shown in FBC 5YHLS Feb 2021 in category "Resolution to Grant Planning Permission"</p>	<p>630</p>	<p>Please see Supplementary Statement on Welborne (FBC.13)</p>	<p>0</p> <p><u>Clear evidence that completions will be achieved</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The outline planning application is recommended to be subject to a very significant number of pre-occupation conditions and obligations which will take a significant amount of time to implement.</li> <li>• One proposed condition requires that all of the sources of funding are in place prior to the commencement of development.</li> <li>• The funding was not and is not in place to discharge this proposed condition although the proposed amendments would provide a potential solution.</li> <li>• However, there is no evidence that the necessary HIF funding will be secured.</li> <li>• There is also no evidence that the proposed review of the CIL Charging Schedule which allows for Welborne to be delivered with a £0 CIL rate will be approved.</li> <li>• Therefore there remains no clear evidence that the necessary funding to bring this scheme forward will be secured.</li> <li>• Even if both of these necessary factors are secured, the reviewed CIL Charging Schedule will not be in place for some time to come as it remains subject to examination.</li> <li>• Even then given that the proposed development would provide a profit of only 1.5% (as compared to 15-20% set out in the PPG 10-018) there would not be any scope to accommodate any slippages in costs which may jeopardise the delivery prospects.</li> <li>• There is no clear evidence that the s106 agreement will be agreed at any time.</li> <li>• The evidence of the Council relies upon the best-case trajectory provided by the applicant rather than a realistic trajectory.</li> <li>• Every previous trajectory provided by the applicant has not been achieved even when these were not identified as being a best-case.</li> <li>• The current best-case trajectory of the applicant remains consistent with that previously relied upon by the Council which assumed that outline planning</li> </ul>
---	------------	--	---

				<p>permission would be secured by the summer of 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Despite the evident delays of at least 6 months the Council and the applicant has not delayed their trajectory.</li> <li>• The current best-case trajectory of the applicant allows 2 years from securing the necessary funding until the first completion such that it assumes that the first completions will be achieved in February 2023.</li> <li>• This is wholly unrealistic. There is no prospect that the review of the CIL Charging Schedule will be operative by then.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that the HIF funding will be secured by then.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that planning permission and a s106 will have been agreed by then.</li> <li>• If these are not achieved, as will almost certainly be the case, the applicant recognises that the “delay to delivery could be exponential.”</li> <li>• The assumed 2 year lead-in time is also wholly unrealistic. This has never been achieved on any site of this scale nationally. The quickest that has ever been achieved is a lead-in time from the grant of outline planning permission until the first completion of 3 years and 4 months.</li> </ul>
<b>Sites identified on a Brownfield Register</b>	<b>321</b>	Please note that this figure differs from that provided in the 5YHLS Feb 2021 position paper due to one additional site for 45 dwellings (Fareham Magistrates Court) being moved from the category headed “Resolutions to Grant Planning Permission”.	<b>0</b>	

<p>Warsash Maritime Academy (no planning application)</p>	<p>100</p>	<p>No planning application has been submitted for development on this site which has since been allocated for 100 dwellings in the Regulation 19 version of the draft Local Plan 2026. The landowner, Solent University, exchanged contracts with Metis Homes on 23rd December 2020 for the disposal of the land. Metis are said to be working on proposals to forward the site for housing and will be engaging with the Council in the coming months.</p> <p>The latest information provided by site promoter in October 2020 (FBC.11, p16) confirmed the delivery of the site as follows: 2021/22 – 100 dwellings, 2022/23 – 50 dwellings. The site promoter has indicated that the site may be capable of delivering 150 dwellings which is more than the Council has projected over the five-years.</p> <p>A screening opinion (EIA) (P/19/0202/EA) for the development of up to 100 dwellings, a care home of up to 66 beds and employment space was issued by the Council on 29th March 2019 indicating that the application would need to be accompanied by an Environmental Statement. Having regard to the consultation responses, the requirements are not unduly onerous. The requirement for a Transport Assessment is a fairly typical requirement for a major planning application, regardless of whether an environmental statement is required and should not lead to significant delay. Matters in relation to European Sites in Fareham Borough are well rehearsed and any necessary mitigation measure to off-set nitrates and/recreational pressures are well understood. It is noted that the environmental health officer has indicated that an assessment with regard to contaminated land is not required. There is no reason why an</p>	<p>0</p> <p><u>Suitability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No nitrate solution had or has been agreed for this site such that it could not and cannot be demonstrated to be suitable.</li> <li>• The Council acknowledge that the suitability of this site will need to be tested through an Environmental Statement and a Transport Assessment, neither of which have been undertaken, and so this site could not and cannot be demonstrated to be suitable.</li> <li>• The suitability of this site has not been tested through a planning application or through a Local Plan allocation and it has not even been subject to public consultation such that it cannot be demonstrated to offer a suitable location for development.</li> </ul> <p><u>Clear evidence that completions will be achieved</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence that the site is suitable to accommodate development.</li> <li>• The evidence of the Council relies upon this site delivering 100 homes in 2021/22 notwithstanding that it is not even subject of a planning application. This trajectory is therefore wholly unrealistic.</li> </ul>
---	------------	---	--

		<p>environmental statement cannot be produced within 3 – 6 months.</p> <p>On 11th October 2019 (P/19/0344/FP) full planning permission was granted for the redevelopment of the adjacent retained section of the academy campus and works are already underway on site. This further provides clear evidence that the wider site is deliverable and capable of being brought forward during the next five-years.</p> <p>The Council has adopted a precautionary approach with the delivery of the site in 2023/24 and 2024/25, the latter part of five-year period. On the basis of the information provided by the site promoter, it is considered that the site is capable of being delivered within the five-year period.</p>		
<p>Fareham Magistrates Court (resolution to grant outline planning permission)</p> <p>Outline planning application P/18/1261/OA (subject to resolution to grant planning permission)</p> <p>Shown in FBC 5YHLS Feb 2021 in category "Resolution to Grant Planning Permission"</p>	<p>45</p>	<p>An outline application for 45 dwellings (P/18/1261/OA) from the landowner (Homes England) was submitted in November 2018. At a meeting held on 16th December 2020 Members of the Council's Planning Committee resolved to grant planning permission subject to S106 obligations. A legal agreement to secure bespoke off-site nitrate mitigation land in Knowle (in the administrative district of Winchester City Council) is expected to be completed by the end of May 2021 with the decision issued as soon thereafter as possible.</p> <p>The reserved matters application is likely to come from Churchill Retirement Living who have already engaged the Council in pre-app discussions. Attached at FBC.8 App1 is a recent letter received by the case officer at the Council from Churchill Retirement Living (CRL) inviting them to view their latest proposals. Similar letters have been sent to various parties as part</p>	<p>0</p>	<p><u>Suitability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The suitability of this site has not been tested through a planning application or through a Local Plan allocation and it had not even been subject to public consultation such that it could not be demonstrated to offer a suitable location for development at the base-date.</li> <li>• The Council has subsequently resolved to grant planning permission providing planning obligations which are necessary to make the proposed development suitable are secured. In the absence of these having been secured the Council presumably consider that the proposal is not suitable.</li> </ul> <p><u>Clear evidence that completions will be achieved</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no written evidence or similar from the interested parties to demonstrate that this site is deliverable.</li> <li>• There is no evidence in support of the Council's trajectory or the milestones necessary to achieve</li> </ul>

		<p>of a round of public engagement required prior to submitting a reserved matters application. The letter, and the details at the CRL website, demonstrate that the scheme is well advanced and this is clear evidence that a reserved matters application will be submitted within the next six months most likely much earlier.</p> <p>The Council has adopted a precautionary approach with the delivery of the site estimated in 2023/24. Given the small number of dwellings on this site, this is reasonable and anticipate the delivery of the site within the 5 year period.</p>		<p>this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The evidence of the Council relies upon the fact that the site is small which does not accord with the position of other Inspectors as set out above.</li> </ul>
<p>22- 27a Stubbington Green</p> <p>Planning application P/18/1410/FP</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>A planning application is under consideration. The applicant has advised that they intend to purchase nitrate mitigation credits at Warnford Park (please see para 8.25 of the Council's Statement of Case). Subject to receiving a Nitrate Mitigation Proposals Pack and to the satisfactory completion of an HRA/AA the Council will consult Natural England before placing the application before the Planning Committee for a decision to be made.</p> <p>No s106 legal agreement will be required in this particular instance. There is also no reason to believe that any of the suggested conditions would be onerous or anything other than standard for a development of this type.</p> <p>For these reasons, it is considered that 10 dwellings could be delivered on this site within the 5 year period.</p>		

<p>Rest of 3 – 33 West Street</p> <p>Outline planning application P/19/1040/OA</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>An outline planning application is currently under consideration. The application has provided Nitrate Mitigation Proposals pack relying on mitigation land at Little Duxmore Farm. A HRA/AA has been completed and Natural England have raised no objection in response to the consultation request.</p> <p>The application will shortly be taken to the Council's Planning Committee for a decision to be made. It is unlikely that a s106 legal agreement will be required. There is also no reason to believe that any of the suggested conditions would be onerous or anything other than standard for a development of this type.</p> <p>For these reasons, it is considered that 10 dwellings could be delivered on this site within the 5 year period.</p>		
<p>Locks Heath District Centre</p>	<p>35</p>	<p>Pre-application advice was provided by Officers in 2019.</p> <p>A planning application is currently under consideration for works to reconfigure the access roads, bus lane and car parking layout (reference P/21/0148/FP) to allow the future redevelopment of parts of the centre, including the petrol station site and part of the car park.</p>		
<p>Former Filling Station, Locks Heath Centre</p>	<p>30</p>	<p>Pre-application advice was provided by Officers in 2019.</p> <p>A planning application is currently under consideration for works to reconfigure the access roads, bus lane and car parking layout (reference P/21/0148/FP) to allow the future redevelopment of parts of the centre, including the petrol station site and part of the car park.</p>		

<p>Hammond Industrial Estate</p> <p>Planning application P/20/1597/FP</p>	<p>36</p>	<p>A planning application for a care home on this site is currently under consideration. Amended drawings have been provided at the request of Officers and work is continuing on technical matters as it is on nitrate mitigation proposals.</p> <p>For these reasons, it is considered that planning permission may shortly be granted meaning care home accommodation to an equivalent of 36 dwellings could be delivered on this site within the 5 year period.</p>		
<p>Assheton Court</p>	<p>27</p>	<p>Pre-app discussions have been held between Fareham Housing and Officers concerning the proposed redevelopment of this existing sheltered housing site. The proposals involve the demolition of the existing 33 flats and the site's redevelopment with around 60 new sheltered units. Detailed plans have been formulated and discussions are in an advanced state.</p> <p>A planning application is expected to be submitted later in 2021.</p>		
<p>68 Titchfield Park Road</p> <p>Planning permission P/20/1137/FP granted 18/3/21</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>Planning permission has been granted for 9 units at this site.</p> <p>There is no s106 agreement. The conditions imposed are standard and are not onerous. An application to discharge conditions has been submitted and is under consideration.</p> <p>For these reasons, it is considered that 9 dwellings could be delivered on this site within the 5 year period.</p>		

<p>Wates House, Wallington Hill</p> <p>Planning application P/20/1483/PC granted 20/1/21</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>Prior approval was granted for the conversion of this former office building in January 2021. A subsequent application has been received proposing an additional storey to the building to provide a further nine residential units (P/21/0350/FP).</p> <p>For these reasons, it is considered that at least 20 units could be delivered on this site within the 5 year period.</p>		
<b>Sites outside of Category A and B</b>				
<p><b>Large unallocated sites subject to a resolution to grant planning permission</b></p>	<p><b>657</b></p>	<p>Please note that this figure differs from that provided in the 5YHLS Feb 2021 position paper due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One site for 45 dwellings (Fareham Magistrates Court) being moved <u>out</u> of this category to the category headed "Brownfield Register Sites"</li> <li>• Two sites for a total of 700 dwellings (Heath Road and Welborne) being moved <u>out</u> of this category to the category headed "Allocations";</li> <li>• Two sites totalling 30 dwellings (Land East &amp; West of 79 Greenaway Lane and 18 Titchfield Park Road) being added <u>in</u> to this category from the category headed "Outstanding Outline Planning Permissions".</li> </ul>	<p><b>0</b></p>	
<p>Land at Brook Lane, Warsash (resolution to grant outline planning permission)</p> <p>Outline planning application P/17/0845/OA</p>	<p>174</p>	<p>The s106 legal agreement is substantially drafted with only matters in relation to maintenance costs for a pedestrian/cycling link and the inclusion of the affordable housing allowance cap remaining outstanding. These are not substantive issues. This evidence clearly shows that good progress is continuing to be made although it is accepted that the Council is not yet in a position to issue the planning consent.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p><u>Suitability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Such sites are not capable of being considered deliverable according to the NPPF, PPG, the overwhelming majority of s78 Inspectors, and the Secretary of State and have not been considered to be deliverable by every appeal decision of which I am aware.</li> <li>• The Council has resolved to grant planning permission providing planning obligations which are necessary to make the proposed development</li> </ul>

The applicant has not expressed an interest in nitrate credits available under the HIWWT scheme and has, as yet, not advised what mitigation it is proposing. However, as set out in paragraph 8.25 of the Council's Statement of Case, a legal agreement has recently been entered into to allow nitrate mitigation to be brought forward at Warnford Park and it is anticipated that this will enable those sites remaining without proposals in place to achieve nitrate neutrality.

The submission of all reserved matters is to be made to the local planning authority no later than 12 months from the date of the permission. The implementation period for the developments has been further reduced to 12 months from the approval of the last reserved matters application.

The delivery of the site within the five years remains a realistic prospect. The Council's trajectory shows only a small number of dwellings (40) being provided in 2022/23 with the remainder being delivered in 2023/24 and 2024/25. The conditions attached to the outline consent are standard and not onerous and strictly limit the time for the submission of reserved matters applications and the commencement of works thereafter. There are no complex or particular onerous matters that suggests there will be any delay in delivery.

On this basis, this clear evidence, proportionate to the circumstances of the case has been provided to demonstrate that this site is deliverable within five years.

suitable are secured. In the absence of these having been secured the Council presumably consider that the proposal is not suitable.

- No nitrate solution had or has been agreed for this site such that it could not and cannot be demonstrated to be suitable.

Clear evidence that completions will be achieved

- There is no written evidence or similar from the interested parties to demonstrate that this site is deliverable.
- There is no evidence in support of the Council's trajectory or the milestones necessary to achieve this.
- No evidence is available to demonstrate that a satisfactory nitrate solution will be identified.
- No evidence from the interested parties that the s106 will be agreed.

<p>Land East of Brook Lane (South), Warsash (resolution to grant outline planning permission)</p> <p>Outline planning application P/17/0752/OA granted 17/2/21</p> <p>Reserved matters application under consideration P/21/0300/RM</p>	<p>110</p>	<p>Outline planning permission has been granted in February 2021. The submission of all reserved matters must be made to the local planning authority no later than 12 months from the date of the permission. In fact a reserved matters application was received on 19<sup>th</sup> February 2021 and is currently under consideration (P/21/0300/RM).</p> <p>The implementation period for the development has been further reduced to 12 months from the submissions of the last reserved matters application. The conditions and obligations are standard and not onerous.</p> <p>For these reasons, it is considered that the Council's projected housing delivery dwellings at Land East of Brook Lane (South), Warsash is entirely deliverable within the 5 year period. This is supported by the information provided by the applicant in their position statement received October 2020 (FBC.11, p 12 – 15).</p>	<p>0</p> <p><u>Suitability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Such sites are not capable of being considered deliverable according to the NPPF, PPG, the overwhelming majority of s78 Inspectors, and the Secretary of State and have not been considered to be deliverable by every appeal decision of which I am aware.</li> <li>• The Council has resolved to grant planning permission providing planning obligations which are necessary to make the proposed development suitable are secured. In the absence of these having been secured the Council presumably consider that the proposal is not suitable.</li> <li>• No nitrate solution had or has been agreed for this site such that it could not and cannot be demonstrated to be suitable.</li> <li>• An HRA/AA has yet to be undertaken to demonstrate whether any significant effects on protected sites will be able to be appropriately mitigated and until this has been achieved it should not be considered suitable.</li> </ul> <p><u>Clear evidence that completions will be achieved</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The evidence of the Council relies upon a pro-forma submitted by the developer which identifies that the lead-in time is dependent upon when the Council grant planning permission, and that delivery will be assessed when there is more certainty in the market.</li> <li>• No evidence from the interested parties that the s106 will be a</li> </ul>
---	------------	--	---

<p>Land South of Greenaway Lane, Warsash (resolution to grant outline planning permission)</p> <p>Also known as Land to the East of Brook Lane and West of Lockwood Road, Warsash</p> <p>Outline planning application P/17/0998/OA</p>	<p>157</p>	<p>The s106 legal agreement is almost concluded but requires signing and sealing. All the developers have expressed an interest with HIWWT to purchase nitrate credits. FBC has already contacted the applicants to set out the final steps required for them to demonstrate nitrate neutrality (by obtaining a Nitrogen Mitigation Proposals pack from HIWWT) and this is expected imminently. FBC will carry out an HRA/AA, consult Natural England and then move to issue the decisions.</p> <p>Once outline permission is granted the submission of all reserved matters is to be made to the local planning authority no later than 18 months from the date of the permission. The implementation period for the development has been further reduced to 12 months from the submissions of the last reserved matters application. The conditions and obligations are standard and not onerous.</p> <p>For these reasons, the Council's projected housing delivery 157 dwellings at Land to the East of Brook Lane and West of Lockwood is entirely deliverable within the 5 year period. This is supported by the information provided by the applicant in their position statements received October 2020 (FBC.11, p 6 – 11).</p>	<p>0</p>	<p><u>Suitability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Such sites are not capable of being considered deliverable according to the NPPF, PPG, the overwhelming majority of s78 Inspectors, and the Secretary of State and have not been considered to be deliverable by every appeal decision of which I am aware.</li> <li>• The Council has resolved to grant planning permission providing planning obligations which are necessary to make the proposed development suitable are secured. In the absence of these having been secured the Council presumably consider that the proposal is not suitable.</li> <li>• No nitrate solution had or has been agreed for this site such that it could not and cannot be demonstrated to be suitable.</li> <li>• An HRA/AA has yet to be undertaken to demonstrate whether any significant effects on protected sites will be able to be appropriately mitigated and until this has been achieved it should not be considered suitable.</li> </ul> <p><u>Clear evidence that completions will be achieved</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The evidence of the Council relies upon a pro-forma submitted by the applicant which identifies that this development will not be nitrate neutral. The suitability of this has yet to be considered by the Council.</li> <li>• The pro-forma also identifies that delivery is being postponed until a nitrate solution is found.</li> <li>• There is no evidence in support of the Council's trajectory or the milestones necessary to achieve this.</li> <li>• No evidence is available to demonstrate that a satisfactory nitrate solution will be identified.</li> <li>• No evidence from the interested parties that the s106 will be agreed.</li> </ul>
--	------------	---	----------	--

<p>East &amp; West of 79 Greenaway Lane, Warsash (resolution to grant outline planning permission)</p> <p>Outline planning permission P/18/0107/OA granted 20/1/21</p> <p>Shown in error in FBC 5YHLS Feb 2021 in category "Outstanding Outline Planning Permission"</p>	<p>24</p>	<p>Outline planning permission has been granted in January 2021. The submission of all reserved matters must be made to the local planning authority no later than 12 months from the date of the permission. The implementation period for the development has been further reduced to 12 months from the submissions of the last reserved matters application. The conditions and obligations are standard and not onerous.</p> <p>For these reasons, the Council's projected housing delivery at this site is entirely deliverable within the 5 year period.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p><u>Suitability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Such sites are not capable of being considered deliverable according to the NPPF, PPG, the overwhelming majority of s78 Inspectors, and the Secretary of State and have not been considered to be deliverable by every appeal decision of which I am aware.</li> <li>• The Council has resolved to grant planning permission providing planning obligations which are necessary to make the proposed development suitable are secured. In the absence of these having been secured the Council presumably consider that the proposal is not suitable.</li> <li>• No nitrate solution had or has been agreed for this site such that it could not and cannot be demonstrated to be suitable.</li> <li>• An HRA/AA has yet to be undertaken to demonstrate whether any significant effects on protected sites will be able to be appropriately mitigated and until this has been achieved it should not be considered suitable.</li> </ul> <p><u>Clear evidence that completions will be achieved</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no written evidence or similar from the interested parties to demonstrate that this site is deliverable.</li> <li>• There is no evidence in support of the Council's trajectory or the milestones necessary to achieve this.</li> <li>• No evidence from the interested parties that the s106 will be agreed.</li> </ul>
--	-----------	---	----------	---

<p>Land South West of Sovereign Crescent, Locks Heath (resolution to grant full planning permission)</p> <p>Planning application P/18/0484/FP</p>	<p>38</p>	<p>In April 2021 the developer at Sovereign Crescent submitted a Nitrate Mitigation Proposals Pack relating to mitigation land at Warnford Park (see para 8.25 of the Council's Statement of Case). Subject to the satisfactory completion of an HRA/AA the Council will consult Natural England before moving to issue the decision.</p> <p>The implementation period for this development has been reduced to 12 months.</p> <p>The conditions to be imposed are standard and are not onerous.</p> <p>This site is entirely deliverable within the five year period.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p><u>Suitability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Such sites are not capable of being considered deliverable according to the NPPF, PPG, the overwhelming majority of s78 Inspectors, and the Secretary of State and have not been considered to be deliverable by every appeal decision of which I am aware.</li> <li>• The Council has resolved to grant planning permission providing planning obligations which are necessary to make the proposed development suitable are secured. In the absence of these having been secured the Council presumably consider that the proposal is not suitable.</li> <li>• No nitrate solution had or has been agreed for this site such that it could not and cannot be demonstrated to be suitable.</li> </ul> <p><u>Clear evidence that completions will be achieved</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no written evidence or similar from the interested parties to demonstrate that this site is deliverable.</li> <li>• There is no evidence in support of the Council's trajectory or the milestones necessary to achieve this.</li> <li>• No evidence is available to demonstrate that a satisfactory nitrate solution will be identified.</li> <li>• No evidence from the interested parties that the s106 will be agreed.</li> </ul>
---	-----------	--	----------	---

<p>Moraunt Drive, Portchester (resolution to grant full planning permission)</p> <p>Outline planning application P/18/0654/OA</p>	<p>48</p>	<p>The legal agreements have been signed ready to be completed. The developer at Moraunt Drive has confirmed an agreement to purchase nitrate credits from HIWWT at Little Duxmore Farm and a Nitrate Mitigation Proposals Pack has been received. A HRA/AA has been completed and no objection raised by Natural England. A decision on this application is therefore likely to be issued imminently.</p> <p>The implementation period has been reduced to 12 months. The conditions to be imposed are standard and are not onerous.</p> <p>This site is entirely deliverable within the five year period.</p>	<p>0</p> <p><u>Suitability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Such sites are not capable of being considered deliverable according to the NPPF, PPG, the overwhelming majority of s78 Inspectors, and the Secretary of State and have not been considered to be deliverable by every appeal decision of which I am aware.</li> <li>• The Council has resolved to grant planning permission providing planning obligations which are necessary to make the proposed development suitable are secured. In the absence of these having been secured the Council presumably consider that the proposal is not suitable.</li> <li>• No nitrate solution had or has been agreed for this site such that it could not and cannot be demonstrated to be suitable.</li> </ul> <p><u>Clear evidence that completions will be achieved</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no written evidence or similar from the interested parties to demonstrate that this site is deliverable.</li> <li>• There is no evidence in support of the Council's trajectory or the milestones necessary to achieve this.</li> <li>• No evidence is available to demonstrate that a satisfactory nitrate solution will be identified.</li> <li>• No evidence from the interested parties that the s106 will be agreed.</li> </ul>
---	-----------	---	--

<p>Land adjacent to 125 Greenaway Lane</p> <p>Outline planning application P/19/0402/OA</p>	<p>100</p>	<p>A resolution to grant planning permission was given by the Planning Committee at their meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2020.</p> <p>The s106 legal agreement is expected to be completed imminently and then the decision will be issued.</p> <p>The submission of reserved matters is required within 12 months of the outline permission being granted. Implementation of the development is required within 12 months of the last of those reserved matters being approved.</p> <p>The conditions to be imposed are standard and are not onerous.</p> <p>This site is entirely deliverable within the five year period.</p>		
<p>18 Titchfield Park Road, Titchfield</p> <p>Outline planning permission P/20/0235/OA</p> <p>Shown in error in FBC 5YHLS Feb 2021 in category "Outstanding Outline Planning Permission"</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>A resolution to grant planning permission was given by the Planning Committee at their meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> August 2020. The site is nitrate neutral and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>The s106 legal agreement is due to be completed imminently after which the decision can be issued. The conditions to be imposed are standard and are not onerous.</p> <p>This site is entirely deliverable within the five year period.</p>		
<b>Windfall allowance</b>				
<b>Windfall allowance</b>	<b>102</b>		<b>74</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2550</b>		<b>599</b>	