

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Committee

(to be confirmed at the next meeting)

Date: Wednesday, 15 September 2021

Venue: Collingwood Room - Civic Offices

PRESENT:

Councillor N J Walker (Chairman)

Councillor I Bastable (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors: F Birkett, Miss J Bull, T M Cartwright, MBE, P J Davies, M J Ford, JP, Mrs C L A Hockley and R H Price, JP

Also Present: Councillor Mrs K K Trott (Item 5 (6)) and Councillor Mrs S M Bayford (Item 5 (3))



1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies of absence for this meeting.

2. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no Chairman's announcements made at this meeting.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In accordance with Standing Orders and the Council's Code of Conduct Councillor Miss J Bull declared a Personal Interest in item 5(4) – Brookfield Community School as she has a child at this school.

4. 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	Item No/ Application No/Page No	Dep Type
ZONE 1 – 2.30pm					
Mr R Marshall	The Fareham Society	LAND EAST OF SOUTHAMPTON ROAD TITCHFIELD – RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION FOR 95 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE, LANDSCAPE, OPEN SPACE AND APPROVAL OF DETAILS PURSUANT TO CONDITIONS 11, 12 AND 18 FOLLOWING GRANTING OF OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION NO. P/18/0068/OA. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT AND SCALE	Opposing	5 (1) P/20/1584/RM Pg 5	Written

Ms L Wiltshire		-DITTO-	Supporting	-Ditto-	In Person
Mr J Gorrod		LOCKS HEATH SHOPPING CENTRE, CENTRE WAY LOCKS HEATH – RECONFIGURATION OF EXISTING CENTRE WAY ACCESS ROAD, BUS LANE & SHOPPING CENTRE CAR PARK LAYOUT TO PROVIDE: A NEW ROUNDABOUT JUNCTION ON CENTRE WAY TO PROVIDE ACCESS TO MAIN CAR PARKS, ALTERATION TO THE PUBLIC CAR PARK LAYOUT TO ALLOW THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF AREAS 1 AND 2 AND THE REDUCTION OF PARKING SPACES, PROVISION OF A NEW BUS TURNING FACILITY PROVIDED ON CENTRE WAY AT THE WESTERN END OF THE SHOPPING CENTRE, PROVISION OF A DECKED CAR PARK WITHIN THE DTAFF PARKING AREA AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AND PUBLIC REALM IMPROVEMENTS CONNECTED WITH THE PROPOSALS.	Opposing	5 (3) P/21/0148/FP Pg 23	In Person
Mr R Marshall	The Fareham Society	-DITTO-	-Ditto-	-Ditto-	Written
Mr P Keenan (Agent)		-DITTO-	Supporting	-Ditto-	In Person
Mr P Lindsey		BROOKFIELD COMMUNITY SCHOOL SARISBURY GREEN SO31 7DU – CREATION OF 3G ARTIFICIAL GRASS PITCH (AGP) WITH PERIMETER FENCING,	Opposing	5 (4) P/21/0693/FP Pg 39	In person

		FLOODLIGHTING, MACADAM HARDSTANDING AREAS, STORAGE CONTAINER & SOIL BUNDS			
Ms M Lush		-DITTO-	-Ditto-	-Ditto-	In Person
Ms S Gillingham		-DITTO-	-Ditto-	-Ditto-	Written
Mr & Mrs Rennie		-DITTO-	-Ditto-	-Ditto-	Written
Mr M Lunn		-DITTO-	-Ditto-	-Ditto-	In Person
Mr T Dickenson		-DITTO-	-Ditto-	-Ditto-	
Ms E Kirby		-DITTO-	-Ditto-	-Ditto-	Video
Ms R Alinson		-DITTO-	-Ditto-	-Ditto-	Video
Mr & Mrs Fleming		8 LOWER CHURCH ROAD – TWO STOREY REAR AND SIDE EXTENSION	Opposing	5 (5) P/21/0942/FP Pg 58	Written
Mr G Reeder		-DITTO-	-Ditto-	-Ditto-	Written
Ms A Bradley		-DITTO-	-Ditto-	-Ditto-	Written
Mr M Line		-DITTO-	Supporting	-Ditto-	In Person
ZONE 2 – 2.30pm					
Mr I Donohue (Agent)		3 EARL GODWIN CLOSE FAREHAM – FIRST FLOOR REAR BALCONY	Supporting	5 (7) P/21/0950/FP Pg 69	In Person
ZONE 3 – 2.30pm					

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS INCLUDING AN UPDATE ON PLANNING APPEALS

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

(1) P/20/1584/RM - LAND EAST OF SOUTHAMPTON ROAD PO14 4PR

The Committee received the deputations referred to in Minute 4 above.

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to grant approval subject to:

- i) The applicant first providing revised plans to take account of two minor revisions to the shared surface layout to the satisfaction of Officers; and
- ii) The conditions in the report

Was voted on and CARRIED.

(Voting: 9 in favour; 0 against)

RESOLVED that, subject to:

- i) The applicant first providing revised plans to take account of two minor revisions to the shared surface layout to the satisfaction of Officers; and
- ii) The conditions in the report.

APPROVAL be granted.

(2) Q/1504/21 - LAND EAST OF SOUTHAMPTON ROAD

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation that Members authorise the deed of variation to the legal agreement be agreed along the following lines:

- a) To remove the obligation relating to the transfer of the public open space including play area and wildlife corridor to the Council;
- b) To secure details of robust and appropriate management and maintenance measures relating to the public open space including play area and wildlife corridor in lieu of the land being transferred to the Council, including details on the formation, funding and governance of the body responsible for doing so;
- c) To delegate to the Head of Development Management authority to agree suitable revised and additional obligations in respect of the above, and any other matters deemed necessary, in relation to Schedule Five of the legal agreement.

Was voted on and CARRIED.

(Voting: 7 in favour; 2 against)

RESOLVED that Members AUTHORISE the deed of variation to the legal agreement along the following lines:

- a) To remove the obligation relating to the transfer of the public open space including play area and wildlife corridor to the Council;
- b) To secure details of robust and appropriate management and maintenance measures relating to the public open space including play area and wildlife corridor in lieu of the land being transferred to the Council, including details on the formation, funding and governance of the body responsible for doing so;

- c) To delegate to the Head of Development Management authority to agree suitable revised and additional obligations in respect of the above, and any other matters deemed necessary, in relation to Schedule Five of the legal agreement.

**(3) P/21/0148/FP - LOCKS HEATH SHOPPING CENTRE CENTRE WAY
SO31 6DX**

The Committee received the deputations referred to in Minute 4 above.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Mrs S M Bayford addressed the Committee on this item.

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

An additional 123 objections have been received from local residents and 1 support comment has been received from Waitrose.

The representations received do not raise any new issues that have not already been addressed in the Officer's Committee Report.

Members raised concerns about the loss of the parking spaces, and how this could affect the vibrancy of the shopping centre. However, they welcomed to the redesign of the car park to allow better flow of traffic and easier parking.

A motion was proposed and seconded to defer the application, to allow officers the opportunity to discuss with the applicant the reconfiguration of the car park which does not result in the loss of any parking to ensure that the vitality and viability of the centre is retained. Further information is also requested regarding how this proposal relates to the future development of the area, and was CARRIED.

(Voting: 9 in favour; 0 against)

RESOLVED that the application be DEFERRED.

**(4) P/21/0693/FP - BROOKFIELD COMMUNITY SCHOOL BROOK LANE
SO31 7DU**

The Committee received the deputations referred to in Minute 4 above.

The first of the video deputations unfortunately was not able to be fully played due to some technical issues, however the depute confirmed that their points had been raised by other deputations and therefore had no issue with the Committee not being able to hear the whole of their deputation.

The Committee Manager read out a statement on behalf of Councillor S D Martin, Ward Councillor.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Headmaster of Brookfield Community School addressed the Committee on this item to answer questions from members.

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

Representations:

One further letter has been received in response to the publication of the Committee agenda. The comments raised are:

- *It is disputed that there will not be an adverse impact in neighbours (para 8.49) as we can already hear sports activity on the pitches behind the site at less frequent hours of use.*
- *Changing operating hours clearly acknowledges that this will be a noisy venture.*
- *The construction schedule gives Brookfield Gardens residents far more consideration than the AGP.*
- *The pitch is too close to residential homes. There is so much room between this school and Sarisbury Infants.*
- *I have no objection if Everyone Active had made the application as no residents would be affected.*
- *Brookfield Gardens slopes down from the school so the site is actually higher than the neighbours. 2m high bunds will not offset the intrusive lighting on 5m tall stanchions or the noise from sport.*

Recommendation:

Within the applicants Noise Impact Assessment it is recommended that a Noise Management Plan is implemented as part of the development. This can be included with an adjustment to condition 11 in the main agenda to include "a noise management plan" as follows:

11. *Prior to first use of the Artificial Grass Pitch a community use agreement prepared in consultation with Sport England must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreement shall apply to the Artificial Grass Pitch, any ancillary accommodation and the car park, and include details of pricing policy, hours of use, access by non-educational establishment users, management responsibilities, **a noise management plan** and a mechanism for review. The development shall not be used otherwise than in strict compliance with the approved agreement.*

REASON: To secure well managed safe community access to the sports facility, to ensure sufficient benefit to the development of sport and to accord with development plan policy.

Councillor Miss J Bull declared a personal interest in this item as she has a child that attends this School.

Members expressed concern over the lack of consultation from the School with the neighbouring properties, and felt that many of the concerns raised in the objections to the application had not been addressed.

A motion was proposed and seconded to defer the application, to allow the school to undertake a public consultation on the plans and to try and resolve, by amendments to the application where appropriate, some of the concerns that have been raised to include:

- Noise impact and the accuracy of the assessment and conclusions within the submitted Noise Assessment;
 - The use of micro plastic in the pitch construction, rubber crumb on its surface and the pitch lifecycle; and
 - The siting of the pitch,
- and was CARRIED.

(Voting: 5 in favour; 4 against)

RESOLVED that the application be DEFERRED to allow the School to undertake a public consultation.

(5) P/21/0942/FP - 8 LOWER CHURCH ROAD PO14 4PN

The Committee received the deputations referred to in Minute 4 above.

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

Further Information Provided:

Further information has been provided by the applicant in response to a third-party comment received in relation to the proposed plans. The points raised are:

- *The proposed foundations have been assessed as suitable by the architect and have obtained building control approval.*
- *The proposed extension will be constructed wholly on the application property, and no part of the structure, including foundations or guttering, will project over the property boundary.*
- *As a result of building works at the adjoining property, the current structure has suffered from water ingress, which is causing damp in ground floor rooms.*
- *No access will be required across neighbouring properties in order to carry out any construction works.*

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions in the report, was voted on and CARRIED.

(Voting: 9 in favour; 0 against)

RESOLVED that, subject to the conditions in the report, PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

(6) P/21/1089/TO - 10 BRONTE GARDENS PO15 7LF

A motion was proposed and seconded to refuse this application as Members considered that the issues have arisen from poor construction of the building, with insufficient foundations, and that the loss of trees proposed to be felled would be harmful to the visual amenity of the area. The motion was voted on and CARRIED.

(Voting: 6 in favour; 1 against; 2 abstention)

RESOLVED that CONSENT be REFUSED.

(7) P/21/0950/FP - 3 EARL GODWIN CLOSE PO16 0DW

Councillor Mrs Hockley, left the room at the start of this item and took no part in the remainder of the meeting.

The Committee received the deputation referred to in Minute 4 above.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Mrs K K Trott, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee on this item.

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions in the report, was voted on and CARRIED.

(Voting: 8 in favour; 0 against)

RESOLVED that, subject to the condition in the report, PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

(8) P/21/1358/FP - STREETLIGHTING CASTLE STREET WATERSIDE LANE HOSPITAL LANE PORTCHESTER

Councillor P J Davies left the room at the start of this item and took no further part in the meeting.

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

Since the publication of the Committee Report, an additional consultation COMMENT FROM English Heritage has been received, stating:

Some of the works proposals are within the English Heritage Guardianship area of Portchester Castle and full consultation with an approval by English Heritage is required here. Archaeological monitoring and recording is likely to be required, tother with agreement on dates of access and works methodology. Replacement with as similar colour to the existing lampposts is likely to be preferred.

In addition, scheduled monument consent from Historic England for works within the scheduled monument area will be required.

Discussions are already underway with FBC officers and SSE on these aspects.

In addition, Historic England have updated their response to reflect the age of the existing columns. However, this amendment has not changed their view regarding the removal of the existing columns.

Further email correspondence has continued with SSEC and FBC since publication of the report, requesting the suitability of the root plated Norwich columns for fixing and the cost difference between the proposed Gainsborough and requested Norwich columns.

SSEC response to Norwich Column Option:

Following a contract review of the units to be replaced in Castle Street and Hospital Lane Portchester the view from the PFI responsibilities have been fulfilled with the proposal to replace the existing units with a standard tubular steel shaft and using one of two options of embellishment kit.

- 1. The Gainsborough embellishment kit, black or green in colour.*
- 2. The Chandler embellishment kit, black or green in colour. This kit has been used to replace one unit already in Castle Street as it had been RTC'd.*

SSE Contracting have investigated your suggestion of the Norwich unit, and we have given this suggestion our full consideration. However, we have already removed and replaced many cast columns within the Hampshire PFI using one of our two equivalent, and a higher standard column is not required. The previously replaced columns on the Hampshire PFI have been replaced with either the Gainsborough kit or Chandler kit which are both of the correct standard and specification set out within the Hampshire PFI contract with Hampshire County Council.

Please confirm which one of the two options you are happy to move forward with so that i may programme the units replacement.

If we do not hear from you by the 17th September 2021, we will proceed with the Chandler embellishment kit to match the unit 22 Castle Street that had been replaced under maintenance through the PFI.

RESOLVED that members agreed with officers that no evidence has been provided by SSEC to clarify why they are structurally unsafe and therefore at the end of their life. Without this information, members consider that the existing lighting columns should be retained.

In the event that evidence can be provided to support the opinion of SSEC regarding the state of the columns, SSEC and Hampshire County Council should seek to replace the columns with a higher quality alternative than those originally suggested.

(9) Planning Appeals

The Committee noted the information in the report.

(10) Update Report

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

(The meeting started at 2.30 pm
and ended at 8.50 pm).