

## UPDATES

for Committee Meeting to be held on 16/02/2022

### **ZONE 1 – WESTERN WARDS**

(1) P/20/1100/FP Sarisbury Ward

The Nursery, Land to the rear of 166 Botley Road, Burridge

After further consideration of the committee report the below paragraphs have been superseded with the following:

#### **Policy DSP40 (ii)**

8.38 This criterion seeks to ensure the proposal is sustainably located, well related to the existing urban settlement boundary and can be well integrated with the neighbouring settlement. The existing urban settlement boundary is located 21 metres to the east of the application site with an area of woodland in between. It is therefore considered that the proposal is reasonably well related to the neighbouring settlement but would be difficult to be integrated due to the woodland. The site is sustainably located however, within walking distance to local services and facilities in Park Gate. The building is not isolated and would be related to the neighbouring dwellings and the therefore the settlement of Burridge. Due to the acknowledged difficulties of integration with the wider settlement of Whiteley (designated urban area), the proposal is considered to not fully comply with part (ii) of DSP40.

#### **The Planning Balance**

8.73 There is a conflict with development plan Policy CS14 which ordinarily would result in this proposal being considered unacceptable in principle. Ordinarily CS14 would be the principal policy such that a scheme in the countryside would be considered contrary to the development plan. However, in light of the Council's lack of 5YHLS, development plan Policy DSP40 is engaged, and Officers have considered the scheme against the criterion therein. The scheme is considered to satisfy four of the five criteria with acknowledged conflict with DSP40 (ii) in part as the dwelling would not be capable of being integrated with the existing urban settlement of Whiteley. However, having regard to the previously developed nature of the site and the previous established residential use through the lapsed prior approval and given that there have been no changes to the legislation or on-site conditions, Officers consider that a further prior approval is likely to be approved. Therefore, the level of harm arising as a result of the development would not be significant and Officers form the view that more weight should be given to Policy DSP40 than CS14 and that when considered against the balance of the development plan, the scheme is considered to accord with the development plan as a whole.

(2) P/20/1138/FP Warsash Ward

Land to the rear of September Cottage, Brook Avenue, Warsash

Since the publication of the planning committee report, seven additional letters, from existing third party objectors have written in re-emphasising their concerns about the application proposal.

Their concerns relate to impact from construction traffic on Brook Avenue, impact on the TPO trees on the site, quality of the sewerage system serving Brook Avenue and the proximity of the overhead powerlines to the rear of the site.

(4) P/21/0300/RM Warsash Ward

Land East of Brook Lane and North of Warsash Road

Update to Report

Paragraph 3.1 of the committee report incorrectly refers to the provision of 78 dwellings. The amended plans propose 76 dwellings as stated at the start of the report. The access referred to in the description was also approved as a full plans application reference P/20/00539/FP as listed in section 5.

Updated Consultee Response from Natural England

No objection subject to the receipt of appropriate mitigation.

Updated Recommendation

In light of the response from Natural England the recommendation is amended as follows:

***Recommendation***

APPROVE RESERVED MATTERS, subject to the following conditions (as listed in the report.)

The following additional plans are to be added to condition 1:

- Road Vertical Alignment 2 of 2 (1802 rev F)
- Road Horizontal Alignment Sheet 1 of 3 (1811 rev F)
- Road Horizontal Alignment Sheet 2 of 3 (1812 rev F)
- Road Horizontal Alignment Sheet 3 of 3 (1813 rev F)

And the following plans updated with the revisions shown in bold:

Coloured site layout drawing CSL.02 updated to Rev J **K**

House Type 3.5-A Floor Plans Rev **B A**

## **ZONE 2 – FAREHAM**

(6) P/21/1888/FP Fareham North

3 Kiln Road, Fareham

Suggested condition 1 is amended as follows:

*“The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved documents:*

- 1. Garden Room sizes from South Elevation*
- 2. Garden Room sizes from East Elevation*
- 3. Garden Room sizes from North Elevation*
- 4. Position of Windows and Doors*
- 5. Site Plan*
- 6. Location Plan*

*REASON: To avoid any doubt over what has been permitted.”*

Suggested condition 2 is amended as follows to omit the wording “... unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority”:

*“The outbuilding hereby permitted shall be used only for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the main dwellinghouse.*

*REASON: To protect the living conditions the occupants of neighbouring properties and to ensure local Planning Authority retains control over the use of the building.”*

## **ZONE 3 – EASTERN WARDS**

(no.) [Reference] [Ward]

[Location]

[Update Notes]