



This page is intentionally left blank

## HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Site Viewing Working Party held on 9 March 2023

Present

Councillor: Crellin (Chairman)

Councillors: Fairhurst and Weeks

Officers: Mark Gregory, Democratic Services Officer  
Steve Weaver, Development Manager  
Ernest Lam, Democratic Services Officer  
David Eaves, Principal Planning Officer

### 25 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bowdell, Linger, and Richardson.

### 26 Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interests relating to matters on the agenda.

### 27 APP/21/00399 - Land at Waterloo Park, Elettra Avenue, Waterlooville

Proposal: Full application for erection of discount foodstore, drive through coffee shop and drive-through restaurant with associated car parking, service yard, landscaping, means of access and associated infrastructure.

The site was viewed at the request of the Executive Head of Place.

The Working Party received a report by the Executive Head of Place.

The Working Party viewed the site, the subject of the application, from Elettra Avenue, Waterlooville and Waterberry Drive to assess whether there were any additional matters that should be considered by the Planning Committee.

RESOLVED that, based on the site inspection and information available at the time, the following additional information be provided to the Planning Committee:

1. The adequacy of the proposed provision for parent/child and disabled parking spaces; and
2. The availability of electric vehicle charging points

**28 APP/22/00761 - 34 Deverell Place, Waterlooville, PO7 5ED**

Proposal: Loft extension for the creation of a first floor with gable end and dormers to front and rear elevations.

The site was viewed at the request of the Executive Head of Place.

The Working Party received a report by the Executive Head of Place.

The Working Party viewed the site, the subject of the application, and viewed from 32 Deverell Place, Waterlooville to assess whether there were any additional matters that should be considered by the Planning Committee.

RESOLVED that, based on the site inspection and information available at the time, no additional information be provided to the Planning Committee.

**The meeting commenced at 1.30 pm and concluded at 2.38 pm**

.....  
**Chairman**

**Date: 13<sup>th</sup> March 2023**

**Statement of Support for Planning Application APP/21/00399**

**Land at Waterloo Park, Elletra Avenue, Waterlooville**

**Planning Committee 16<sup>th</sup> March – Agenda Item 5**

We write on behalf of Hargreaves, the Applicant for the above planning application, and welcome the opportunity to submit a written statement to Members of the Planning Committee prior to their consideration of the application.

Hargreaves have owned the site for a number of years, having acquired it when BAE vacated the site. The site was cleared and has previously secured permission for a Lidl supermarket and drive thru restaurant which are now constructed and operational. It is previously developed land within the built up area that is well related to the town centre and other edge of centre facilities.

The wider site currently benefits from outline planning permission, granted in 2021, for employment, retail, leisure and food and drink uses. The drive thru element now proposed as part of this application wholly accords with the permission that has already been granted for the site. Furthermore, the balance of the site that is not subject to this application remains available for those permitted uses, including leisure uses, to come forward should there be occupier demand.

A retail impact assessment and sequential test have been prepared to support the proposed retail element, which conclude that the proposal would not adversely affect the town centre, nor that there are other sequentially preferable sites available in the town centre to accommodate the development.

The policies of the local plans support the uses proposed and as such we contend that the principle of development is acceptable.

Extensive discussions with the Highway Authority have resulted in an acceptable access solution being agreed, along with improvements to pedestrian and cycling infrastructure to serve the development along with other localised improvement highway works. Contributions to a toucan crossing and improvements to the Hambleton Road Roundabout will ensure that the impact of the development is fully mitigated.

New landscaping is proposed that will reduce and mitigate the impact of the development, whilst no other issues arise in respect of pollution, drainage/flooding or residential amenity.

The development will be constructed to achieve a BREEAM ‘Very Good’ rating.



The site will generate significant benefits in terms of improving the retail offer in Waterloooville as well as creating jobs and attracting investment into the town.

As such, we conclude that the benefits of the development are considered to outweigh the harm and the support of the Council is, therefore, sought through the grant of planning permission.

Written by Councillor Gary Hughes  
Presented by Councillor Caren Diamond

**Planning Application APP/20/00761 - Loft extension for the creation of a first floor with gable end and dormers to front and rear elevations – 34 Deverell Place, Purbrook, PO7 5ED.**

In the almost 8 years that I have served as a Councillor for Purbrook Ward, this is only the second occasion I have requested the opportunity to speak directly to you in relation to a Planning Application. I trust the process. I often engage with residents on planning matters, listen to their concerns and advise them where appropriate. Quite often, the conversation is brief. Just because a resident doesn't like an application, that in itself is not a reason for refusal. Equally, I have offered support to applicants. I do believe that most issues can be resolved through direct communications and constructive conversations, and I do encourage engagement with our officers when such matters arise. These are usually successful.

The process does favour applicants and rightly so. There are occasions when a resident has legitimate concerns on a particular application and those concerns are material. This is such an occasion.

The neighbouring property, No 32 Deverell Place and the owners, will be significantly impacted by this proposal, such that their objections are material.

Firstly, their privacy will be invaded. Anyone who attended the Site Visit will have seen first-hand how their conservatory is a fully integrated part of their home, not just a room that is too hot in the summer and too cold in the winter. If this application is approved, the neighbouring property at No 34 will have an uninterrupted view into their living space from the first-floor rear windows. Loss of privacy is a material consideration in planning matters. In normal circumstances, conditions can be applied to maintain privacy; obscure glass, non-opening windows etc. I am not sure that such conditions would be practicable.

Therefore, I must take issue with Para 7.9 in the officers report, which states... 'views to No 32 and 36 would be at an angle and are considered acceptable and similar to those presented by other dormers in Deverell Place'. This is eminently untrue for the reasons set out above. The conservatory at No32 extends well beyond the rear wall of No 34 and therefore fully open to views from above; a significant infringement of their privacy.

Secondly, the South South West facing roof of No 32 is fitted with solar panels. Clearly, the greater access to light, the more efficient they are. Any shadowing will have a detrimental impact of the performance of the solar panels and increase their utility bills. This is a material consideration established under case law through a High Court ruling in 2019, in the planning dispute between William Ellis McLennan and Medway Council. It confirmed that the impact of a development on a neighbour's [solar panels](#) was capable of being a material consideration in the determination of a planning application. The council's failure to take account of this meant its decision to grant planning consent was unlawful, and the High Court overturned the decision. I have read the report on the portal offered by the

applicants and believe it does not address the principal above. It offers British Research Establishment (BRE) theoretical figures that bear no relation to reality. The occupant at No 32 has demonstrated that a simple broom head held over a panel can result in a 200 watt loss in performance, equating to 10.6% of the total load. The BRE states that any loss over 10% requires further testing. This should be essential as the overshadowing caused by this application is likely to be far greater than a broom head. It has been noted in Para 7.11 of the report, considered and dismissed. At a time of historically high energy prices, the residents will incur a financial penalty if this application is approved.

I accept that the precedent has been set in respect to this type of extension, as demonstrated by similar properties in the vicinity.

The three tenets of 'sustainable development' are 'social', 'economic' and 'environmental'. As currently presented, this application fails on every one:

- The loss of privacy to the residents at No 32 is a significant social impact to them personally.
- The economic consequences on the residents at No 32 will be particularly hard should this development be allowed in its current form and the overshadowing of their solar panels occurs.
- This at a time when we, as a council are encouraging residents to do the right thing, to invest in carbon free technologies, to help the environment. The residents at No 32 have done the right thing, invested in carbon free technologies, optimising their position to achieve the greatest results and now along comes an application that will ultimately impact on the environmental investments we encouraged residents make.

For the reasons set out above, I believe that this application is unacceptable in its current form and should be refused.

Thank you for your time.



Dear Planning Committee,

We made our views on why we opposed the planning application for 34 Deverell Place, due to the fact that any shadowing to our solar panels would reduce their performance.

Together with the invasion of our privacy at the rear of our property, in our opinion, we thought permission would be denied.

We were shocked and confused when the planning office recommended in favour of the proposal. We are planning to add to our existing solar panels but they can only be fitted to the side which would put them in a far greater shadow should permission be granted.

The findings of the company TFT. with the existing solar panels as they are in my opinion are incorrect, and have photos to support my own findings but unable to present them due to your policy of no photos allowed.

I Would like to thank you for taking the time to view our property and hope you can see the impact the proposal would have on our privacy.

Earlier, I said we were shocked and confused because we were under the impression that the Government and Havant Borough Council were in favour to encourage the public to Play there part in addressing the current energy crisis and environmental issues and would be in favour not to permit works to be carried out that would compromise performance and efficiency. It is with respect, that we ask you not to grant permission.

Many thanks,  
Regards.  
Mr Mrs Wooldridge

This page is intentionally left blank