

## **HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 23 January 2020

Present

Councillor Satchwell (Chairman)

Councillors Crellin, Howard, Keast, Lloyd, Lowe and Patrick (Standing Deputy)

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor(s): Robinson

### **1 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Mrs Shimbart.

### **2 Declarations of Interest**

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

### **3 Chairman's Report**

The Chairman reminded the members that the next meeting of this Committee would be held on 27 January 2020.

### **4 Matters to be Considered for Site Viewing and Deferment**

There were no matters to be considered for site viewing and deferment.

### **5 APP/19/00427 - Land at Lower Road, Havant**

(The site was viewed by the Site Viewing Working Party on 5 December 2019)

Proposal: Development of 50 new dwellings together with access, landscaping and open space.

The Committee considered the written report and recommendation from the Head of Planning to grant permission

The Committee received the supplementary information, circulated prior to the meeting which:

- (1) updated the calculated sizes of the open space, the developable area, and the density of the development;
- (2) amended the site description under page 8, paragraph 1.5 of the submitted report;

- (3) updated the number of representations and gave a summary of those representations received since the report was published;
- (4) amended condition 2 of the report: and
- (5) recommended a conditional removing the permitted development rights for plots 1,10,11, 22, and 28.

The Committee noted that the information set out in the supplementary information did not affect the conclusions and recommendations of the submitted report. The Committee was advised that the cards received in support of the application referred to in the supplementary information had not been received by the Council in response to the statutory consultation but were forwarded to the Council by the applicants.

The Committee was addressed by the following deputies:

- (a) Mr Tate, on behalf of the Bedhampton Heritage Alliance and local residents, who objected to the application for the following reasons:
  - 1. there was a lack of supplementary evidence to support the application;
  - 2. the heritage statement did not adequately address the impact on the area's heritage assets and its conclusions were unsupported;
  - 3. the proposals fell short of a sustainable development;
  - 4. the transport assessment was inaccurate, inconsistent and flawed;
  - 5. the traffic likely to be generated by this proposal would exacerbate the existing traffic problems in the area and cause undue interference with the safety and convenience of vehicles and pedestrians;
  - 6. the development would destroy the historic Narrow Marsh Lane, which ran across the application site;
  - 7. the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the tranquillity of the area and deter visitors;
  - 8. the development would have a detrimental impact on the nearby heritage assets (including The Elms listed building), the Conservation Area, the ecology of the area and existing wildlife habitats;
  - 9. the principle of the development of this site should be determined at the forthcoming Local Plan Enquiry before an application for development of the site is considered; and

10. the proposal would harm the character of Bedhampton.
- (b) Mr Beck, on behalf of the applicant, who supported the officer's report and made the following additional comments:
1. the proposal had been submitted after extensive public consultation and amended to address concerns raised during this consultation period and at the pre-application stage;
  2. 38 representations supported the application;
  3. the statutory consultees had not objected to the proposal; and
  4. the applicants had agreed to make contributions under a Section 106 Agreement in addition to the Community Infrastructure Levy.
- (c) County Councillor Fairhurst, who objected to the proposal for the following reasons:
1. the application site had been considered and removed from the Local Plan in 2014. There had been no changes to justify a reversal of this decision: the inclusion of Manor Farm within the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area meant that the development of this site would have a greater detrimental impact on the Conservation Area than it did in 2014;
  2. the proposal would exacerbate the existing dangers to children and pedestrians using Lower Road;
  3. the proposal would have a harmful impact on Old Bedhampton, which was a valuable asset in the Borough;
  4. the proposal, if granted, would create an undesirable precedent which would make it difficult for the Council to refuse further applications for development of other fields within the area; and
  5. the site should not be developed to enable future generations to benefit from this tranquil part of the Borough.
- (d) Councillor Robinson, who objected to the proposal for the following reasons:
1. there were more suitable sites within the Borough to enable the Council to meet its housing supply targets;
  2. the reasons for removing this site from the Local Plan in 2014 had not been surmounted;
  3. the application was not supported by sufficient evidence;

4. the proposal would damage Narrow Marsh lane, which was the subject of an application to the County Council to establish this Lane as a public right of way;
5. the roads leading to and from the site could not adequately accommodate safely the additional pedestrian traffic likely to be generated by this proposal.
6. the traffic likely to be generated by this proposal would add to the dangers of existing pedestrians using the roads to and from the application site;
7. the proposed footway improvements would not adequately address the hazards faced by current and additional pedestrian traffic likely to be generated by the proposal;
8. the assessment of the highway made by the County Council was unrealistic;
9. the transport statement was flawed;
10. the proposal was contrary to Policy CS18 as the roads leading to and from the site were narrow and inadequately lit;
11. the site was unsustainable;
12. some of the proposed dwellings did not comply with policy H1 in the emerging local plan; this policy should be fully applied and not given limited weight as suggested by the officers in their report;
13. there was a conflict of interest between the proposed Housing Association and the applicant;
14. the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the nearby heritage assets and the Conservation Area; and
15. consideration of the development of this site was premature as the inclusion of this site within the emerging plan had still to be considered at a forthcoming Local Plan Inquiry.

In response to questions from the Committee, officers advised that:

- Although the County Archaeologist did not endorse the submitted archaeology assessment, he considered that the shortcomings in this assessment could be resolved by the proposed condition 17.
- The maintenance and retention of the proposed orchard and open space would be the responsibility of the management company.

- The car parking provision complied with the Council's supplementary planning document.
- The layout and design of the late Victorian/Edwardian terracing to the west was less standardised than the development built between 1918 and 1939.
- It was acknowledged that 4 of the proposed housing units could fall short of the nationally described space standards set out in Policy H1 of the emerging local plan depending upon the occupancy of these units. In view of the objections to Policy H1 received during the pre-submission consultation of the emerging local plan, the Committee was advised that only limited weight should be given to this policy at this stage.
- The Local Education Authority had identified that the proposal sat within the catchment areas of Bidbury Infant and Junior Schools and Warblington Secondary School. It was understood that these schools could accommodate this development without the need for expansion, as the number of places currently filled by out of catchment area pupils would diminish over time.
- Although one of the doctors surgeries identified in the report was currently not taking new patients it was understood that this was only a temporary measure. It appeared that other surgeries mentioned in the report were taking on new patients.
- The Lead Flood Authority was satisfied with drainage arrangements.
- The Local Plan's Transport Assessment for the mainland included a mitigation measure associated with the roundabout at Bedhampton Hill. However, the Transport Assessment mitigation measures for this development did not require an improvement to the roundabout at Bedhampton Hill.
- With regard to Narrow Marsh Lane, the proposal included an internal footpath. The applicant had offered to provide signage lining this route to the nearby public footpath. It was understood that this route followed the same route as the right of way referred to by Councillor Robinson in his deputation.

*(at this stage:*

- (i) *Mr Tate, at the request of the Chairman, advised that the proposed footpath did not follow the route of Narrow Marsh Lane; the drainage plans submitted showed that the rear gardens of some of the houses would be built over the lane; and*

(ii) *Mr Fairley, at the request of the Chairman, advised the Committee that he had submitted the application to make Narrow Marsh Lane a public right way and that the right of way applied for did not follow the proposed footpath)*

- This development would be nutrient neutral.
- The proposed Condition 19 required the applicant to demonstrate measures that would be put in place enabling no more than 110 litres of water per person per day to be consumed within the development.

In view of the concerns raised by the members, the Chairman advised that she intended to adjourn the meeting to obtain advice from the officers.

(the meeting adjourned at 6.35pm and resumed at 6.41 pm)

The Chairman advised that it was evident from the questions raised by members that there were a number of issues that required clarification before the Committee could reach a decision on this application and therefore proposed that the Committee defer consideration of this application. Before taking a vote on deferral she requested the Committee to discuss and list the issues on which they needed further advice.

In response to a question, it was confirmed by officers that when this application is resubmitted to the Committee it will be considered afresh, and the standing deputies would only be invited to attend if a committee member was unable to attend.

RESOLVED that consideration of application APP/19/00427 be deferred to enable the officers to clarify the issues set out below and report back to the Committee:

- (a) how the education authority would manage a situation where Bidbury infant and junior schools could not accommodate pupils living on the proposed development and how these arrangements would affect existing pupils who lived outside the catchment area;
- (b) impact of the traffic likely to be generated by this proposal on the Bedhampton Hill roundabout and how this impact (if any) would be mitigated;
- (c) how the likely new registration requests from people living in the area of the proposed development would be accommodated by the existing GP surgeries;
- (d) how the occupancy of the affordable housing and the right to buy properties will be managed to ensure that households are provided with properties of a suitable size;
- (e) the route of the historic Narrow Marsh Lane compared to the route of the proposed footpath to be provided within the application site; and

- (f) how the proposed archaeological condition would overcome the concerns raised by the County Archaeologist and the procedure that would be put in place if major finds were uncovered during the preliminary survey.

**The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm and concluded at 6.50 pm**

.....

**Chairman**