

Committee Item

TEAM MANAGER
SIGN OFF SHEET

Case No:	14/02872/REM	Valid Date	19 December 2014
W No:	19499/36	Recommendation Date	2 March 2015
Case Officer:	Mrs Jill Lee	8 Week Date	20 March 2015
CIL Liable?	NO	Committee date	12 March 2015
Recommendation:	Application Refused	Decision:	Committee Decision

Proposal:	This application is for 104 units of private rented accommodation and includes the following: Approval of Reserved Matters 6 (i) a), b), c) and d) of planning consent 10/02862/OUT and conditions 3, 6(ii) a), b), d), f), h), i), j), k), l), m), n), 11 and 18 (An Environmental Impact Statement was submitted and approved with the outline planning consent).
------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Site:	Berewood Phase 1 Hambledon Road Denmead Hampshire
--------------	---------------------------------------------------

Transport	Open Space Y/N	Legal Agreement	S.O.S	Objections	EIA Development	Monitoring Code	Previously Developed Land
				NO		NO	

<p>APPROVE Subject to the condition(s) listed</p>	<p>REFUSE for the reason(s) listed</p>	
	Signature	Date
CASE OFFICER	Jill Lee	
TEAM MANAGER		

AMENDED PLANS DATE:- Amended landscaping and rear boundary details submitted 26th February 2015.

Item No:
Case No: 14/02872/REM / W19499/36
Proposal Description: This application is for 104 units of private rented accommodation and includes the following:
Approval of Reserved Matters 6 (i) a), b), c) and d) of planning consent 10/02862/OUT and conditions 3, 6(ii) a), b), d), f), h), i), j), k), l), m), n), 11 and 18 (An Environmental Impact Statement was submitted and approved with the outline planning consent).

Address: Berewood Phase 1 Hambledon Road Denmead Hampshire
Parish, or Ward if within Winchester City: Southwick And Widley
Applicants Name:
Case Officer: Mrs Jill Lee
Date Valid: 19 December 2014
Site Factors:

River Bank Top
County Heritage Site
Contaminated Land Consultation
Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Zone

Recommendation: Application Refused

General Comments

This report relates to development within the southern section of the West of Waterlooville Major Development Area (MDA). It refers to a reserved matter application in respect of the outline permission for the Grainger (Berewood) part of the MDA. The development is within Winchester City Council's administrative area.

Site Description

The application site known as E1 forms part of a mixed use area situated near to the south boundary of the Brambles Farm Industrial Estate which included approximately 30 dwellings.

The application site comprises an undeveloped area of land which is largely grassed and is abutted by the housing development currently being undertaken on phase 1.

To the north of the site is the main access which will eventually connect with the northern part of the Major Development Area (MDA) and the household waste recycling facility and beyond that Brambles Farm Industrial Estate.

To the south of the site is phase 1 which is still under construction but parts of which are also completed and occupied.

To the west of the site is the remaining mixed use parcel of land within E1 and to the east the main access into the site, the roundabout and beyond, development on the Hambledon Road.

The dwellings on phase 1 were designed by Robert Adams and are traditional form and materials.

Proposal

The proposal is for 104 units of private rented accommodation and includes the following:
Approval of Reserved Matters

- 6 (i)
 - a The layout, siting and scale of all buildings and structures,
 - b the design and external appearance of all buildings,
 - c the details of the means of access and
 - d landscaping of planning consent 10/02862/OUT and conditions 3 compliance with primary outline documents,
- 6(ii)
 - a The layout of the development,
 - b The finished levels,
 - d Drainage details,
 - f Ecological mitigation measures,
 - h Means of enclosure,
 - l Hard surfacing,
 - j Parking, turning, loading and unloading of vehicles and cycle parking,
 - k Provision for storage and removal of refuse,
 - l Provision for street lighting,
 - m Provision for external lighting ,
 - n Chimneys, flues and vents,

11 Submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and
18 drainage scheme,

(An Environmental Impact Statement was submitted and approved with the outline planning consent).

It is proposed to build a 100% private rental scheme of dwellings within the mixed use area. The proposal will provide a mix of 13no 1 bedroom dwellings, 54no 2 bedroom dwellings, 31no 3 bedroom dwellings and 6no 4 bedroom dwellings but no affordable housing.

Because the application contains 74 dwellings over and above what was envisaged in the outline application and supporting documents, legal advice was sought to ensure that it was correct to deal with the application as a reserved matters application and not a full planning application. The advice confirmed that the application could be treated as reserved matters and the applicant has confirmed that there will be no increase in dwellings overall on the MDA because future phases will comprise 74 fewer units although no information has been given to show how this will still achieve development which is in compliance with the outline and approved suite of documents including the design codes.

Relevant Planning History

The outline permission for the site is **10/02862/OUT** for Winchester and **APP/10/00828** for Havant. The approved outline permission was for: Outline application for the development of approx 2550 no dwellings including the construction of a new access from Ladybridge Roundabout, Milk Lane and completion of Maurepas Way access, a local centre comprising retail, community building, land for healthcare, land for elderly care, public house, land for 2 primary schools, land for a nursery, land for employment uses, associated amenity space along with substantial green infrastructure, SUDS, land for allotments, main pumping station, land for cemetery, restoration of River Wallington together with landscape structure planting.

The same permission also approved the detail for 194 dwellings on Phase 1, to the west of the ASDA roundabout on Maurepas Way which are currently under construction. There is a S106 agreement that covers financial contributions and works for various infrastructure matters; the timing of the payments and works being tied to numbers of units completed over the entire Grainger part of the MDA. The context for this current application is provided by the documents that were included in the application the primary ones being:

- The Design and Access Statement
- The Masterplan Design Document
- The Planning Statement
- The Environmental Statement and Appendices
- The Sustainability and Energy Statements

The Masterplan Design Document included an Illustrative Masterplan and a number of Parameter plans to set the context for the whole outline area.

The outline planning application was approved at committee on 21 March 2011. Subsequent to the approval of the outline permission, both Authorities approved a Design Code under **APP/12/01297** for Havant and **10/02862/OUT** for Winchester for Berewood, in December 2012. The Code deals with the structure, use and form of development for a number of identity areas which are the Market Town, Garden Suburb, The Hamlets, Employment Hub and the Countryside and River Wallington Corridor. The mixed use Area of which this forms a part, falls within the Market Town identity area. There are also Development Wide codes for the whole of the Grainger area that address street hierarchy and design and utilities.

Consultations

Head of New Homes Delivery Team:

The need for housing

- There is Government support for the principle of providing more good quality Private Rented Sector (PRS) housing however this needs to be balanced against the need to provide affordable housing as part of the overall development of the MDA.
- The applicant needs to be clear about the benefit that the provision of a scheme of 100% PRS housing will have to the local housing market. PRS is not affordable housing. No evidence has been submitted to explain how those who have been accepted by the Council as homeless or are on the housing register will be able to access the new homes. The principle determinant will be rent levels. No information has been submitted by the applicants. If rents are above Local Housing Allowance levels then this will have a limiting effect on who register/homeless households who can access the homes. The new homes will, of course, add to the supply of PRS locally.

What a PRS scheme can offer to the local market.

Grainger are a large scale landlord

- The Government is keen to see good quality large scale landlords providing PRS. This is supported and reflects the changing requirements of households

- A number of issues have been raised over the last year, and the applicant has been asked to provide further information. This has not happened. There are a number of issues that give rise to uncertainty about the quality of the offer:
 - Uncertainty re access for those in need of affordable housing, in particular those groups highlighted above
 - The local housing market – the applicants have not provided the information from a local agent showing the local demand for PRS housing.
 - Increasing the rate of delivery – was to be a significant part of the case for justifying PRS housing in this location. If it is considered material it should have been covered in the submission. There is also concern if the delivery of housing on this site is directly related to lower densities on other phases. If so it seems that affordable housing supply in the short term is diminished.
 - Sustainable communities including mix of households, tenancy lengths and churn. The applicant says the proposal will help create sustainable communities but does not provide any supporting information. The mix of dwellings proposed mean that is likely a range of households types will be present. Information from the PRS Task Force indicates that average length of household stay outside London is 3 yrs (blended across all property types/locations).
 - Quality of landlord – Grainger have a long track record however we have no significant direct experience of their management and nothing has been submitted with this application so it is hard to comment on this aspect. Is there a guarantee that Grainger would remain as landlord throughout the life of the PRS?

Government's PRS Task Force

When we met with the Task Force they indicated that matters such as quality of the landlord, tenancy length, management standards were legitimate considerations for the Council when assessing the planning application.

S106 and Affordable Housing Strategies

It is envisaged that there will be a legal agreement which would result in 40% of the development being transferred to a registered provider at the end of 12 years or completion of 2200 dwellings whichever is sooner. This would ensure that the level of affordable housing over the MDA did not fall below 40% on completion of the development.

Summary

Good quality PRS housing will create a more diverse offer to the local market. Precisely what the unmet demand is here is unclear, however, we know that it has increased in recent years and that could be expected to continue.

Government policy is to promote good quality PRS housing and this is something we should support. In a meeting the Head of the PRS Task Force it was clear that quality of housing was important, as was creating sustainable communities, PRS housing is needed

in addition to affordable housing. PRS housing is not however a substitute for good quality, accessible affordable housing for those on the council's waiting list.

Local Plan Part 1 is clear that one of its priorities is to maximise the supply of affordable housing. What is proposed is not affordable housing and so a case needs to be made for delayed provision. Notwithstanding the other issue I raise and if the case is accepted I am happy with the principle of converting 40% of the units to affordable housing at a future date.

However a number of concerns about the quality of the offer, as set out above, and this makes me concerned about the benefit to the local housing market and the contribution towards creating a sustainable community, particularly, if this is at the expense of affordable housing in the short to medium term. It is disappointing that the information it was understood would be provided by the applicant has not materialised in full.

Strategic Planning:

'The proposals involve the loss of around 1.89 ha of land which was identified in the approved master plan for employment lead mixed uses. However, because it is possible to achieve a smarter more effective layout of the mixed use area, the amount and quality of employment floorspace eventually provided in this location should not be diminished, and the remaining available mixed use employment land would be sufficient to fulfil the original objective of creating a mixture of employment opportunities and employment uses, in both the local centre and on this important gateway into the site'

'There are still significant areas of employment land within Berewood, and it has always been the case that the main employment area would be on plots E1 and E2 adjacent to the Brambles Business Park, which is not changed by this application. While the amount of land available in this location has not changed its potential to provide employment opportunities has increased significantly since the original outline consent. The Review of Employment Prospects, Employment Land and Demographics Projections under taken for the Council by DTZ in August 2011, suggests that up to 3833 new jobs could be created depending on the amount of B1 floorspace eventually developed, as opposed to a likely scenario of a maximum of 2090 jobs in the original consent. There will of course still be additional employment opportunities within the mixed use area and local centre. As a consequence the potential remains to provide significant employment opportunities within Berewood to meet the needs of the new community and surrounding area'.

Engineers highways:

This consultation seeks highway comments to the proposed layout plans (drg. No's. GTWVILLE_PRS1/RD/01; RD/02; RD/03).

On checking these drawings and by cross referencing to the Housing Type Mix plan (drg. No:- 29309(02)010 REV.p1) it appears there is a significant shortfall in the amount of car parking provision for the blocks of flats A to E as follows:-

- Block A - 19 proposed which is 1 space short of minimum requirement if all are unallocated or 9 short of allocated requirements.
- Block B - 15 proposed which complies with unallocated but is 3 short of allocated requirements.
- Block C - 11 proposed which is 1 space short of minimum requirement if all are unallocated or 6 short of allocated requirements.

- Block D - 6 proposed which is 2 space short of minimum requirement if all are unallocated or 5 short of allocated requirements.
- Block E - 8 proposed which is 3 space short of minimum requirement if all are unallocated or 7 short of allocated requirements.

The proposed development relies almost entirely on providing rear car parking areas. Although I note that gated entrances into the private gardens are proposed there is no indication of a hardened footpath link to the secondary rear entrances to these properties. In addition, if these routes are to be used then access will be via patio doors directly into the main living areas, which will prove unpopular in times of inclement weather when the occupiers may well have muddy shoes and wet clothing. It is also normal practice for rear gates to be locked on the inside in order to maintain security.

In many cases the alternative route between the rear parking areas and the main primary entrance to the dwellings is considered excessive.

Section 3 (entitled PRS Landscape Strategy - Boundary Treatment) of the Design and Access Statement indicates that the rear garden areas will be enclosed by 1.8m high brick walls and 1.8m high timber close boarded fences - both of which do not allow for good intervisibility at ground level between vehicles parked in these spaces and the occupiers in the dwellings they are intended to serve. Consequently it is considered that the proposed rear parking areas do not achieve the design aims discussed in paragraph 4.6.3 of Manual for Streets (MFS) which reads "cars are less prone to damage or theft if parked in-curtilage (but see chapter 8). If cars cannot be parked in- curtilage, they should ideally be parked on the street in view of the home. Where parking courts are used, they should be small and have natural surveillance".

Paragraph 8.3.31 reads "Better Places to Live notes that courtyard parking can be a useful addition to spaces in front of dwellings, and that courtyards which work well exhibit three main characteristics

- * they are not car parks, but places which have parking in them;
- * they are overlooked by adjoining houses, or by buildings entered from the parking area (Figs. 8.12 and 8.13) and
- * they normally include, at most, 10 parking spaces - if there are more spaces, the courtyard layout should be broken up.

Paragraph 8.3.36 of MFS goes on to explain amongst other things that "there is no single best solution to providing car parking - a combination of on-plot, off-plot and on street will often be appropriate" and additionally "parking within a block is recommended only after parking at the front and on-street has been fully considered - rear courtyards should support on street parking, not replace it".

CONCLUSION.

Mindful of the above, I do not consider the proposed parking layout successfully achieves the Design Aims set out in Manual for Streets and will prove unpopular in use. Consequently, vehicles are likely to be parked within the public highway areas, which have not been specifically designed to accommodate significant and material on street parking and thereby interfere with the free flow of traffic, including pedestrian movements and access by emergency/service vehicles".

Engineers: Drainage:

No objection to the discharge of 6(ii) d and 18.

Head of Environmental Protection:

No objection to the discharge of condition 11 (CEMP).

Head of Landscape:

No objection to the application based on the amended plans. This application seeks approval of reserved matters including layout and hard and soft landscape. It also seeks discharge of conditions with regard to inter alia levels, drainage, walls and fences, hard surfacing and street lighting.

The submitted information in respect of these aspects has been reviewed and the following observations and comments are listed here:

1. Condition 6 (ii) 'a' deals with layout, including 'footpaths to the countryside'. There are dedicated footpath links from the PRS site to the Wallington Nature Reserve. Crossing points will be available along the road network from the pavements, with footpath and cycle ways incorporated into the landscape scheme to be developed to form the Wallington Nature Reserve. In particular, within the PRS phase there is a dropped crossing of the spine road to a point close to the gap between the large SuDS features to the north of the plot. This could link up with the River Wallington Nature Reserve footpath network.
2. Condition 6 (ii) 'h' deals with walls and fences. These are shown on the Fabrik landscape general arrangement plans. There was a concern that close-board timber fencing was being proposed between private rear gardens and communal car park courtyards. It should be a principle of design that where private gardens back onto public realm, there should be brick walls instead of timber fencing. The applicant has since confirmed that where a boundary faces onto a public or communal space a brick wall will be provided 1.8m high with a lockable timber gate. The walling will also be softened by climbers.
3. Layout and tree planting: the layout has been amended following officer input and feedback last summer. These changes include improvements to the areas of landscape and tree planting within the public realm. Areas of landscape have been agglomerated or clustered into larger more prominent areas which collectively provide a more robust framework. This is to be welcomed. However, opportunities do exist to provide larger trees like Oak trees in the centre of the site, but this will require adjustment in the design of building foundations where they are affected and proper tree pit preparation to allow adequate rooting volume. Examples include: the tree at the bottom of the garden of Plot 13, the tree adjacent to the garden of Plot 33, the tree at the bottom of the garden of Plot 57, the tree on the corner to the south of Plot 66 and the tree to the north of plot 67. All of these tree positions are at least 10m clear of any residential façade. The applicant has confirmed that some larger trees can be accommodated and more detailed information will be provided at the detailed stage when the specific species are selected on planting plans.

4. Trees have been proposed along the northern perimeter of the site. However there was initially some concern that these trees are less than 5m away from the adjacent dwellings. This would mean that either the trees selected will be small and fairly insignificant species, or that the selected trees will have an unacceptable impact on those resident in the houses – both through limiting light (on a north facing aspect) and inhibiting views – which would be unfortunate as the houses overlook the Wallington Nature Reserve. However, in discussion with the applicant, it has been agreed that these trees will be very narrow in form to ensure that there is no conflict with the built form whilst maintaining the green avenue along the northern section of the site.

5. Lighting: Mayer Brown’s engineering plans show the lighting positions but no details of the proposed luminaires. It will be essential to ensure that these are full-cut-off type with appropriate lux levels in order to avoid unpleasant light spill. The applicant has confirmed that the luminaires will be Metcraft Gladstone, the same type used on Phases 1 and 2 for the internal residential streets.

Urban Design

No objection to the application in terms of design.

Environment Agency:

No objection to the application.

Southern Water:

No objection to the application.

Natural England:

No objection to the application.

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended)
Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)
Internationally and nationally designated sites:

The application site is within or in close proximity to a European designated site (also commonly referred to as Natura 2000 sites), and therefore has the potential to affect its interest features. European sites are afforded protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended (the ‘Habitats Regulations’). The application site is in close proximity to the Chichester And Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA) / Ramsar¹ site and Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Langstone Harbour Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Please see the subsequent sections of this letter for our advice relating to SSSI features.

In considering the European site interest, Natural England advises that you, as a competent authority under the provisions of the Habitats Regulations, should have regard for any potential impacts that a plan or project may have¹. The Conservation objectives for each European site explain how the site should be restored and/or maintained and may be helpful in assessing what, if any, potential impacts a plan or project may have.

The application site is within the 5.6km zone of influence in the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy. This letter comprises our statutory consultation response under provisions of Article 10 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 and Section 28 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended).

Natura 2000 Sites - No objection

Given the nature of the reserved matters and conditions being discharged, Natural England advises your authority that the proposal, if undertaken in strict accordance with the details submitted, is not likely to have a significant effect on the interest features for which the aforementioned SSSI, SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites are designated, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.² Further, following my telephone conversation on the 26 February and the assurances given for the provision of greenspace, both with respect to timing and over-provision, the change in the number of housing units in Phase 1 is acceptable within the constraints of the total number across the whole development remaining the same.

Nationally Designated Site (SSSI) – No objection

Natural England is satisfied that, subject to the development being undertaken in strict accordance with the submitted proposals and the conditions and advice set out above, these development proposals will avoid impacts upon the interest features of the aforementioned SSSI.

Representations:

None received.

Relevant Planning Policy:

Winchester District Local Plan 2006 Review

DP3 - general design criteria,
DP4 - landscape and the built environment,
DP5 - design of amenity open space,
T2 - development access,
T3 - development layout,
T4 - parking standards.

Winchester City Council has now adopted its Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy but as this is a reserved matters application it does not require assessment against these policies which were adopted after the outline consent had been granted.

National Planning Policy Guidance/Statements:

National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The principle of the development of this area for mixed use including an element of residential has been established by the outline permission 10/02862/OUT (WCC) and

APP/10/00828 (HBC). Legal advice has been sought and the application must be accepted as a reserved matters application even though it includes some 74 dwellings over and above the 30 envisaged in the outline and supporting documents. To overcome this the applicant is offering to reduce the housing numbers in subsequent phases as follows;

Phase 3 – reduction of 25 units from 418 to 393,
Phase 5 – reduction of 25 units from 356 to 331,
Phase 9 – reduction of 9 units from 251 to 242,
Phase 10 – reduction of 6 units from 189 to 183,
Phase 11 – reduction of 9 units from 218 to 209.

However no justification for this approach has been submitted and it is not clear that the proposed reduction in dwellings on these phases will be acceptable in design terms and still allow for development that will accord with the outline and the design codes.

In order to justify providing no affordable housing the applicant would be expected to submit a fully detailed financial viability assessment which proves that the proposed development cannot afford to provide affordable housing and remain viable. This has now been submitted and the external valuer has advised the Council that the scheme can only afford to provide affordable housing after year 12 which is what is outlined in the draft S106 agreement submitted in support of the application.

In addition to establishing the financial viability case the applicant would need to provide a compelling argument explaining why providing PRS accommodation is meeting a local need and would provide a valuable source of housing for the area such that it would warrant setting on one side the normal MDA requirement of providing 40% affordable housing on all phases up front. In other words the benefits of 104 PRS homes outweighs the delay in the provision of affordable housing. Questions have been asked of the applicant during the application process and at pre application stage but officers view is that a convincing case has yet to be made. The PRS will be provided at 100% market rent and so will not be affordable and as the rent levels are not known it is not possible to make an assessment as to how “affordable” the accommodation will be to the local housing market. There are also other considerations in providing a phase of a single tenure accommodation as this is an approach which is not encouraged on the MDA which anticipates a mixed sustainable community in terms of housing tenures. Sustainable communities generally have a mix of households, tenures and tenancy lengths this will not be achieved on this single tenure proposal. There is a possibility of a high level of short terms lets which lack stability for an area and whilst Grainger state that they encourage longer term rents there is no information to back this up.

It is not clear what the benefit of providing PRS is to the local housing market. The rents are not known and they will be 100% market so not affordable. If the rents are above Local Housing Allowance levels then this will limit who can access the homes particularly if they are on the housing need register or homeless.

The applicant has submitted a draft legal agreement which aims to show a mechanism for allowing 40% of the proposed dwellings to become affordable houses in either 12 years time or prior to completion of 2200 dwellings over the MDA. They argue that this will ensure that the MDA as a whole still provides 40% affordable housing as originally envisaged. There is no overriding justification submitted to support this approach however.

It is clear that there is support for providing good quality private rented accommodation, it

is supported by the Governments PRS Task Force who came to talk to officers from the City Council about the benefits of PRS generally and this is something that the City Council would also support in principle but on the MDA a prime aim is to provide mixed sustainable communities including 40% affordable housing over each of the housing phases. Grainger have not provided a convincing argument for setting all of these requirements on one side to allow 100% PRS to be provided with affordable housing being delivered much further down the line. It is also not clear how future affordable housing provision will be affected by the proposal but if lower densities (fewer dwellings) are to be provided on future phases then it is likely that the numbers of affordable dwellings provided will also be reduced in the short term. It is also not clear what the demand for open market PRS is in Waterlooville.

PRS is needed to provide diversity in the local market but the case for meeting unmet demand has not been shown. Government policy is to promote good quality PRS housing but it is needed in addition to affordable housing and not instead of. New Homes Team have stated that PRS housing is not a substitute for good quality, accessible affordable housing for those on the council's waiting list. Local Plan Part 1 is clear that one of its priorities is to maximise the supply of affordable housing and Grainger have not made a sufficiently good case for supporting the provision of PRS at the cost of providing affordable housing up front.

Whilst the principle of providing good quality PRS housing can be supported in principle, in respect of this application there is no overriding justification for settling on one side the normal requirements of providing a mix of dwellings and 40% affordable housing up front.

Compliance with the Design Codes and other supporting documents.

The site is within the Market Town identity area which is an area of mix of uses and activities. It should provide a strong sense of place acting as a gateway to Berewood. The site was designated for mixed use with provision of approximately 30 dwellings and so the Design Code for the mixed use does not relate well to the provision of an entirely residential scheme.

The applicants have followed the design coding for residential development within the Market Town Identity Area which is the same as Phase 1 to the south of the site. In terms of the requirements of the design code the general approach to the design and siting of the dwellings is regarded as being acceptable.

Parking

The parking is all provided in rear parking courts which is something that is not allowed for in the design codes which encourage a range of parking provision including on plot, on street and small courts serving not more than 10 dwellings. It is a mandatory requirement that on street parking is provided for visitor parking and that a mix of parking solutions are incorporated into the Market Town layouts. The application does not accord with the design code requirements for parking provision and also falls short of the number of spaces required to serve the development and lack of natural surveillance. That combined with the inconvenient location of the car parking in relation to the dwellings is likely to lead to on street car parking, which in itself is encouraged but only when it is designed in to the layout of the scheme so as not to interfere with the free flow of traffic on the highway. Consequently the parking arrangement is not considered to be satisfactory.

Density.

The site falls within an area envisaged for higher density development 37 – 45 dwellings per hectare. The site area is 2 hectares and so the proposed density would be approximately 37 dwellings per hectare so is just within the identified density range.

Scale and height.

The design codes allow for up to 15m or four storeys in height and the proposed development is restricted to three storeys for the flatted blocks and 2.5, 2 and 1 storey elsewhere so the development is within the scale parameters set for this area.

Housing mix.

The proposed development will provide a suitable mix of houses. It is proposed to provide 13no 1 bedroom dwellings, 54no 2 bedroom dwellings, 31no 3 bedroom dwellings and 6no 4 bedroom dwellings.

Road Hierarchy.

The road hierarchy accords with the approved infrastructure layout and the main roads outside the site have already been partially constructed. The layout within the site mirrors that found in phase 1.

Sustainability

The dwellings are designed to meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 which is generally what is achieved over the MDA and so is acceptable. Although WCC aims to achieve higher sustainability through LPP1 policy CP11 this cannot be applied retrospectively to this proposal as it is a reserved matters application and subject to the constraints of the outline and supporting documents which included a Sustainability and Energy Statement.

Design

The design of the proposed dwellings is acceptable. The applicants have taken their cue from phase 1 and have provided traditional dwellings set out in a perimeter block and mews lane layout. This is an acceptable approach and is in accordance with the design codes for the Market Town.

Landscaping

The proposed landscaping has been amended to try to allow for more space for significant green areas and trees. Walls have been provided to the rear gardens where they abut public space instead of close boarded fences. This has improved the situation and the landscape officer has confirmed that there is no objection to the scheme in terms of landscaping or boundary treatments.

Lighting

It is proposed that the luminaires will be Metcraft Gladstone, the same type used on Phases 1 and 2 for the internal residential streets. This consistent approach to lighting is acceptable.

Materials and detailing

The detailing of the proposed dwellings is largely acceptable and follows the precedent set in phase 1 to the south. The materials are generally acceptable with the exception of the proposed concrete roof tile which is contrary to the design codes which requires natural materials and no concrete has been allowed on other parts of the MDA. The finish of a concrete tiled roof will not provide the quality of finish required for these traditionally designed dwellings.

Otherwise natural slate is proposed for some of the roofs, brick and render for the elevations and timber windows.

Affordable housing

The scheme is providing no affordable housing up front as explained above. A financial viability assessment has been submitted and assessed by the external valuer who has confirmed that the proposed development cannot afford to provide affordable housing until year 12 when it is proposed to transfer 40% of the dwellings to a registered provider and the remainder will be sold on the open market. The other issues affecting affordable housing provision have been set out in the principles of development section above.

Ecology

The site was used as arable farming and does not include any hedgerow, ditch or tree features and so is considered to be of limited ecological interest. As there is no increase in overall numbers of dwellings over the MDA the site wide ecological mitigation is still considered to be acceptable and appropriate in scale and this has been confirmed by Natural England who accept that the existing mitigation strategy is acceptable and no further actions or financial contributions will be sought.

Loss of mixed use land.

The proposals involve the loss of around 1.89 ha of land which was identified in the approved master plan for employment lead mixed uses. However, because it is possible to achieve a smarter more effective layout of the mixed use area, the amount and quality of employment floorspace available will still allow for the development of a mixture of employment opportunities and employment uses, in both the local centre and on this important gateway into the site' There are also other significant areas of employment land within Berewood such as E1 and E2 and the local centre which are unaffected by this application. There is no objection to the loss of this mixed use land as the potential remains to provide significant employment opportunities within Berewood to meet the needs of the new community and surrounding area'.

Conclusion:

The Government is promoting housing in the form of PRS dwellings and officers acknowledge that this type of accommodation can make a valuable contribution to the housing offer at Waterlooville. However in this instance, the development of 104 houses would not deliver any affordable housing for 12 years for viability reasons. Officers are not

convinced that the benefit of including PRS units justify delaying the delivery of much needed affordable housing and the application is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

Application Refused for the following reasons:

Reasons;

- 1 The proposed development is contrary to the provisions of the approved Masterplan Design document, The Design And Access Statement, The Design Code document, the outline consent 10/02862/OUT and S106 agreement in that it fails to provide affordable housing up front when the development is built and occupied and no overriding justification has been put forward to support this deviation which will mean affordable housing will not be delivered for 12 years. As a result the development would not meet the requirement for all development at the West of Waterlooville Major Development Area to provide 40% affordable housing when each phase is built and occupied.
- 2 The proposed development is contrary to the provisions of the approved Masterplan Design document, The Design And Access Statement, The Design Code Document, the outline consent and S106 agreement in that the car parking provided falls short of the number of spaces required to serve the dwellings and the parking is not conveniently located being provided in large rear parking courts from which residents are required to access their dwellings via the back garden and patio doors. This is likely to lead to parking on the street which has not been designed into the scheme and which would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the area and would interfere with the free flow of traffic, including pedestrian movements and access by emergency and service vehicles to the detriment of highway safety.
- 3 The proposed use of a concrete roof tile within the proposed development is contrary to the provisions of the approved Design Code Document which seeks to achieve a high quality environment and will be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.

Informatives:

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the NPPF Winchester City Council (WCC) take a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. WCC work with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by;

- offering a pre-application advice service and,
- updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy:

SH2 - strategic housing allocation West of Waterlooville,

CP1 - housing provision,

CP2 - housing provision and mix,

CP3 - affordable housing provision on market led housing sites,

CP10 - transport,

CP11 - sustainable low and zero carbon built development,

CP13 - high quality design,

CP15 - green infrastructure,

CP16 - biodiversity,

CP20 - heritage and landscape character.

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006:

DP3 - general design criteria,

DP4 - landscape and the built environment,

DP5 - design of amenity open space,

T2 - development access,

T3 - development layout,

T4 - parking standards.