

14/02872/REM/W19499/36 – Berewood Phase 1 Hambledon Road, Denmead, Hampshire

Since the publication of the agenda for this meeting some significant additional information has been submitted by the applicant's agent which seeks to address the three reasons for refusal.

This information will be expanded upon at the meeting tomorrow afternoon but is set out in brief on this update sheet.

The recommendation is to grant approval of reserved matters subject to securing appropriate planning obligations to deal the delivery of affordable housing and other matters. A detailed revised recommendation will be provided at the Committee meeting.

Reason for refusal number 1.

This dealt with the failure of the scheme to provide affordable housing as the development is built in the usual way and the fact that no overriding justification had been put forward to support this approach.

Information submitted by the agent

Monday 9th March – meeting with Vails where financial viability of the scheme was examined and it was agreed that the provision of PRS houses could not afford to provide any affordable housing until year 12 when 40% of the houses would be allocated to a registered landlord and the remaining 60% would be sold on the open market. The fact that the scheme cannot afford to provide affordable housing in the normal way (when the development is built) is therefore accepted and this is considered to be justification for accepting the delayed provision of these affordable housing units for the scheme.

The applicant has also confirmed that they intend to provide the 74 dwellings as additional homes rather than reducing the number of units in future phases by 74 which was the approach detailed in their original submission. If this is the case it will mean that at an additional 30 affordable houses will be provided on the MDA over and above what we would have achieved on the phases consented in the outline.

This is considered an acceptable approach as it would represent a net gain in affordable housing. The original approach which is explained in the Principles of development on page 29 of the agenda would have resulted in slower delivery of affordable housing over the MDA because of the requirement to reduce total housing numbers on future phases to account for the 74 now being proposed on phase E1.

It is considered that on the basis of this information the objections to the principle of providing a 100% PRS housing scheme which are contained in reason for refusal number 1 have now been satisfactorily addressed.

Reason for refusal 2.

This deals with the parking strategy which is for 100% parking to be provided in rear parking courts, inadequate number of spaces and inconvenience of spaces to dwellings which could result in parking on the highway.

Information submitted by the applicant.

The applicant has clarified the mix of allocated and unallocated spaces and the highways engineer has updated his response and removed his objection to the scheme. If permission was forthcoming then a condition would be required to control the provision of parking and some wording has been suggested by Ian Elvin. The applicant has also supplied wording from their standard covenant which requires tenants to utilise their car parking spaces and so some additional control is available.

The applicant has also submitted plans which show that the rear boundary walls will incorporate some areas of vertical railings to allow for inter visibility between the property and its parking space. This is an approach used in phase 1.

The fact that 100% of the car parking on this phase is provided in rear parking courts remains but in phases 1 and 2 this approach has been taken for the affordable apartments but as part of a larger phase which also includes on street and on plot parking.

Reason for refusal 3

This deals with the applicant's proposal to use a concrete roof tile which is contrary to the design codes and would not help to deliver a high quality development overall.

The applicant has now proposed Marley Acme Clay Plain Tile in Heather Blend and this is considered to be an acceptable solution; all other proposed materials in the original submission were acceptable.

Procedure and timescales.

Under normal circumstances if significant changes were made to an application in order to overcome reasons for refusal, the item would be deferred from the agenda and reported to the next available committee with an updated report and recommendation. In this case this has not been possible. The application is for PRS accommodation and has attracted government funding by way of a low cost loan which is dependant on the scheme achieving planning permission by 31 March 2015. It would not be possible to defer the committee and still meet this date as the application also requires a S106 agreement to cover the transfer of 40% of the units to an RSL at year 12 or 2200 dwellings whichever is sooner.