

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL AND WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
JOINT WEST OF WATERLOOVILLE MAJOR DEVELOPMENT AREA PLANNING
COMMITTEE

17 June 2014

Attendance

Councillor Ruffell (Chairman)(Winchester City Council)

Councillor Paul Buckley, Havant Borough Council
 Councillor Cyril Hilton, Havant Borough Council
 Councillor Elaine Shimbart, Havant Borough Council
 Councillor Leah Turner, Havant Borough Council
 Councillor Sam Newman - Mckie, Winchester City Council
 Councillor Therese Evans BA, MCIL, Winchester City Council
 Councillor Frank Pearson, Winchester City Council
 Councillor Michael Read, Winchester City Council

1 Chairman's Announcement

The meeting was held in the Hollybank Room at the Public Service Plaza, of Havant Borough Council.

The Chairman welcomed members and officers from Winchester City Council and Havant Borough Council to the inaugural meeting of this committee.

The Chairman reminded the Committee that Winchester City Council and Havant Borough Council had agreed to appoint this Joint Committee to streamline and improve the decision making process for dealing with applications relating to the West of Waterlooville Major Development Area.

This new committee was comprised of councillors from both councils; 5 from Winchester and 4 from Havant and replaced the procedure which involved the Planning Development Control/Development Management Committees of Winchester and Havant meeting together to consider the applications.

2 Disclosures of Interests

Councillor Read declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in respect of applications 13/02843/FUL/ W19499/27 (WCC), APP/14/00032 (HBC), 14/00068/REM (WCC), APP/14/00061 (HBC) and 14/00092/REM due to his role as Chairman of the West of Waterlooville Forum. He advised that he had not seen or spoken about these applications and remained in the room and spoke and voted

3 13/02843/FUL - Land At Old Park Farm Wimpey Site Part Of West Of Waterlooville MDA Hambledon Road Denmead Hampshire

Proposal: (AMENDED PLANS) Residential development comprising 103 no. dwellings with associated on-site infrastructure

The Committee considered the written report and recommendation of the Head of Development Management of Winchester City Council to grant permission.

Arising from members' questions it was clarified that:

- (a) the density of the proposal was similar to the density of other residential phases within the major development area;
- (b) the loss of this employment site could be justified because it was not recognised as a strategic employment site by the Solent Local Enterprise Partnership and recent evidence demonstrated that less floor space was required to create the level of jobs envisaged when the Major Development Area was first proposed. In addition the applicant had supported the application with a marketing exercise that proved that there was no demand for the site as employment land;
- (c) other retained areas for employment due to their location were not suitable for residential use and would be retained for employment use;
- (d) changes had been made to the position of some of the access gates to residential gardens to address security issues;
- (e) although the concentration of some of the affordable housing in the west end of the site was not ideal, the proposals complied with the requirements set out in Section 106 Agreement for the rest of the MDA and this arrangement was acceptable;
- (f) the garden amenity space for units 551 – 554 was considered adequate;
- (g) the change from 3 bed flats over garages to 2 bed units was requested by the officers;
- (h) the materials proposed for rendering was of a high quality and would be the same materials used for other phases in this development; the existing staining problem raised by members was likely to be maintenance issue;
- (i) the officers noted that some members were concerned about the bund and agreed it was important to ensure that the bund was appropriately designed and recommended a condition requiring the approval of details including height, profile, planting details and future maintenance of the feature to ensure that the members' concerns were adequately addressed;
- (j) the main roads within the development would be offered for adoption by the highway authority: the maintenance of the other roads and parking courts would be private;
- (k) the scheme had been designed to provide safe pedestrian routes across the entire major development area so as to encourage residents not to use vehicles;

- (l) bollards prevented vehicles onto the common; and

The Committee was addressed by Mrs Caine, on behalf of the Old Park Farm Residents Association and Civic Society, who raised the following issues:

- (1) the traffic likely to be generated by the proposed increase in housing would interfere with the free flow of traffic on the single access road and exacerbate the existing problem of on street parking; and
- (2) the proposed increase in housing, without adequate play areas or a community building, would exacerbate the existing anti social behavioural problems experienced by residents of the area;

In response to questions raised by members of the Committee, Mrs Caine advised that:

- (A) she would have raised the issue of traffic problems associated with the school had this not already been discussed;
- (b) open spaces would not necessarily solve the anti social behaviour problem as: there was need for more formal play areas and the nearest play area was Sickle Way. The lack of nearby play areas had encouraged children to play on the highway which was dangerous and had recently led to a serious incident; and
- (c) the on street parking problems could not be enforced until the roads were adopted as highways maintainable at the public expense;

Parish Councillor Lander-Brinkley, on behalf of Denmead Parish Council addressed the Committee and raised the following concerns:

- (i) although the applicant had agreed to consider the provision of a community building during the pre application stage, such a facility was not included in the application;
- (ii) the proposed single access road would be unable to accommodate the traffic likely to be generated by this proposal; Sickle Way should be kept open;
- (iii) the pedestrian access to the school should be completed and adopted by Hampshire County Council as early as possible
- (iv) a recent article suggested that there was a need for employment units in South Hampshire

In response to a question raised by a Member of the Committee Parish Councillor Lander-Brinkley advised that the proposed strip of land between the bund and nearby houses would attract fly tipping, which would be difficult to keep clean.

The Committee discussed this application in detail together with the views raised by the deputees. Although concern was expressed about the lack of a community facility, the allocation of proposed location of the affordable housing

units and the lack of a safe pedestrian route to the school, the majority of the Committee supported the application.

In view of the concerns raised by the Committee concerning the bund, the officers suggested that Condition 9 be amended to prevent the occupation of houses until the bund had been provided.

It was Agreed that

- (A) permission be granted for the reasons set out in the report and subject to a Section 106 Agreement and conditions 1 to 8, and 10 to 16 as set out in the report and condition 9 of the report amended to prohibit the occupation of any houses prior to construction of the bund (with authority delegated to the Head of Development Management to agree the wording) and
- (B) in the event of the legal agreement not being completed within 6 months, the application may be refused without further reference to Committee.

(the meeting adjourned at 11.38am and resumed at 11.54 am)

4 Applications APP/14/00032 (HBC) and 14/00068/REM (WCC) - Berewood Phase 2 Development Site, London Road, Purbrook, Waterlooville

Proposal: Reserved Matters Application for 246 residential dwellings, phase 2 of the Berewood development within the West of Waterlooville MDA development (to meet the requirements of Condition 6, together with discharge of conditions 3 (Compliance with outline documents), 4 (Compliance with Design Code), 11 (noise mitigation) and 16 (Construction Management Plan), of Outline permissions for HBC APP/10/00828 and WCC 10/02862/OUT).

The Committee considered the written report and recommendation of the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment and Head of Development Management together with an update issued prior to the meeting.

The Committee was advised that Appendix A showed the location of those objectors, who could be identified: a further anonymous representation had been received.

Arising from Members' questions, it was clarified that:

- (1) the density quoted of 31 dph was calculated for the area that included the application site and the infrastructure of the central spine road and SUDs; without the inclusion of these features the density for the application site would be a higher figure;
- (2) that nature of the boundary along the London Road would prevent breakthroughs;

- (3) the distances between the gas valve compound and the proposed housing was such that it should not materially affect the amenities of the residents of these properties;
- (4) no objections had been received from the gas provider or fire service;
- (5) the marginal shortfall in affordable housing would be provided elsewhere in the major development area in accordance with the Section 106 Agreement;
- (6) the Master Plan did not require the link to the school to be provided for at least another two years;
- (7) there was adequate space for parking at the school either on street or using vacant land; and
- (8) there was a difference between the Code for Sustainable Homes Levels adopted by the Councils, through their Local Plans (Havant required level 3 and Winchester code level 4 for water and 5 for energy) – in this case the open market homes would achieve level 3. This was considered acceptable by officers because most of the dwellings were located in Havant and it would not be reasonable to apply Winchester’s policy to the handful of market housing in their part of the site. However, all the affordable housing across the entire site would be required to meet Level 4;

Following debate, the Committee agreed

- (a) to grant planning permission for the reasons (and subject to the conditions) as set out in the Report and the update;
- (b) that the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment at Havant Borough Council and the Head of Development Management at Winchester City Council be authorised to approve the discharge of Conditions 3 (Compliance with outline documents), 4 (Compliance with Design Code), 11 (noise mitigation) and 16 (Construction Management Plan), of Planning Permissions for HBC APP/10/00828 and WCC 10/02862/OUT

5 Applications APP/14/00061 (HBC) and 14/00092/REM (WCC) - Berewood Phase 2 Development Site, London Road, Purbrook, Waterlooville

Proposal: Reserved Matters Application for landscaping of Phase A of the Town Park (under Condition 6(i)d)), together with discharge of Condition 6(ii)(f)(ecological mitigation) and condition 3 (Compliance with outline documents) of Planning Permissions for HBC APP/10/00828 and WCC 10/02862/OUT.

The Committee considered the written report and recommendation of the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment and Head of Development Management together with an update.

Arising from members' questions, it was clarified that::

- (1) the village green was not a "village green" as defined by legislation; and
- (2) the amphitheatre would be grassland.

Mr Fletcher, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application emphasising that Redrow and Grainger were committed to providing an open space facility that would benefit the whole community. He further advised that work was underway on the design of the skateboard park and additional landscaping features.

Following debate, the Committee agreed:

- (a) to grant planning permission for the reasons (and subject to the conditions) as set out in the Report and
- (b) that the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment at Havant Borough Council and the Head of Development Management at Winchester City Council be authorised to APPROVE the discharge of Condition 6(ii)(f)(ecological mitigation) and condition 3 (Compliance with outline documents) of Planning Permissions for HBC APP/10/00828 and WCC 10/02862/OUT.

The meeting commenced at 10.00 am and concluded at 1.18 pm