

WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE**29 May 2003****Attendance:****Councillors:**

Bidgood (Chairman) (P)

Bailey (P)

Bennetts (P)

Beveridge (P)

Chamberlain (P)

Davies (P)

Hiscock (P)

Jeffs

Pearson (P)

Porter (P)

Read

Deputy Members:

Councillor Wright (Standing Deputy for Councillor Jeffs)

Others in Attendance:

Councillor Cook (Portfolio Holder for Environment, Economy and Development)

Councillors Busher, Coates, Craig, de Peyer, Fothergill, and Nelmes

County Councillors Dickens and Peskett

1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A number of statements and issues were raised and were dealt with under the consideration of the relevant items.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**RESOLVED:**

That Councillor Bailey be appointed Vice-Chairman for the remainder of the 2003/2004 Municipal Year.

3. MINUTES

(Report CAB555 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 10 January 2003, numbered 715-722 be approved and adopted.

4. REVISED DEPOSIT WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: PUBLICITY AND CONSULTATION ARRANGEMENTS

(Report WDLP20 refers)

The report set out the details of the publication, publicity and consultation arrangements for the revised Deposit Local Plan. In response to Members' questions, Mrs Kirby explained that the majority of the comments made at the Local

Plan exhibitions around the district had concerned the West of Waterlooville MDA and peoples' own objections to the Plan or specific allocations.

Members noted that there would be series of meetings of this Committee in autumn 2003 to consider the comments made on the changes to the original Deposit Local Plan and any other necessary changes (such as updating in response to the Housing Needs Survey) prior to the commencement of the Public Inquiry in late April 2004.

RESOLVED:

That a further report on the representations be brought back to the Winchester District Local Plan Committee following the closure of the comment period.

5. THE FUTURE OF STRATEGIC PLANNING IN HAMPSHIRE
(Report WDLP23 refers)

The Director of Development Services reported that a Government Bill was currently being considered by the Commons that proposed to alter the future of strategic planning. In summary, Structure Plans would be replaced by more detailed Regional Planning Guidance from the South East Regional Assembly and District Council's Local Plans would be replaced by Local Development Frameworks.

However the Bill allowed for Sub-Regional Strategies to be developed in areas where significant development or change was likely as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy. At a meeting of the Strategic Planning Joint Advisory Panel (JAP, which comprised of Southampton and Portsmouth City Councils and Hampshire County Council) held in April 2003 it was considered likely that two Sub-Regional Strategies could be formed in Hampshire. These would cover South Hampshire (principally the urban conurbations of Southampton and Portsmouth) and the Blackwater Valley. Members were therefore asked to consider the City Council's view on whether the Winchester Town area should be included in the South Hampshire Sub-Regional Strategy.

The Director recommended that, on balance, the Winchester Town area should be included in the Sub-Regional Strategy. He argued that the Strategy would inevitably influence the Winchester Town area and that it would be beneficial for the City Council to be involved in the formation of the Strategy's policies. Members noted that the advantages and disadvantages of joining the Strategy were set out in the report.

In response to Members' questions, the Director stated that the decision to release reserve housing sites (such as the Winchester City North Major Development Area) would remain with the higher tier authorities of Southampton and Portsmouth City Councils and the County Council for the duration of the Structure Plan but would then transfer to the Regional Assembly.

The Committee also noted that the Sub-Regional Strategy's boundaries were likely to be indistinct as the areas affected by different policies on issues such as transport and housing varied.

The Director reported that it was likely that additional Government funding in areas such as housing and transport, would be channelled through the Strategies and that the Strategic Planning Authorities were already working on a South Hampshire Study that was likely to form the basis of the Sub-Regional Strategy.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mrs Edwards of the City of Winchester Trust and Mrs Slattery of the Save Barton Farm Group commented on the proposal. They both stated that further information and greater public awareness was required on what was an important change to strategic planning and suggested that the planning policies governing Winchester Town should be the same as those in rural Hampshire

Members discussed the view that northern parts of the Town had closer links to Basingstoke and the possible democratic deficit of the Sub-Regional Strategy. The Director stated that the details of the Strategy's formation were not yet available. He also pointed out that it would be the Regional Assembly that would ultimately decide on which areas should have sub-regional strategies and what their boundaries should be.

Other Members commented that further investigations should be undertaken into the now defunct Mid-Hampshire Structure Plan and the view of Test Valley District Council whose boundary bordered Southampton. The Director replied that the Bill discouraged the replacement of Structure Plans by another name with numerous Sub-Regional Strategies and, until the Strategy was actually produced, there was little additional information that officers could supply to Members or the public.

The Committee discussed the possible effect of the South Downs National Park on the future of strategic planning and some Members commented that the City Council should withdraw its objection to the Park as it was likely to protect the District's rural nature.

In conclusion, Members recommended to Cabinet that the Winchester Town area should not be included in the South Hampshire Sub Regional Strategy, unless it could be demonstrated that additional investment in transport and social housing would be concentrated in such areas.

RESOLVED:

That it be recommended to Cabinet that:

1. The strategic planning authorities and the South East England Regional Assembly be informed that the City Council:
 - i) Generally supports the recommendation that work on a further Structure Plan Review for Hampshire be abandoned and that sub-regional strategies be produced for South Hampshire and the Blackwater Valley.
 - ii) Considers that, on balance, the Town area of Winchester should not be included in the South Hampshire Sub-Regional Strategy unless it can be proved that regional investment in transport and social housing will be concentrated in such areas.

6. **BROADWAY/FRIARSGATE PLANNING BRIEF** (Report WDLP21 refers)

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal interest in this item as a member of the City of Winchester Trust who had commented on the Brief and both spoke and voted thereon. In addition Councillor Davies also declared a personal interest as a member of the St Johns Winchester Charity and of the City of Winchester Trust, both of whom had commented on the Brief, and spoke and voted thereon.

The Director of Development Services explained that the Draft Broadway/Friarsgate Planning Brief had been published for public consultation and that the report set out the public's comments.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mrs Martin and Mrs Edwards of the City of Winchester Trust commented on the Planning Brief and stated that the Kings Walk Antiques Market building should be retained. They also commented on the need for the masterplanners to consider areas outside the Brief's boundary and the potential to open the Broadway as a public space.

Mr Cole of the City of Winchester Trust commented on the retail allocations in the Brief and stated that the projected required floorspace was likely to have been overestimated and he opposed what appeared to be encouragement for a 3000sq metre food store in the re-development. Mr Cole also stated that the summarisation of the City of Winchester Trust's comments in the report was inadequate, for which the Director of Development Services apologised.

The Director clarified that the Retail Needs Study had identified the need for an additional 3000sq metres gross convenience shopping floorspace in the town centre, of which only some was likely to be developed at the Broadway/Friarsgate re-development. He considered that the Brief made it clear that the site was not expected to accommodate all the future growth and doubted whether any developer or operator would be interested in locating such a large convenience store on the site.

County Councillor Peskett commented on the need to retain the Kings Walk Antiques Market and the need for the re-development to include facilities for young people.

County Councillor Dickens echoed this view and spoke of the need to support an evening economy in the re-development, a drop-off car parking area close to the medical centres, and temporary ice-rink.

Members considered the proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief on a subject by subject basis and a brief summary of the main discussion points are listed below along with any further amendments to the report in bold:

Car Parking: The Director confirmed that the developers would prepare a transport assessment on the effects of the development as part of the planning application. The development would provide short stay car parking equal to the number of spaces that would have been provided if the Friarsgate car park had been refurbished (approximately 250 spaces) plus a replacement of that lost elsewhere in the town centre (in total around 350 spaces). In response to a Member's comment on the relationship of the re-development to the Park and Ride scheme, the Director stated that construction work was likely to be after the completion of the Park and Ride extension.

Buses: In response to Members' questions, the Director explained that the proposed bus station would meet the likely middle-term demand and that the buses' contra-flow egress onto Friarsgate had been prepared by Consultant Engineers and accepted as workable by Hampshire County Council highways and public transport staff. A Member commented on the need to include within the Brief Park and Ride bus-stops in or very close to the re-development, and it was noted that the Park and Ride service was shortly to be reviewed.

It was further explained that National Express Coaches would use the Bus Station whilst tourist coaches would continue to use the Broadway, but that this could be re-developed to create safer drop off points.

Medical Centres: In response to comments made by County Councillor Dickens, the Committee agreed that a reference should be made to the provision of suitable drop-off car parking spaces near to the medical facilities for people with limited mobility.

Post Office: The Committee agreed to not accept the officers' proposed changes to the draft Brief which would have allowed Post Office Counters to relocate to an alternative site in the town centre as, whilst not wishing to limit the Post Office, Members did not want to encourage them to move from the current position.

Market: It was agreed to delete the proposed change which added a reference to the possible future uses of the Woolstaplers Hall (paragraph 2.12.1) as Members considered that this would make the demolition of the Kings Walk Antiques Market more likely.

Evening Economy: Members noted that the Brief would encourage an evening economy in the re-development and several Members commented on the need for a nightclub which could operate on certain nights for the under-18s. However, the Director explained that a recent Council study for the Bapsy Bequest had not identified any particular need for further community facilities for young people.

Retail: Further to Mr Cole's comments, Members discussed the potential size of the retail units in the redevelopment and the Director confirmed that the developers had intended there to be at least one anchor store. The Committee considered the possibility of limiting the size of any foodstore but the majority of Members considered that this was neither practical nor desirable in planning terms. The Director added that most of the new retail units would have larger floorspaces than the current shops in the High Street. The units would be constructed in such a way so that they could be adapted to future needs by being converted into smaller or larger units.

Antiques Market: With regard to the Kings Walk Antiques Market, the Director agreed that it would be preferable to retain the building but that its position on the site was such that it was likely to severely constrain the developer's options. For this reason, the Planning Brief had allowed for the Market's potential demolition. However, **the Committee agreed that the Brief should be amended to underline the importance and popularity of the Kings Walk Antiques Market and that its demolition should only be allowed if the benefit of doing so for the whole scheme were overwhelming**

Multi-storey Car Park: It was agreed to add the word "public" to the proposed changes to the Draft Planning Brief in relation to 7.3, Multi Storey Car Park.

Access: Members discussed the arrangements for the goods delivery at the re-development and the need to encourage retailers to take out-of-hours deliveries so as to reduce traffic congestion. The Director explained that the visual intrusion of the goods delivery access area would be minimised.

Housing: It was agreed to clarify within the Brief the Committee's understanding that it was likely that there would be a minimum of 100 new small residential units on the site. It was noted that approximately 50% of these units would have no private car

parking and the Director confirmed that the developers' transport assessment would investigate the possibilities of car-pooling.

General Comments: Members agreed to include a reference to the Cultural Strategy.

At the conclusion of the debate, the Committee agreed that the Developer's scheme should be debated in public, once drawn up, prior to the consideration of a planning application, and that this would be best administered through further meetings of this Committee.

RESOLVED:

That it be recommended to Cabinet that:

1. The changes set out in Appendix One of the report be endorsed and incorporated into the final text of the Planning Brief, subject to the above amendments.

2. The Director of Development Services be given delegated authority to make the appropriate minor amendments to the Planning Brief to correct any minor inaccuracies to the text, plans or images.

7. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The Director explained that a further meeting of this Committee was necessary to report back on the number and nature of representations on the Revised Deposit Plan and other matters, and this was subsequently set as Friday 18 July 2003 at 9.30am in the Walton Room, Guildhall, Winchester.

8. **MR STEVE BEE**

The Chairman announced that the Director of Development Services, Mr Steve Bee, was set to leave the Council, and the Committee unanimously expressed its thanks for his work and advice over the five years he held the post.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 2.15pm.

I.Bidgood
Chairman