

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**30 November 2006**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Jefts (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)  
Bennetts (P)  
Beveridge (P)  
Busher (P)  
de Peyer (P)  
Evans (P)  
Huxstep (P)

Johnston (P)  
Lipscomb (P)  
Read (P)  
Ruffell  
Saunders (P)  
Sutton (P)

Deputy Members in Attendance:

Councillor Godfrey (Standing Deputy for Councillor Ruffell)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Stallard (Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport) – during the informal meeting.

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Hollingbery and Pearson

---

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Ruffell.

2. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT**

The meeting was held in the Council Chamber at the offices of Havant Borough Council.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Members and Officers from Havant Borough Council, Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council, members of the public and representatives of amenities groups, Denmead Parish Council, and representatives of the applicant George Wimpey UK Ltd.

It was pointed out that the proceedings had been convened to consider applications from George Wimpey UK Limited, for the development of part of the West of Waterlooville Major Development Area. The site for this development straddled the administrative boundary between the Winchester District and Havant Borough, and the applicant had therefore submitted separate applications to each local planning authority. It was these applications which were to be determined at the proceedings.

The format of the meeting was explained. The Winchester Planning Development Control Committee and Havant's Development Control Committee would each separately open to consider procedural items and then adjourn for informal discussions. Following these informal discussions, each Committee would reconvene to determine the application submitted in respect of its own area.

The Chairman accordingly opened and adjourned the Winchester Planning Development Control Committee. Following the opening and adjournment of the Havant Development Control Committee, informal discussions (including officer presentations, public participation, representations by the applicant and debate between Members of both Committees) took place, the detail of which is attached as Appendix A to the Minutes.

Following the conclusion of these informal discussions, the Winchester Planning Development Control Committee reconvened to formally consider the recommendations and resolved to determine the applications as set out in the resolution below. Following the closure of the Winchester meeting, the Havant Development Control Committee reconvened and dealt with the application submitted within respect to land within the Havant Borough.

3. **DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR RESIDENTIAL (450 UNITS); LIVE/WORK (24 UNITS); EMPLOYMENT (7.1 HECTARES INCLUDING B1, B2 AND B8 AND A HOUSEHOLD WASTE RECYCLING CENTRE); MIXED USE INCLUDING RETAIL, FOOD AND DRINK, FINANCIAL/PROFESSIONAL AND HEALTH; OPEN SPACE/RECREATIONAL PURPOSES AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF TWO ACCESSES FROM HAMBLEDON ROAD (OUTLINE) – LAND AT OLD PARK FARM (PART OF WEST OF WATERLOOVILLE MDA), HAMBLEDON ROAD, DENMEAD, HAMPSHIRE (APPLICANT GEORGE WIMPEY UK LTD) – CASE NUMBER WCC-05/00500/OUT AND HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL 05/40000/000.**

The Director of Development reported that since the report was published further representation had been received in response to consultation as detailed below.

Hampshire County Council (Highways) had stated that a full written response had now been received from the Highway Authority in which they confirmed that they had no objection to the applications subject to planning obligations/conditions to cover: off-site highways/junction improvements, the provision of the internal spine road, passenger and transport services and infrastructure, safer routes to school, a link to the Brambles Business Park, a Green Travel Plan, parking, construction traffic management and highways design/construction.

In addition, the Highways Agency had now formally set out their position in respect to the applications in a letter dated 28 November 2006. They had raised no objections to the proposals, but would require certain mitigation measures to be put into place. These would be secured through a Section 106 agreement. They also required targets to monitor whether the Green Travel Plan was effective in reducing travel by car.

The Highways Agency had also agreed the basis for the traffic model, and had concluded that overall the model was fit for purpose, and was a reasonable representation of traffic patterns on the strategic highways network (trunk roads and motorways).

The Director of Development additionally reported that the Government had, on 29 November 2006, published its latest guidance in Planning Policy Statement 3. This latest guidance would have to be taken into consideration to see if it conflicted with any guidance with the Section 106 agreements and conditions as set out in the report's recommendations. Delegation of powers to the respective Directors of Development and Solicitors of both Authorities would ensure that these issues were addressed.

The Director of Development also asked the Committee to take into consideration a number of amendments (as highlighted in italics) to the conditions to the recommendations as detailed below:

Condition 11 be revised to read as follows: *"The layout of the site shall allow for the possible future extension of the 'The Main Avenue', as identified in the application papers, into the MDA land to the south and there shall be no barriers or other restrictions preventing access between the application site and this adjoining land to the south via 'The Main Avenue' unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority."*

Condition 13 to have the following added to the last paragraph: *"The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the agreed details and any changes..."*

Condition 14 to have the following added: *"shall be dealt with, including timing provisions, and the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the agreed details"*.

Condition 18 to have the following added: *"The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the agreed details"*.

Condition 33 to have the following added at the end *"as appropriate"*.

In reaching its decision the Committee took into consideration the representations received through formal consultations and through public participation and debate in the informal discussions. Following further debate, Committee agreed to grant outline permission as set out in the report, subject to the amendments to conditions 11, 13, 14, 18 and 33 as outlined above and to a number of further amendments detailed as follows:

That in respect of the Heads of Terms as set out in Appendix A, under the heading "Other Items covered in the S106 Agreement", the following provisions be added:

*"Signing and Lorry Routeing*

*A routeing agreement for heavy goods vehicles accessing the Household Waste Recycling Centre to include provision of appropriate signing for domestic vehicles from the existing highway network with the objective of encouraging users of the Household Waste Recycling Centre to use an agreed route, with a long term objective of heavy goods vehicles accessing the Household Waste Recycling Centre from the Grainger Trust development."*

That in respect of the conditions as set out in Appendix B, Section B – Compliance with The Master Plan and Proposed Design Codes, the following amendments be made (changes highlighted in italics):

- (a) In Condition 6 the insertion of the words: “*including climatic change issues*” after the sub heading ‘General’.
- (b) In Condition 6 under the sub heading ‘General’ (including climatic change issues) (as amended above), Sub condition “v”, the paragraph be amended to read as follows: “On site measures which show how energy efficiency is being addressed *to reflect current practice and policy in climate change*, and show the on-site measures to be taken to produce at least 10% of the total energy requirements of the new development by means of renewable energy sources. “
- (c) In Condition 6, the insertion of a new sub-condition xii: “*the inter-relationship between residential uses and access to employment areas so as to mitigate the impact on residential amenity*” and subsequent sub-conditions to be renumbered.
- (d) That an informative be added to state: “*Continuing consideration should be given to the requirements of both Winchester City and Havant Borough Councils’ developing climate change plans.*”
- (e) That an informative be added to state: “*The Local Planning Authority granted planning permission for the development taking into account the following policies:-*

*The Adopted Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996-2011 (Review)*

<i>Policy H1/H2</i>	<i>Housing Provision</i>
<i>Policy H3</i>	<i>Housing Provision in MDAs</i>
<i>Policy MDA1</i>	<i>Principles of Major Development Areas</i>
<i>Policy MDA2</i>	<i>A new community West of Waterlooville</i>
<i>Policy UB3</i>	<i>Design</i>
<i>Policy R2</i>	<i>Open Space, recreation and play facilities</i>
<i>Policy T5</i>	<i>Transport Requirements for New Development</i>
<i>Policy T12</i>	<i>Provision of facilities for walking and cycling</i>

*The Adopted Winchester District Local Plan (Review 2006)*

*Chapter 3 Design and Development Principles*

<i>DP.1</i>	<i>Planning Applications Supporting and Explanatory Information</i>
<i>DP.3</i>	<i>General Design Criteria</i>
<i>DP.4</i>	<i>Landscape and the Built Environment</i>
<i>DP.5</i>	<i>Design of Amenity Open Space</i>
<i>DP.6</i>	<i>Efficient Use of Resources</i>
<i>DP.8</i>	<i>Flood Risk</i>
<i>DP.9</i>	<i>Infrastructure for New Development</i>

*Chapter 4 Countryside and Natural Environment*

<i>CE.10</i>	<i>Other sites of Nature Conservation Interest</i>
--------------	--

*Chapter 6 Housing*

H.1	<i>Provision for Housing Development</i>
H.5	<i>Affordable Housing</i>
H7	<i>Housing Mix and Density</i>

#### *Chapter 9 Recreation and Tourism*

RT.4	<i>Recreational Space for New Housing Development</i>
RT.9	<i>Recreational Routes</i>

#### *Chapter 10 Transport*

T.1	<i>Development Location</i>
T.2	<i>Development Access</i>
T.3	<i>Development Layout</i>
T.4	<i>Parking standards</i>
T.5	<i>Off Site Transportation Contributions</i>
T.6	<i>Integrated Transport Infrastructure</i>

#### *Chapter 12 Major Development Areas*

##### *MDA.1 West of Waterlooville*

*Planning permission is granted because the development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan as set out above, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted."*

#### RESOLVED:

1. That the Director of Development at Winchester City Council be authorised to GRANT PERMISSION to application 05/00500/OUT(W19499) subject to:-
  - (a) The referral to The Secretary of State in accordance with the requirements of The Town and Country Planning (Residential Development On Greenfield Land) (England) Direction 2000;
  - (b) The completion of legal agreements under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other relevant legislation, incorporating the terms set out in Appendix A to the report as amended above (attached as amended as an appendix to the minutes) (subject to such changes as the Head of Development Services (Havant Borough Council) and Director of Development (Winchester City Council) may determine), such agreements to be to the satisfaction of the City Secretary and Solicitor (Winchester City Council) and the Solicitor to the Council (Havant Borough Council);
  - (c) That subject to the amendments and additional conditions as detailed above, the conditions be approved as set out in Appendix B to the report (attached as amended as Appendix B to the minutes).

2. That the Director of Development be authorised to include any additional condition which he considers appropriate in the light of the decision taken in respect of application 05/40000/000 (Havant Borough Council). (Subsequent to the meeting there were no additional conditions to include following Havant Borough Council's decision).

3. That the Committee's thanks be forwarded to the Members and Officers of Havant Borough Council for their hospitality and joint working in considering the applications; to Hampshire County Councils' Members and Officers and to all other parties present.

The meeting commenced at 10:00am, adjourned at 10:05am, reconvened at 3:45pm and concluded at 4:10pm.

Chairman

**HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL EXTRAORDINARY PLANNING DEVELOPMENT  
CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**AND**

**WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**30 November 2006**

**INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS**

**REGARDING**

**DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR RESIDENTIAL (450 UNITS); LIVE/WORK (24 UNITS);  
EMPLOYMENT (7.1 HECTARES INCLUDING B1, B2 AND B8 AND A HOUSEHOLD  
WASTE RECYCLING CENTRE; MIXED USE INCLUDING RETAIL, FOOD AND DRINK,  
FINANCIAL/PROFESSIONAL AND HEALTH; OPEN SPACE/RECREATIONAL  
PURPOSES AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF TWO ACCESSES FROM HAMBLEDON  
ROAD (OUTLINE) – LAND AT OLD PARK FARM (PART OF WEST OF WATERLOOVILLE  
MDA) – HAMBLEDON ROAD, DENMEAD, HAMPSHIRE – CASE NUMBER WCC-  
05/00500/OUT AND HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL 05/40000/000. LAND AT OLD PARK  
FARM, SOUTH OF HAMBLEDON ROAD, WATERLOOVILLE. APPLICANT GEORGE  
WIMPEY (UK) LTD.**

---

**OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

**Havant Borough Council**

Jackie Batchelor – Head of Development and Technical Services  
Shirley Shaw – Deputy to the Solicitor to the Council  
Andrew Mclean – Traffic and Transportation Manager  
Sally Smith – Senior Planner

**Winchester City Council**

Steve Tilbury – Director of Development  
Howard Bone – Assistant City Secretary (Legal)  
Fiona Tebbutt – Head of Planning  
Simon Finch – Team Manager Planning DC West.  
Nigel Green – Major Development Project Leader  
Simon Maggs - Housing Strategy & Development Manager  
Elizabeth Stewart - Planner

**Hampshire County Council**

Steve Jenkins – Senior Engineer (Highways)  
Chris Walton – Head of Highways Development Control

**Environment Agency**

Simon Jones-Parry

**Atkins (Consultants)**

Ian Johnston

## **SUMMARY OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND DEBATE FROM THE INFORMAL PART OF THE MEETING BETWEEN WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL AND HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL TO DISCUSS THE ABOVE APPLICATION.**

### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.**

It was noted that the public consultation and representation for the George Wimpey (UK) Ltd application had been carried out prior to the submission of the current application by the Grainger Trust for the remainder of the Major Development Area. It did not take into account therefore representation and comment on the Grainger Trust application.

A summary of consultation and representation was set out within the report as submitted to the two Committees.

### **SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION AT THE MEETING**

#### **Councillors**

**Councillor Henderson - Portsmouth City Council**, commented that he was born and raised in the local area and knew the development site well. The destruction of the open land was unnecessary as it represented a wonderful and historic site. He had spoken to many people, none of whom were in favour of the development. If the development did proceed then he could confidently predict that there would be questions in the future as to its necessity. The case for the development had not been proven and was not wanted. There were other areas that should be taken into consideration, which were more desirable for development. He quoted HRH Prince Charles on the need to protect green land against development, and as this was an outline application, he urged the Committees that it was not too late to refuse the applications.

**Councillor Moss - Havant Borough Council**, stated that he agreed with the principles put forward by Councillor Henderson. He had objected to the proposals 12 years ago, but now had to face the fact that the application was before Committee and that emphasis should be placed on making it correct and to iron out problematic areas. The roads needed to be correct. From Hambledon Road, the provision of a car park opposite the shops would create a hazard for those having to cross the main road. There was also the need for a filter road into the development. Measures to deal with the impact of additional traffic needed to be correct. He also had concerns at the location of the Household Waste Recycling Centre and the damage this would have on the area. Its current location led to a back up of traffic into the retail park and such a situation should be avoided in the current application. The recycling centre should be located at the nearest point of access to the development and traffic should not be routed through the residential area. He concluded by stating that if these two major areas were addressed then the scheme could be made a success.

**Councillor Stallard - Winchester City Council**, stated that she had not spoken to Councillors Henderson or Moss previous to the meeting, but endorsed their comments. She made reference to a Radio Four programme that had highlighted that there were one million empty homes in the UK, which provided an alternative to such development.

As the Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport at Winchester City Council, she was pleased to note that £2.5million had been allocated in the whole of the Major Development Area for formal and informal play. She was also pleased that some provision had been made for public art, although this amount could have been greater. Also, on a positive note, the archaeology on the site had been safeguarded.



As a Ward Councillor for Denmead, local residents had voiced extreme concern at the additional traffic generation and the introduction of traffic signals on Hambledon Road. There were concerns at extreme traffic build up, with local alternative routes such as Newlands Lane being potentially used as rat runs and this needed to be addressed. There was also local concern at the arrangements for the access of construction traffic during the building period. Controls on construction traffic needed to be implemented and monitored. She also had concerns about the Household Waste Recycling Centre and in particular the access to it through the residential estate. In addition, residents of the estate would also need to cross this access road to reach recreational land beyond, which could lead to conflict between pedestrians and traffic. There was also the impact on the Denmead Strategic Gap to take into consideration.

### **Objectors**

**Honorary Alderman (Havant Borough Council) – Bill Blackett**, stated that 450 households and the associated industrial and Household Waste Recycling Centre traffic would have to use residential roads with resultant noise, dust and traffic congestion. This traffic would also have to use Hambledon Road. Traffic problems would be exacerbated by the lack of a link road into the Brambles Industrial Estate.

Mr Blackett suggested that the Household Waste Recycling Centre could be located by Brambles Farm, which would require only a short link road to Hambledon Road. He also suggested that the access road could be nearer to the power lines, and therefore be further away from the residential development. As the electricity provider would need to replace the power lines to supply the additional capacity to power the development, it may lead to a short delay in going forward, but would be less problematic in the long term.

**Mr Paul Diaper** stated that he had a long family association with the local area and wished to comment on carbon dioxide emissions. The report stated (in Appendix B, Section B – 06-iv) that the sustainable design on construction should achieve a minimum eco-home standard of 'very good' which was satisfactory, but the method of achieving this rating needed to be carefully considered. He encouraged that the Councils ensure that the ratings were achieved through energy efficiency, which could contribute to less carbon dioxide emissions, rather than by other initiatives. He also asked that cycle parking be provided for each residential unit.

**Mr John Harvey (Purbrook and Widley Area Residents Association)**, stated that the Residents Association had fought against the development and retained some concerns. Firstly, that the West of Waterlooville Major Development Area should be one development, and not two applications, as was the case. Secondly, the applications should not be isolated from each other and needed to be considered as one application, in order that a piecemeal development was avoided.

The Residents Association also had concerns about the Household Waste Recycling Centre. The access of heavy goods vehicles to the recycling centre through mixed and residential development was unacceptable and the access should be relocated in order that a safe route was achieved.

### **Commentators**

**Mr Paul Denyer, representing Portsmouth City Council**, stated that the City Council was disappointed only to be consulted on 11 September 2006 about the Transport Assessment Report in its final form. Portsmouth City Council had subsequently formally objected to the proposals in October.

The formal objection related to the Transport Assessment Report's unrealistically low predictions of traffic growth in London Road, Portsmouth, which was considered unsuitable for the extra traffic generated through private cars leading to heavy congestion. However, further contact with the relevant authorities had revealed that part of the £1.2million provided for Highway Mitigation Contingency Funding could be used to mitigate the impact on surrounding roads, including London Road and other access roads outside of the application site, which had led to Portsmouth City Council formally withdrawing its objection, but with the desire that formal dialogue continue to take place.

**Mr Guy Phelps – Member from the South East Hampshire Public People Initiative in Health**, commented that there was a lack of certainty over health provision. The location of the health centre currently based in Waterlooville and the financing of its possible relocation or duplication needed to be decided. He asked that if health services were to be relocated, who would finance their relocation and would transport be provided from existing facilities to the new facilities?

**Mr Peter Sanders - Chairman of the Brambles Traffic Group**, commented that the Brambles Industrial Park was a major employer and generator of wealth for the local economy. He encouraged partnership working with the Councils and the Police etc for the development of the Major Development Area, but also supported objections based on the impact of the proposals on the infrastructure, particularly relating to local roads and pathways. The proposals should not impact on the viability of the existing Brambles Industrial Park. A Planning Inspector had previously commented that, due to the potential extra vehicle movements, infrastructure improvements should be in place prior to construction work commencing.

He also had concerns over the Household Waste Recycling Centre. The operation of the Centre could impact on two companies operating on the Brambles Industrial Park as the noise and fumes from the Centre could affect their operations as they required clean air and a lack of vibration to operate sensitive equipment.

### **Parish Council**

**Councillor Neil Lander – Brinkley (Representing Denmead Parish Council)**, stated that the Parish Council's concerns were set out in paragraph 5.23 of the report. The Parish Council was concerned at the traffic impact on the B2150 and other surrounding minor roads and supported Hampshire County Council and Portsmouth City Council's comments on traffic impact in a similar manner. There was only partial information on the impact on surrounding roads and this did not ease the Parish Council's fears over traffic impact. These roads were barely capable of taking agricultural traffic and the impact to be caused by construction traffic was also of concern.

The Parish Council were of the opinion that the Household Waste Recycling Centre was not located in the best position and alternative solutions to its access route should be considered. Other points raised related to eco-friendly building and the affordability of units within the site.

### **Applicant and Agent**

Mr D. Hammond and Mr D. Brimmer (Agents) spoke in support of the application on behalf of George Wimpey (UK) Ltd.

In summary, Mr Hammond and Mr Brimmer outlined the work that the various parties working on behalf of the applicant had carried out in submitting the application. Fifty policies and twenty-seven documents of good practice had been referred to in submitting the application.

The new Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) regarding sufficient and well designed housing was now to be taken into consideration.

A number of topics had to be taken into consideration.

The application site had to fit with the Grainger land and had not to be a piecemeal development. Roads, paths etc were joined up and a comprehensive application had been submitted.

A complete package had been submitted, which had addressed issues such as sustainability including travel choices and finer details such as free bus passes.

A new land drainage system would be incorporated to reduce ponding of water. Other issues taken into account included biodiversity, the power lines that transcend the site, the use of sustainable materials to provide low energy consumption and saving water.

An example was given of the approach to low energy consumption. The principal rooms of the residential development would, where possible, be orientated to face south to maximise solar gain. The homes would also have good IT provision through cabling. These principles also extended to the industrial development. In order to meet sustainability targets and to respond to changes in building regulations, changes in the level of house insulation would be taken into account. The applicant was willing to work to achieve the maximum possible and, for example, photovoltaic roof tiles might be incorporated should they become economically viable in the future.

The need for good quality design, as required by PPS3, would be taken into account. The applicant had won awards for design in recognition of its 21<sup>st</sup> Century living design principles. This had recognised safety, public and private public open space, treed avenues and reflection of the character of the area in style and density as well as other factors.

The new development could attract new employers to the area and expansion opportunities for existing companies. This would boost the local area in Havant and Waterlooville and also the adjacent thriving Brambles Industrial Park. Small start-up units with the opportunity for live and work would be incorporated, to be controlled by condition, which would be the largest provision of this type of unit within the Havant area.

With regard to public transport, the applicant had worked closely with the consultants for the Grainger Trust application and Hampshire County Council and others to ensure comprehensive measures. This had led to a Public Transport Strategy for the development. The road corridor to Havant and Portsmouth and other services had been taken into account. There would be the provision of 10 buses per hour in peak periods with four of these to Portsmouth. Cycle provision and pedestrian walkways would be provided. There would be a cycle route to Cowplain School. Free bus passes would be provided as part of the travel plan requirements within the proposed Section 106 Agreement and there would be discounts for cycling and the provision of a travel club. The SATURN traffic model had been used and had now been judged to be fit for purpose by Hampshire County Council. This model also took into consideration offsite highway improvements, which would address the issues raised by Portsmouth City Council.

There would also be contributions to improve the access to the site. The access by the parade of shops on Hambledon Road would be widened to reduce queuing. The capacity of the junction to Sunnymead Drive remained unchanged so as not to increase its capacity, therefore preventing it becoming more attractive as a rat run.

Affordable housing would be provided at 40% for rent and these would be pepper potted throughout the site.

There would be benefit to the community obtained through the development. The travel plan, community fund, skills training and recycling would bring about community benefit. There would be units for local artists to live and work and countryside access provided for residents. As a point of detail, a Community Development Officer would be funded through the scheme for a period of 10 years.

In respect to electricity provision, this would be through additional power lines rather than replacement of the existing power lines, which could not be moved.

In conclusion, the representatives stated that the applications fitted in with the objective of the respective Councils' strategic plans and would be an exemplary scheme for which planning permission should be granted.

### **Officers' Response to Questions by Public Speakers**

**Comprehensive and integrated development** – the application from Wimpey had been received in the early part of 2005, but had not been brought to Committee as a comprehensive master plan was required to integrate both the Wimpey Development and the Grainger Trust application. This had led to the draft Heads of Terms, attached as an appendix to the report, for the proposed Section 106 Agreement, which was required to ensure that the infrastructure came forward as a comprehensive development rather than two piecemeal applications. It was also commented that the construction of 2000 dwellings would also take some time, allowing flexibility to integrate the infrastructure. A robust Section 106 Agreement would also tie down the legal requirements.

**Rat runs and construction traffic** – traffic management plans for construction traffic would be dealt with by means of a Section 106 Agreement. The principal point of access for construction traffic would be off the A3/M at junctions 3 and 4. Access to the Grainger land would be to the main MDA from Maurepas Way. Rural routes would be made less attractive through traffic management controls and traffic restrictions could be introduced on certain roads if required.

**Health provision** – a meeting would be held shortly with the Primary Care Trust to discuss health provision. It was envisaged that the Forest End Surgery at Waterlooville would be the principal surgery to serve the site. Discussion needed to take place on where it would be best located to serve the community and the timing of any move.

**Traffic routes** – to ensure full integration with existing development, the link to the Brambles development could be done in a number of ways, including pedestrian and cycle links. A cycle/pedestrian link could be provided to the leisure centre but not a vehicular link. However, there remained the possibility that access into the Brambles Industrial Park could be provided from the Grainger development.

**Household Waste Recycling Centre** – the main access to the recycling centre would be provided by the access road running close by the electricity pylons. It would not be through the heart of the residential area. The possibility remained that when the Grainger application was progressed, then access could be through the industrial development via the Grainger site.

**Eco-Homes** – although the Government criteria could not be changed, both Councils needed to be intelligent as to how it was applied so that the best results in terms of eco-homes were achieved.

**Members' Questions and Officers' Answers.****Councillor Pierce – Jones (Havant Borough Council)**

- Q. Asked if the countryside and farming community been consulted on the impact of the proposals?
- A. In reply, the officers stated that the Countryside Agency had been consulted and had made no comment. In addition, the proposals had been the subject of consultation with the wider community, which would have included any farms within the area. Again no comment had been received.

**Councillor Read (Winchester City Council)**

- Q. Would construction traffic for the Grainger site access the development through the Wimpey site and could the footpath on the B2150 be extended to gain access to the Leisure Centre?
- A. The Grainger site could be used for access for construction traffic for the Wimpey site. Access to the Leisure Centre would not be provided from Hambledon Road to discourage people from stopping on the road to gain access. Existing footpaths would be used and a Toucan crossing would be installed by Hambledon Parade to provide access across Hambledon Road.

**Councillor Hilton (Havant Borough Council)**

- Q. Regarding Health Centre provision, Councillor Hilton commented that the Forest End Surgery was already overstretched with a one to two hour wait before seeing a doctor etc. He asked if this Centre would be closed, and would it be incorporated into an extended surgery. Would extra transport be provided and were the bus companies aware of the situation?
- A. It was envisaged that the old surgery would be closed and a new one designed and purpose built to have more up to date facilities. It could, for example, incorporate a dentists and space would be provided within the development for such provision. In addition, a sum of £1.4million pounds would be provided by Wimpey towards bus provision for the new development.

**Councillor Busher (Winchester City Council) and Councillor Brown (Havant Borough Council)**

- Q. Raised questions relating to the access to the Household Waste Recycling Centre and its route.
- A. In reply, the relationship of frontage properties in the residential area was explained.

**Councillor Beveridge (Winchester City Council)**

- Q. Asked about the risk of approving the Wimpey Development before the Grainger Trust Application was determined. For example would new schools be provided within, or outside of, the new Major Development Area?
- A. In order to reduce risk, the Grainger Trust had been involved as part of comprehensive negotiations and each developer would be required to enter into a Section 106 Agreement, which included the controls over infrastructure. Elements of

risk did remain, however, as the development would take place over a long period, which could result in delays in taking it forward.

**Councillor Beveridge (Winchester City Council)**

- Q. Added that if the developments were carried out separately, would the risk be greater than delaying and determining both applications together?
- A. Negotiations had ensured that the development was signed up as a whole and there was no benefit to be additionally gained by determining both applications simultaneously.

**Councillor Cheshire (Havant Borough Council)**

- Q. 40% of the affordable housing mix would be one and two bed units and would better provision be made for growing families by providing 3 bed houses, for which there was a five to ten year waiting list?
- A. Winchester City Council's Planning Policy currently required 50% of affordable housing to be one and two bed smaller units up to 75 square metres internal size. For this development 40% was being requested, which was less than the 50% in current policy. This would allow more scope for larger units, which was thought appropriate for the development proposed.

**Councillor Cheshire (Havant Borough Council)**

- Q. Asked questions about the Household Waste Recycling Centre and industrial units and which roads would be used to provide access.
- A. The access route was demonstrated by Officers and attention drawn to the Design Codes which would minimise noise and disturbance. Industrial units would be B1 office use and would not interfere with residential dwellings, but the units to the south of the site were allocated for general storage.

**Councillor Evans (Winchester City Council).**

- Q. Enquired how the reserve fund within the Heads of Terms, in Appendix A, would be managed and monitored and what was the role of the West of Waterlooville Forum in the future and who would look after community needs?
- A. The Section 106 Agreement would contain trigger mechanisms for the release of funds throughout the development. The reserve would be held by an appropriate Local Authority with mechanisms for its release. Wimpey would make its contribution even if the Grainger Trust application did not proceed. Therefore, the contribution element relating to this development was specific to Wimpey and would be safeguarded in the most appropriate way. The applicant had been involved in the negotiation for the Section 106 Agreement and was aware of the details and the infrastructure required for the release of funds. With respect to the role of the Forum, it would be involved in the implementation of the process by monitoring on-going development, acting as a sounding board and involving the community to monitor that the Section 106 Agreement had been complied with.

**Councillor Evans (Winchester City Council)**

- Q. Additionally asked whether the funds paid under the Section 106 Agreement would be spent on the West of Waterlooville development.
- A. It was essential that the use of the Section 106 Agreement was transparent and that the West of Waterlooville Forum would have regular reports on its expenditure.

**Councillor Mrs Pearce (Havant Borough Council).**

- Q. Questions were asked about the provision of a filter road at Sunnymead Drive and the potential for traffic hold-ups on London Road, as highlighted by Portsmouth City Council.
- A. The filter lanes would be provided for left and right turning on Hambledon Road but not on Sunnymead Drive as the provision of four lanes would not be conducive for the integration of the shops. Portsmouth's concerns had been at a technical level due to the late request for a response. This had now been addressed by submission of the Transport Assessment report, which had led to Portsmouth withdrawing its objection.

**Councillor Sutton (Winchester City Council).**

- Q. Was it possible to provide a sub-way or footbridge to the parade of shops opposite Hambledon Road.
- A. These options had been considered, but had been discounted, as sub-ways were associated with security problems and the provision of a ramp would require a lot of room. The provision of crossing "at grade" (i.e. without a change in level) provided the best solution and would have the added benefit of providing breaks in traffic in Hambledon Road, which would ease traffic accessing Sunnymead Drive.

**Councillor Smith (Havant Borough Council).**

- Q. Would the additional power lines be provided by underground or overhead cabling?
- A. The applicant had been in discussion with the power providers, who were aware of the applicant's requirements. Scottish and Southern Energy had indicated that there was the ability to upgrade the existing system to meet with supply. The substation at Widley would be upgraded at the developer's expense.

**Councillor Godfrey (Winchester City Council).**

- Q. Questions were asked about vehicle movements and safety options for the crossing of the access road between the residential development and the recreation areas opposite and the relationship with the industrial estate.
- A. Traffic flows had been estimated at 500 movements per hour at peak times with 5000 per day on the access road. The pedestrian crossing of the access road would not be light controlled but would be informal with refuge only. The layout and design of the recreational area would provide progression to the countryside beyond. Good design and landscaping with the incorporation of tree belts would provide a progression from formal to a less formal appearance across the site. The road design within the development would be the subject of a reserved matters application, with only the detail of the access to Hambledon Road being approved at this meeting.

**Councillor Pierce – Jones (Havant Borough Council).**

- Q. Raised questions about the 40% affordable housing percentage which he stated was more reminiscent of an urban area and would encourage excessive commuting on local roads, particularly those going south.
- A. Both Winchester City Council and Havant Borough Council had adopted policies within their Local Plan to achieve 40% affordable housing. The proposals before the Committees were in accordance with this policy.

**Councillor Huxstep (Winchester City Council).**

- Q. Commented that the new Household Waste Recycling Centre referred to in paragraph 8.24 of the report would be better located in the north of the site. In addition, the 40% affordable housing contained 40% one and two bed roomed dwellings and in terms of providing accommodation for a couple with two teenage children he asked whether a minimum of two bedrooms to each dwelling would be more appropriate.
- A. The Household Waste Recycling Centre was well designed with the skips to be located below ground level. To locate the Recycling Centre at the northern entrance of the site would be visually more intrusive, but the site to the south would be well screened from wider views. In terms of housing allocation, a one bedroom unit would not be allocated to two people with two teenage children as a two bed or a three bedroomed unit would be more appropriate. A balance of units was required and the policy in the Local Plan also included one bedroomed units to help ensure affordability.

**Councillor Brown (Havant Borough Council).**

- Q. Commented that more debate was required on the issues surrounding young children accessing the recreational area when 500 peak time traffic movements per hour were anticipated for the access road.

**Councillor de Peyer (Winchester City Council).**

- Q. Commented that the statement attributed to Hampshire Constabulary, as set out in paragraph 5.34 of the report, required further consideration. Dialogue should continue with Hampshire Constabulary over the links to the Industrial Estate and any points arising should be incorporated within the Design Code. In addition, issues relating to climate change should be acknowledged and a climate change plan should be incorporated within the Design Code.
- A. The important issue of climate change was acknowledged in condition 6 relating to sustainability. The issue had been addressed in a full and rounded way and was also relevant to the Grainger Trust application. Nevertheless, it was proposed to amend condition 6 to refer specifically to current policy and practice regarding climate change.

**Councillor Bolton (Havant Borough Council)**

- Q. Commented that the Main Avenue, as addressed by Condition 11, had an inbuilt bottleneck and asked why a straight access rather than the T-Junction could not be provided. He added that the route should also be kept away from the residential dwellings accessing the Household Waste Recycling Centre.



- A. The provision of a straight road would increase traffic speed and the provision of the T – Junction and the bend was designed to slow traffic.

**Councillor Beveridge (Winchester City Council).**

- Q. Asked whether condition 6 on page 56 of the report was flexible enough to take in changes over time.
- A. The Design Codes would be considered against current standards as they were set. The Design Codes allowed for flexibility and could take advantage of developments and changes in technology. For example, those options that were presently expensive may become cheaper in the future and could be utilised as development proceeded on site.

**Councillor Cheshire (Havant Borough Council).**

- Q. Commented that the full plans for both development sites should be considered together in order that development was joined up in the future.
- A. The Section 106 Agreement Heads of Terms related to one Major Development Area as a whole. Therefore the Wimpey application could be considered in isolation from the Grainger Trust application.

**Councillor Cheshire (Havant Borough Council).**

- Q. Asked a question about four storey developments within the development together with a Local Equipped Area of Play “LEAP” to be located by the roundabout next to Hambledon Road.
- A. Indicative drawings were not committal at this stage. Design Codes and Reserved Matters could lead to these issues being revisited, although in some areas four storey developments would not be inappropriate. With respect to the LEAP, its positioning adjacent to Hambledon Road would allow it to be used by both existing communities to the north of the development site and the new Major Development Area. The LEAP would be landscaped and safety fencing incorporated to ensure pedestrian and highway safety. A new crossing would be incorporated to allow access from existing development to the north.

**Councillor Mrs Brown (Havant Borough Council).**

- Q. Asked whether Hambledon Road would be widened and was it possible to locate the MDA access road nearer to the edge of the boundary of development, away from the residential development.
- A. Hambledon Road would be widened by the new junction to allow two-way traffic. To re-route the access road to the edge of the development would affect sustainable drainage and ecological matters and its relationship with the countryside beyond. Substantial traffic improvements would be part of the scheme. Highway works, including the new entrance to the site from Hambledon Road, would be completed before the first house was occupied.

**Councillors' Debate**

The following issues were raised during debate:

- That certain issues including the pedestrian access to the leisure centre; the possible provision of traffic lights at the access to Sunnymead Drive; detail of landscaping and play areas; the long term management arrangements of the Master Plan and improved arrangements for access to the Household Waste Recycling Centre should be further investigated.
- That there should be adequate monitoring of the development in order that the objectives of the Master Plan were met.
- That there was a requirement for a comprehensive development.
- That the community should continue to be involved throughout the development process so that the mistakes of the Whiteley and other developments were not repeated.
- That measures should be taken to ensure that residents living near to the access route to the Household Waste Recycling Centre should have disturbance kept to a minimum.
- That there should be less provision of one and two bedroomed units and increased provision of three bedroomed units.
- That a mix of affordable housing was required including one and two bed units as well as family accommodation; that affordable housing provision should meet local needs and that executive houses should also be provided.
- That the issues regarding the housing mix could be further considered as the scheme proceeded and that little would be gained by deferring the applications in order that both applications could be considered together.
- That the road junctions should be monitored by Hampshire County Council for congestion.
- That the site provided both residential units and employment and that, with approximately half of the site being left for open space, it would offer a great deal to its residents.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee concluded its informal discussion and the formal meetings of both Committees were reconvened.