

**BARTON FARM FORUM**

**10 September 2013**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Winchester City Council

Wood (Chairman) (P)

Byrnes (P)  
E Berry (P)  
Learney (P)

Nelmes (P)  
Pines (P)  
Scott (P)  
Weir

Hampshire County Council

Mather (P)

Tod (P)

Headbourne Worthy Parish Council

Rutter (P)

Littleton and Harestock Parish Council

J Burgess

Deputy Members in attendance:

Councillor Hiscock (Standing Deputy for Councillor Weir)

Others in Attendance:

Winchester City Councillors Tait

Officers in Attendance:

Mr S Tilbury: Corporate Director, Winchester City Council

Mr A Hickman: Head of Major Projects, Winchester City Council

Others in Attendance:

Mr M Emett: Cala Homes

Mr M Adams: John Thompson and Partners

---

1. **CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME**

The Chairman welcomed six members of the public, local residents, representatives of amenity groups.

2. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Members of the public addressed the Forum in response to matters related to the update report below and to the ensuing discussion of the Forum and their comments are summarised below.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Forum held 16 July be agreed as a correct record.

4. **BARTON FARM DEVELOPMENT – UPDATE REPORT**

(Report BFF6 refers)

Mr Adams (John Thompson and Partners) gave a presentation to the Forum on the progress to date in formulating planning applications for the Design Codes for the development, reserved matters for Phases 1A and 1B and the discharge of outline planning permissions for the site. Mr Adams and Mr Emmett (Cala Homes) responded to questions.

In summary, Mr Adams reminded the meeting that the detailed work to date had been a collaborative process, responding to outcomes of the various exhibitions, Forum meetings, site visits, training and stakeholder events etc.

Mr Adams explained that Phases 1A and 1B of the development would be inclusive of 202 private and affordable dwellings to the north of the site and 223 located to the south. He described the various character and landscape concepts that had informed the design of the new neighbourhoods. Some streets would be enclosed and well defined, overlooking and addressing the public realm. Neighbourhoods would vary in character through their response to the context of the character of the area.

Mr Adams presented an updated illustrative plan of the MDA to the Forum. He drew attention to a physical link from Henry Beaufort School, by way of a footway, with new community assets around the local centre. He also indicated new formal and informal recreational open spaces around the MDA. The key changes to earlier indicative plans were explained, which had been incorporated in response to consultation with residents and stakeholders.

Mr Adams drew attention to the regulatory elements of the document, itself cross referenced with a Regulatory Plan. This set out the character areas of the MDA and existing site constraints. Bus routes, pedestrian and cycle routes were shown as well as key groupings, such as the local centre, school and green open spaces.

Illustrative indicative drawings were shown of residential areas and Mr Adams summarised architectural principles (including materials and detailing, which were controlled within the Design Codes) and boundary treatments etc. Sustainability requirements were also set out in the Design Codes. For example, solar panels were not to be 'retro fitted' and homes had been architecturally designed so that panels were placed not only in the most effective location, but also least conspicuous.

Phase 1A to the south was inclusive of an urban gateway which was adjacent to some lower density housing and the 'Stoney Green' informal open space. Both Phases 1A and 1B included both high and low density housing. A sustainable urban drainage system was to run from the northern edge through the Phase 1B area of the site, which would be incorporated into green areas. The phasing of areas of the MDA would be guided by a Phasing Strategy and this was explained.

At the conclusion of the presentation, the Chairman thanked Mr Adams for his detailed presentation and suggested that it made available via the Council's website in due course.

Mr Tilbury reminded the Forum that this was to be its final meeting before the formal planning applications were submitted. He explained that the planning process itself was inclusive of an extensive consultation process. Mr Tilbury also reported on the proposed variations to existing conditions of Cala's outline consent which were to be considered by the Planning Development Control Committee next week. These were to allow the Design Codes and phases 1A and 1B reserved matters applications to be submitted simultaneously (rather than consecutively) and also proposed changes to the size of public house and variations to condition 33 (with regard to provision of a medical building). It was expected that the detailed planning applications for Design Codes and phases 1A and 1B reserved matters would be determined by February 2014.

During the ensuing discussion of the Forum, the following matters were raised:

- (i) Mr Emmett clarified that, in response to feedback from residents, a footpath linking Courtney Road to Worthy Road would be provided as part of Phase 1B. Existing rights of way, including the path adjacent to the railway line, would be maintained whilst they were upgraded.
- (ii) Guidance within the Design Codes referred to matters related to infrastructure, including the placing of aerials and dishes. This would also be addressed within reserved matters. Mr Tilbury advised that there was not an intention to remove permitted development rights in the new development.
- (iii) Mr Emmett advised that both construction access routes, located to the north and south, were to be signal controlled. A Construction Strategy

was currently being drafted, and it was intended to take as much construction related traffic away from the existing Andover Road as possible.

- (iv) The developer continued to work closely with the County Council in finalising the siting, size and layout of the new school. The school was planned to open by the second September after the first dwelling had been occupied. It was agreed that the County Council be asked again whether they considered whether a pre-school formally linked to the new primary school was appropriate and whether this should be best located within the new school site, or adjacent to. The Forum also agreed that careful regard should be had to ensuring that future capacity of the new school was appropriate.
- (v) Streets within the development had been designed to be able to be incorporated into bus routes, should providers choose to do this.
- (vi) Open space within the MDA would be eventually transferred to the Council with corresponding commuted sums, the amounts of which were currently under discussion.
- (vii) Mr Hickman reported that 20mph speed limits were not intended to be formalised, rather, were implicated through street design. He also clarified that the section 106 agreement was triggered once development commenced and this included synchronising any required off-site improvements.
- (viii) Mr Tilbury referred to retail space within the local centre being sufficiently flexible so to be suitable for a post office and/or bank – should providers considered there was sufficient need for this.
- (ix) Extensive discussion was underway with Council officers and RSLs with regard to affordable housing within phases 1A and 1B. This included consideration of its design, tenure, type and location. A Community Lettings Plan was being drafted.

In line with the Forum's public participation procedure, the Chairman invited members of the public (including local interest groups etc) to raise any matters related to the Report and to the ensuing discussion of the Forum.

In summary, the following matters were raised and, where appropriate, responses given:

- (i) Mr Wallis (representing the Ramblers Association) requested that design and detail of the footpath link from Well House Lane be finalised and presented at a future exhibition.
- (ii) Mr Tilbury clarified to Ms Holloway (WinACC) that the County Council and the City Council would look to ensure that the impact of other developments in the vicinity of the MDA on local infrastructure was taken into account. He also explained that Planning Development

Control Committee would consider both phases 1A and 1B reserved matters and the Design Codes at the same meeting. This would assist Members in establishing what the Design Codes were intended to achieve in practice and therefore would help establish a more informed determination of the proposals.

- (iii) Mr Hickman and Mr Tilbury advised Ms Martin (City of Winchester Trust) that pedestrian routes to Henry Beaufort School were currently being planned and would be triggered by the section 106 agreement. There was no requirement for there to be a separate medical facility within the MDA. Therefore, it was proposed that some primary care facilities would be provided in others ways. Mr Adams advised that it was likely that 40% affordable housing would be provided within phases 1A and 1B and there would be a complete range of type and tenure which would be well distributed around the sites.
- (iv) Councillor Tait suggested that the Council should not be too prescriptive with regard to affordable housing provision at the site, as flexibility was likely to achieve the best outcome for residents.

RESOLVED:

That the update report be noted.

The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and concluded at 8.00pm.

Chairman