

# The Apex Centre, Church Lane, Colden Common

12/01598/FUL



## Legend

Scale:



Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Winchester City Council © 2007.

<b>Organisation</b>	Winchester City Council
<b>Department</b>	Winchester GIS
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Date</b>	30 October 2012
<b>SLA Number</b>	100019531

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

**Item No:** 3  
**Case No:** 12/01598/FUL / W14226/08  
**Proposal Description:** Erection of 14 no. dwellings comprising 8 no. two bed, 2 no. three bed and 4 no. four bed dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping following demolition of existing buildings (REPUBLICATION - ADDITIONAL DETAILS SUBMITTED)  
**Address:** The Apex Centre Church Lane Colden Common Hampshire  
**Parish, or Ward if within Winchester City:** Colden Common  
**Applicants Name:** Fleetwater Homes  
**Case Officer:** Mr James Jenkison  
**Date Valid:** 23 July 2012  
**Site Factors:**  
**Recommendation:** Application Refused

### General Comments

This application is reported to Committee because of the number of letters of support received contrary to the officers recommendation and at the request of Colden Common Parish Council, whose request is appended in full to this report.

The applicant has informally offered to provide 2 of the smaller units within the settlement boundary as affordable housing, however, for the reasons set out below, this is considered to be insufficient to overcome the design and policy objections to the scheme.

The applicant has also submitted further ecological information and Hampshire County Council Ecology Department has now withdrawn its objection to the scheme.

### Site Description

The site comprises approximately 0.48 hectares of relatively flat land located along a private access off Church Lane and set behind 1-7 Dimon Cottages ( a 2-storey terrace approximately 8.5 metres height to ridge height, with 6 and 7 comprising maisonettes) and 27 and 27a Church Lane (a pair of modest detached 2-storey houses).

The site can be subdivided into two distinct sections, with the front section comprising commercial buildings and located within the settlement boundary, and the rear section comprising predominantly grassed area of land located within the designated countryside. The settlement boundary extends approximately along the rear elevations of the 3 modest commercial buildings that enclose the front section of the site. Two of these buildings have a similar appearance and scale to modest warehouses (with ridge level similar to the eaves level of Dimon Cottages) whilst the westernmost building is a much smaller single storey building with low eaves and ridgeline. The warehouse type building at the west of the site is occupied by a water cooler supply business.

Apex House is a part single storey and part 2-storey flat roof office building adjacent to the boundary with the rear gardens of 27 and 27a Church Lane.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

The site is surrounded to the south by a dense woodland known as Finches Copse and when viewed from Church Lane there are expansive views of the copse through the large gap between Dimon Cottages and 27 Church Lane and, beyond this, the large gap between the larger commercial units on the application site.

The private access is shared with 1-7 Dimon Cottages, which has parking in a courtyard behind 6-7 Dimon Cottages and visitor parking alongside the access in front of the dwellings. 6-7 Dimon Cottages have their front entrances on the end (south) elevation of the terrace, and which has been designed to give the appearance of a front elevation.

### **Proposal**

The proposal is to demolish the existing buildings and replace them with a 14 dwelling housing development that covers the entire site, including that part of the site within the defined countryside.

The dwellings comprise 7 x 2-bedroom and 2 x 3-bedroom semi-detached dwellings within the settlement boundary and 4 x 4-bedroom detached houses within the designated countryside.

The proposed dwellings will vary in height between 9.3 and 9.8 metres and have large roofs of approximately 45% of the elevation height.

The gap between the houses on plots 2 and 3 and plots 6 and 7 is approximately 2 metres and the gaps between houses on plots 5 and 6, plots 7 and 8, plots 10 and 11 and plots 12 and 13 is approximately 6 metres.

### **Relevant Planning History**

**00/00010/FUL** - (AMENDED DESCRIPTION) Use of building A for offices B1(a) and buildings B,C and D for B1(c) or B8 (Retrospective). Permitted subject to conditions 13th April 2000.

**00/00783/FUL** - Use of building for B1(a) office use (RETROSPECTIVE). Permitted subject to conditions 30th June 2000.

**02/01985/FUL** - Erection of 5 No. starter units for use as store/offices and light industrial with associated parking. Refused 12th December 2002.

**02/03118/FUL** - Erection of 3 No. starter units for B1/B2 use. Refused 7th March 2003. Appeal ref:APP/L1765/A/03/1116678 dismissed 26 August 2003.

**05/02940/FUL** - Demolition and reconstruction of premises; demolition of woodstore for additional parking. Permitted subject to conditions 16th February 2006.

The 2003 appeal decision for planning application 02/03118/FUL is notable in its description of the settlement boundary and the use of the rear section of land that is located within the defined countryside. It correctly noted that the settlement boundary appeared to have been deliberately drawn to exclude the rear portion of the site from the settlement boundary and the Inspector correctly reported that it was not within his remit to redraw the settlement boundary. It is notable that the existing location of the settlement

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

boundary has been carried through to the Adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 without any changes.

### **Consultations**

#### Design Review Panel:

Proposal has cramped and dense appearance that did not respect the sites context as a transition from housing to woodland.

Considered that some form of public amenity space should be provided and that the scheme should have a softer edge that allows suitable views to the trees beyond rather than an abrupt end to the street.

Scheme would also be unduly hard and over-dominated by carparking, which would be a visually dominant feature of the scheme and contribute to an intense enclosed feeling to the scheme, amplified by the minimal spaces between some dwellings.

Traditional design of dwellings acceptable, subject to quality detailing.

Scope for alternative options to be investigated.

#### Engineers Drainage:

No objection. Permeable materials should be used.

#### Engineers: Highways:

No objection - conditions recommended. Financial contribution for sustainable transport fund not required.

#### Head of Environmental Protection:

Conditions relating to potential land contamination recommended.

#### Head of Landscape:

Garages for plots 6 and 7 should be pulled away from the rear boundary and additional landscaping implemented. Conditions recommended.

#### Head of Strategic Planning – Object:

- Principle of development/redevelopment only acceptable on front part of the site, within the settlement boundary.
- Policy E.2 resists the loss of sites or premises within Use Classes B1, B2 and B8 unless there are over-riding environmental or highway objections or the need for the proposed use outweighs the benefits of retaining an employment use.
- Policy SH.3 of the South East Plan sets out the importance of economic development in the PUSH area and also resists the loss of employment land.
- Interim Policy Aspirations would be a material consideration in considering a future application, especially if the applicant is seeking a flexible interpretation of Local Plan policy.
- These policies seek affordable housing provision (40% for all sites) and a high standard of sustainable construction and have been generally incorporated into the emerging Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 which has reached the submission stage and is, therefore well advanced. The Council has also adopted a Car Parking Standards SPD.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

- Applicants case is based upon the claim that the housing land supply situation means that there is a greater need for housing than retention of the employment site rather than claiming that the existing use is causing overriding environmental or highway problems (E2i) but applicant also claims that it has not been possible to re-let the existing buildings and that their redevelopment would not be viable.
- Viability assessment does not appear to be robust, constrains itself to rebuilding of the existing buildings for the existing uses and does not appear to explore various alternative employment options for the site.
- The Core Strategy part 1 strategy for the larger villages such as Colden Common promotes economic and commercial growth to improve the balance between housing employment and services, and retains existing settlement boundaries until there is a proper review of development needs and opportunities.
- The Local Plan Part 1 strategy, the emphasis on economic growth within the PUSH area and the thrust of government policy make every effort to retain the site in employment use, even if this is in a different form from the current uses.
- Even if it were concluded that the housing land supply situation warranted accepting the principle of housing redevelopment, it does not justify extending the development beyond the existing settlement boundary and an exception affordable housing scheme is not being proposed.
- The inclusion of the site within the SHLAA does not imply acceptance that the site has been assessed as suitable for development.
- As density is less than 30 dwellings to the hectare then proposal does not appear to be efficient and effective use of land.

While the short-term shortfall in housing land availability may justify some relaxation of policy, the conflicts are such that the current scheme does nothing to seek to address the loss of employment land (e.g. by redevelopment for employment uses or inclusion of some employment or live-work units), or to meet anything other than market housing needs. It also does not seem to address the Council's Interim Policy Aspirations or emerging Local Plan Part 1 requirements. Accordingly, I conclude that the substantial degree of policy conflict is not outweighed by the factors in favour of the development.

Head of Estates:

Similar properties elsewhere on the market which have remained vacant for some time. Currently an oversupply of offices and office rental market remains uncertain.

Figures quoted by agent for the units appear to be in line with other quoted rents elsewhere. These units do suffer from low eaves height and layout and may be a case that a lower rental should be quoted to fully test the market for possible occupiers.

No details supplied of any interested parties or offers made and this should be provided in this case as older units tend to reach a stage in their life cycle where, in order to secure the best return, the units should be demolished and rebuilt and these units are beginning to edge towards this stage.

Appraisal should be based on the demolition of the units and a scheme for modern commercial Industrial Units to make the best use of the site as the use of the site at present is considered to be underutilised.

Potential may exist for a mixed development of housing and commercial whereby the housing element could support the viability of the whole development.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

HCC Education Department:

Colden Common Primary School has no spare capacity to accommodate children from the proposed development. Financial contribution of £81,676 requested to provide additional capacity generated.

HCC Ecology Department:

Development itself is up to the edge of the redline boundary for the development site, and apart from a proposed southern boundary hedgerow provides no buffer habitat enhancement to the SINC woodland.

The buffer between development and the woodland edge does not appear to be under the ownership or control of the developer.

Natural England standing advice regarding ancient woodlands recommends that a buffer of 15 m between the woodland edge and developed area (which includes back gardens) should be retained.

Recommendations have been made with regards to lighting and avoiding impacts on boundary habitats and species using them, however plans do not demonstrate this.

The proposal will result in the loss of a low level summer (non maternity) roost of Common Pipistrelle bats from building 2 within the site. Council is required to assess whether the three derogation tests are met. Third test requires clarification of proposed mitigation and it was previously proposed for this to be incorporated within buildings, however, it is now proposed to place bat boxes in trees along the woodland boundary, which may be outside the control and ownership of the applicant and would not therefore be able to be conditioned or enforced. Incorporating nesting within buildings is preferred, with temporary roosts during the construction period.

The proposal for 14 houses provides minimal enhancements, mainly in the form of a planted native hedgerow along the southern site boundary, and further enhancements should be provided.

Conditions recommended.

Environment Agency:

Had no comment to make on the proposal.

Southern Water:

Sewer could be crossing the property. Foul and surface water disposal able to be provided. Conditions recommended.

**Representations:**

Colden Common Parish Council supported the application for the following reasons:

- The site is unattractive in its present state and the security of the existing housing can be compromised by unknown persons walking onto the site.
- Site appears not to be commercially viable in the longer term due to its position and location behind residential housing. The only remaining commercial occupier is seeking to move to larger premises and is expected to leave shortly.
- If the site is developed for housing an offset contribution for affordable housing should be provided as the houses are situated outside the development boundary.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

- The possibility of shared ownership should be explored together with the possibility of participation from Housing Associations.
- Development of this area for residential housing would improve the ambience and outlook of the existing residential accommodation at the front of the site as there is a tension between the residential and commercial use of this site.
- Woodland area to the rear of the site provides protection to wildlife however access to this area is unclear and needs to be specified to allow the necessary management and maintenance of the woodland area. Residential area considered more appropriately situated next to this woodland area than a commercial site.

1 letter received objecting to the application for the following reasons:

- Impact of proposal on wildlife within the SINC.
- Loss of employment site.
- Site extends beyond settlement boundary and would set a precedent for further back garden development in the locality.

7 letters of support received.

- Proposal will reduce heavy traffic on local roads and improve amenities.
- Existing buildings are unsightly and residential development is preferable.
- Commercial redevelopment unlikely.
- Design acceptable.

**Relevant Planning Policy:**

South East Plan 2009:

SP.3 – Urban focus for development  
CC.4 – Sustainable Design & Construction  
RE.3 – Employment Land  
H.1-H.5 –Housing Provision/Affordability/Mix/Design/Density  
T.2 – Mobility Management  
T.4 - Parking  
NRM.4 – Flood Risk  
NRM.11 – Energy Efficiency/Renewables  
BE.4 – Role of Small Rural Towns  
SH.1 – Strategy for South Hampshire  
SH.3 – Employment Development  
SH.5-SH.6 – Housing Provision/Affordable Housing  
SH.8 - Sustainability

Adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006:

DP1, DP3, DP4, DP5, CE5, CE10, H3, H5, H6, E2

National Planning Policy Framework:

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Draft Colden Common Village design Statement 2012 (Consultation period ended 17 September 2012)

Other Planning guidance:

Hampshire County Council - Developers' Contributions towards Children's Services

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

Facilities’.

Hampshire County Council – School Places Plan 2011-2015.

4

Open Space Strategy.

## **Planning Considerations**

### Principle of development

Local employment sites provide jobs and promote economic growth and development. The variety of stock and type of sites and buildings can assist in ensuring that a wide range of different employment uses can be undertaken. It is a recognised planning principle that B1 employment uses in particular (research and development, light industry, offices) are able to be undertaken adjacent to residential development without harming residential amenities. Policy E2 reflects this and generally resists the loss of employment sites, and in particular resists the conversion of employment sites in the countryside to residential development. This principle was also reflected in the planning history of this site (planning permissions 00/00010/FUL and 05/02940/FUL), which had appropriate safeguarding conditions for protecting nearby residential amenities. Planning permission 05/02940/FUL was for an extension to the larger unit on the eastern side of the site (currently occupied by the water cooler company). It is therefore considered that the use of the site for employment purposes is not causing overriding environmental or highways harm and that the site does not satisfy criterion (i) of Policy E2.

In relation to criterion (ii) this scheme is for entirely residential purposes for open market housing and is not therefore considered to provide any public benefit or planning gain to warrant a departure from policy. Whilst the applicant has provided an expert appraisal from Goadsby indicating a lack of demand for the buildings, no evidence has been provided of offers from potential purchasers or lessees. Both the Head of Estates and Head of Strategic Planning are concerned that the applicant has not considered the potential to redevelop the site for commercial activity (rather than let out existing buildings) or considered the potential for a mixed- use development whereby, in the event that commercial redevelopment is unviable on its own, a degree of residential development could cross-subsidise commercial development, thereby enabling a partial relaxation of the policy. The Head of Estates also considered that evidence of offers by interested parties should be required for a proposal of this nature.

The policies of the proposed Joint Core Strategy, which is currently being reviewed by the Planning Inspectorate, contains a similar policy to Policy E2 (Policy CP9) in addition to Policy MRTA2 which seeks to promote employment and local facilities and ensure that settlements such as Colden Common maintain an effective balance of employment, services, facilities, retail and housing and do not become dominated by any one particular use.

Whilst there is a need for the Council to make provision for new housing of all types through its local plan process, adequate provision for delivery is being made, including maintaining reserve sites. This allocation process is at an advanced stage and the Joint Core Strategy Part 1 is currently undergoing examination by the Planning Inspectorate.

As a part of this process, landowners are entitled to submit their sites for investigation in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The application site is



WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

identified as site 360 in the latest (November 2011) SHLAA, and its constraints are summarised at page 148, which includes the employment designation of the site.

The Council will, through the local plan process, assess the suitability of each site for allocation. This assessment has not yet been undertaken and an application for housing development on the site is considered to be premature in this respect.

The Head of Strategic Planning has accepted that there is a short-term housing land supply shortfall at present but has noted that even if it were concluded that the housing land supply situation warranted accepting the principle of housing redevelopment on this site it still did not justify extending the development beyond the existing settlement boundary. Additionally, the only policy support for new houses in the countryside is through Policy H6 for 100% affordable housing scheme. In such circumstances, the 4 houses located within the designated countryside (plots 5-8) would have to be provided as affordable housing in order to comply with policy requirements for building houses in the designated countryside. Accordingly, a housing scheme utilising the entire site would be expected to provide affordable housing equal to the number of houses proposed in the countryside area outside the settlement boundary in order to comply, in principle, with Policy H6. Even in these circumstances, the Policy E2 objection would still not be overcome as the 4 houses would only overcome the objection, in principle, for building new houses in the countryside. It is also significant that one of the 3 derogation tests for loss of habitats for a protected species is that a proposed scheme must be of overriding public interest of a social or economic nature. This is discussed in more detail below.

It should also be noted that the settlement boundary has not been arbitrarily drawn, but has intentionally excluded the rear part of this site and much of the rear gardens of many nearby residential properties and that the Council has successfully resisted attempts to extend commercial development to the rear of the site.

The proposed development is therefore contrary to the local plan and cannot be supported in principle.

Design/layout/ Impact on character of area

The proposed development has a suburban layout and character of tall houses approximately 1-1.3 metres taller than Dimon Cottages. Because of this, views of the development from the access with Church Lane will not be of receding building forms merging into expansive views of the countryside and woodland but of large houses set close together. The large size of houses combined with some of them being set approximately only 2 metres apart would create a cramped appearance made more apparent by plots 6 and 7 being in direct views along the access at its junction with Church Lane. The Design Review Panel's comments in this respect are therefore considered to be valid concerns as maintaining the open and spacious character for this edge of settlement and countryside location is considered to be an important design consideration.

Additionally the double garages for plots 6-8 and the sidewall for the house on plot 1 are set close to the site boundaries, reducing the ability to provide dense, continuous hedgerow landscaping. Whilst the Landscape Departments comments are noted, the size of the gardens for most of the plots, combined with the location of the houses, garages, parking spaces and driveways restricts the ability for an adequate level of

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

mature tree planting to be introduced.

Impact on neighbouring property

27 and 27a Church Lane have back gardens approximately 9 metres deep and the sidewall of the dwelling for plot 14 will be located approximately 12 metres from the rear elevations of these neighbouring dwellings, which are located to the north of the application site. The sidewall of the dwelling for plot 14 would be approximately 9 metres deep and a height of approximately 9.3 metres. The sidewall would contain 2 narrow windows at first floor level serving bathrooms. Whilst this will have a level of impact on the amenities of 27 and 27a Church Lane, the impact is not considered to be materially harmful in this instance to warrant a reason for refusal, and windows could be conditioned for obscure glazing.

The sidewall of the dwelling for plot 1 has a similar design and scale to that of the sidewall for plot 14 and would be located approximately 11 metres from the facing elevation of 6 and 7 Dimon Cottages. This facing elevation of 6 and 7 Dimon Cottages is predominantly for access. Again, whilst this will have a level of impact on the amenities of 6 and 7 Dimon Cottages, the impact is not considered to be materially harmful in this instance, and windows could be conditioned for obscure glazing.

Due to the juxtaposition of the proposal with other neighbouring properties and their dwellings and the site characteristics of those properties it considered that the proposed development will also not materially harm the amenities of those properties.

Landscape/Trees/Ecology

The applicant has prepared an arboricultural statement that states the proposal will not require any tree removal. The development proposal does seek to introduce 4 semi-mature dawn redwood trees in the front gardens of plots 1, 3, 4 and 9, however, for the reasons set out above it is not considered that this is sufficient to ameliorate the cramped appearance of the proposed development.

The applicant's ecology report of August 2012 has identified up to 6 bat species utilising the office building for summer non-maternity roosts and a license from Natural England will be required.

The Council must be satisfied that any proposed development meets the following three tests before it grants development for any proposal of this nature:

1. *the consented operation must be for 'preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment'; (Regulation 53(2)(e))*
2. *there must be 'no satisfactory alternative' (Regulation 53(9)(a)); and*
3. *the action authorised 'will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range' (Regulation 53(9)(b)).*

Hampshire County Council Ecology have recommended that compensatory roosting should be provided within one of the houses, consistent with the recommendation of the bat survey report submitted by the applicant, dated 9 July 2012. Special roof tiles are

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

now available that will allow bat roosts within new buildings, which normally also requires roof voids to be provided. Given the large size of the roofs of the dwellings of the proposal, the existence of garages and the fact that this is a new development of some scale it is considered that incorporating bat roosts in the proposed buildings and on the site would allow test 3 to be met, where mitigation measures can be controlled by condition.

In normal circumstances, where there are not policy conflicts that are considered to cause harm to the public interest, new housing development might be considered to meet the first and second test. However, in this instance, the proposed development is resulting in the loss of an employment site, is resulting in a scheme that is considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the locality and which is contrary to countryside policy. The proposal cannot therefore be considered to meet the public interest test and more satisfactory alternatives exist, including a potential housing scheme (such as a housing scheme providing an appropriate level of affordable housing) with less policy conflict.

Highways/Parking

The car parking and access arrangements are acceptable from a highways perspective, however, as noted by the Design Review Panel, the location and arrangement of parking spaces and garages as part of the overall scheme is considered to result in a development that is too hard in appearance and which does not respond effectively to the countryside and edge of settlement location of the site.

Education Contributions

In December 2011 Hampshire County Council adopted the policy document 'Developers' Contributions towards Children's Services Facilities' in accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. This document sets out the instances where developer contributions are expected to be provided, which includes housing development of 10 or more houses. The School Organisation Officer for Hampshire County Council has stated that there is no spare capacity at Colden Common Primary School and it is therefore considered in this instance that a contribution of £81,676 should be required for this development towards community and education infrastructure in accordance with Policy DP9. As no contribution has been offered by the applicant the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy DP9.

Open Space Contributions

Policy RT4 of the Adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 requires that all new housing developments provide for public recreational space and facilities are available to the full standard of 2.8 hectares per 1000 population. This can be provided either on-site or by making a financial contribution, where physical provision is not feasible or appropriate on-site. Consistent with the advice of the NPPF for quantitative and qualitative analysis to justify contributions and where they will be spent, the Council has also adopted an Open Space Strategy (updated annually) as a supplementary planning guidance document to Policy RT4. The Strategy outlines the criteria for collecting contributions and the amounts to be collected in accordance with scales appropriate for each parish. The Strategy also specifies the deficiencies of each parish and where financial contributions will be directed. Colden Common is within Scale B for play space for the 2012-2013 Open Space Strategy and there is no requirement for sports provision. As the applicant is not offering to provide communal children's play space on the site it is therefore considered that the payment of financial contributions of

**WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA**

£17,844 for play space provision according to the 2012-2013 contribution scales for improvements would be appropriate in this instance. As the applicant has not offered to make such a provision the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy RT4 of the Adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

**Recommendation**

Application Refused for the following reasons:-

- 1 It is considered that, in the absence of evidence alternative schemes that retain some employment use, insufficient evidence has been provided to justify the loss of this B1 employment site for an entirely residential scheme. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy E2 of the Adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.
- 2 The proposed development represents an unjustified encroachment into the designated countryside beyond the defined settlement boundary of Colden Common of a market housing scheme for which there is no overriding justification. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to paragraphs 4.61, 4.62, 6.33 and 6.7 of the Adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 which set a specific presumption against new open market housing in the countryside outside the defined settlement boundaries and it is considered that there are no material considerations that would justify an exception.
- 3 The proposal by reason of its heights and layout is considered to result in a cramped form of suburban development that does not positively respond to its surroundings, edge of settlement setting and countryside context and is therefore considered to be visually harmful in its context, contrary to policy CC6 of the South East Plan and policies DP3, DP4 and CE5 of the Adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.
- 4 The proposal is contrary to Policy RT4 of the Winchester District Local Plan Revised 2006 in that it fails to make adequate provision for public recreational open space to the required standard, and would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the area.
- 5 The proposal is contrary to Policy DP9 of the Winchester District Local Plan Revised 2006 in that it fails to make adequate provision for education infrastructure in the locality that would be generated by the proposal contrary to Policy DP9 of the Adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.
- 6 As a result in the harm identified in refusal reasons 1 to 5, and the fact that mitigation measures are proposed on land that has not been identified as being within the applicants control it is considered that the proposed development fails to meet the derogation tests set out in Regulation 53 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and would be harmful to the interests of protected species identified as using the site contrary to policies CE10 and CE11 of the Adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

**Informatives:**

The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and objectives:-

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: E2, DP3, DP4, DP9, CE5, CE10, CE11, Housing and Countryside policy paragraphs 4.61, 4.62, 6.33 and 6.7

South East Plan 2009:

SP.3 – Urban focus for development  
CC.4 – Sustainable Design & Construction  
CC.6 – Sustainable communities and character of the environment.  
C.5 – Managing the Rural –Urban Fringe  
RE.3 – Employment Land  
H.1-H.5 –Housing Provision/Affordability/Mix/Design/Density  
T.2 – Mobility Management  
T.4 - Parking  
NRM.4 – Flood Risk  
NRM.11 – Energy Efficiency/Renewables  
BE.4 – Role of Small Rural Towns  
SH.1 – Strategy for South Hampshire  
SH.3 – Employment Development  
SH.5-SH.6 – Housing Provision/Affordable Housing  
SH.8 - Sustainability

**Jacky Wilson**

---

**From:** Keith Best [Keith.Best@coldencommon.hants.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** 31 August 2012 12:35  
**To:** Planning Mailbox Account  
**Subject:** Planning Application 12/01598/FUL Apex Centre

For Attention of James Jenkinson

Colden Common Parish Council's Planning Committee, having considered the above application would like to make the following comments.

There is a real desire to press ahead with housing provision within Colden Common. The following points were made in consideration of the projected housing development at the Apex Centre.

1. This is a Brownfield site and the Parish Council would support development there. The site is unattractive in its present state and the security of the existing housing can be compromised by unknown persons walking onto the site.
2. The site appears not to be commercially viable in the longer term because it lacks commercial visibility and its position in the middle of residential housing makes road access awkward. Most of the buildings have been empty for a considerable time and there has been no take up either through sale or rent of the buildings to date for reasons of limitations of size, access and location. The only remaining commercial occupier is seeking to move to larger premises and is expected to leave shortly.
3. If the site is developed for housing there might be the possibility of an offset contribution to affordable housing elsewhere in the village as the houses are situated outside the development boundary.
4. The proposed development is for 8 x 2 bedroomed houses; 2 x 3 bedroomed houses and 4 x 4 bedroomed houses which provides a mix of accommodation. The possibility of shared ownership should be explored, especially for the 8 x 2 bedroomed houses, together with the possibility of participation from Housing Associations.
5. Access for residential housing already exists, and the development of this area for residential housing would improve the ambience and outlook of the existing residential accommodation at the front of the site. There is currently a tension between the residential and commercial use of this site. It would also be beneficial to the wider surroundings in this residential area.
6. There is a woodland area to the rear of the Apex site which provides protection to wildlife and which it is proposed to retain. However, access to this area is currently unclear and needs to be specified to allow the necessary management and maintenance of the woodland area. It is suggested that a residential area is more appropriately situated next to this woodland area than a commercial site.

It was also agreed that, in the event that the officers are minded to recommend refusal of this application, the Council would like the application to be considered by Committee.

**Keith Best**  
**Clerk to the Parish Council**

**Parish Office  
Community Centre  
St Vigor Way  
Colden Common  
Hampshire  
SO21 1UU**

**Tel/fax: 01962 713700  
Mobile: 07775 627131**

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.