

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

10 March 2005

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
Bennetts (P)
Beveridge
Davies (P)
Darbyshire (P)
Evans
Jeffs (P)

Johnston (P)
Mitchell
Pearson (P)
Read (P)
Saunders (P)
Sutton (P)
Tait (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Campbell, Clohosey and Mather

954. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Beveridge, Evans, Mitchell and Pearce (Standing Deputy for Councillor Evans).

955. **MEMBERSHIP OF SUB-COMMITTEES ETC**

RESOLVED:

That a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Royal Observer Corps, Winchester) Sub-Committee be held to consider amended plans. (Subsequent to the meeting, the following date was agreed: 9.30am on Wednesday 13 April 2005 at the King Charles Suite, Guildhall, Winchester).

956. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**

(Report PDC517 refers.)

The Schedule of Development Control Decisions arising from the consideration of the above report is circulated separately and forms an Appendix to the minutes.

Councillor Busher declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 2, as she was acquainted with an objector and she spoke and voted thereon. She also declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 4, as she was acquainted with both the applicant and an objector and she spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 3 and 6, as he was a member of the Council of the City of Winchester Trust who had commented on the application and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Darbyshire declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 2, as he was an employee of Mark Oaten MP who had commented on the application, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Tait declared a personal (but not prejudicial interest) in respect of item 4, as he was acquainted with one of the objectors and he spoke and voted thereon.

In the public participation part of the meeting, the following items were discussed:

In respect of item 2 - Bumble Cottage, 6 Liberty Road, Newtown, Mr Bingham spoke in objection to the application and Mr Tutton, agent, spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman a Ward Member Councillor Campbell spoke on this item. In summary, Councillor Campbell stated that the part-finished building had been constructed too close to Liberty Road, which was a breach of the planning permission. This increased the building's dominance of the street scene and broke the rhythm of the street frontages onto the road. Councillor Campbell recommended that the Viewing Sub-Committee assess the site. Following debate it was agreed that a site visit should be held at 9.30am on Monday 21 March 2005 to further consider highways issues, the distance of the dwelling from the road and the on-site advice given by Building Control and Planning Enforcement Officers.

In respect of item 4 – 81a St Cross Road, Winchester, Mr Norris spoke in objection to the application and Mr Teague (applicant) spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, a Ward Member, Councillor Mather spoke on this item. In summary, she highlighted the neighbours' concerns regarding possible litter generation and the opening hours of the proposed fish and chip shop. The Acting Director of Development Services confirmed that it was not necessary to attach a condition prohibiting the installation of illuminated signs as this would require a separate planning permission. Following debate, the Committee agreed to the application as set out in the report subject to further conditions regarding the location and possible colour of the extraction flume.

In respect of item 5 – Knowle Village, Knowle Avenue, Knowle, Mr Shrive (Chairman of the Knowle Village Residents' Association) spoke against the application and Mr Shepherd spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, a Ward Member Councillor Clohosey spoke on this item. In summary, he suggested that the three storey buildings at the proposed South Block were too high and should be reduced to two storeys and he requested the speedy installation of play facilities for older children. Councillor Clohosey further advised that until the drainage system had been adopted by a utility company, the Highways Authority would not adopt the loop road. The Chairman read to Committee an email received from the other Ward Member, Councillor Evans, who in addition to the issues raised by Councillor Clohosey commented on the density of the development. In response to concerns regarding drainage issues, the Acting Director explained that the outline permission granted in 1997 contained a condition requiring the applicant to establish adequate drainage facilities and that this would only be discharged if a suitable utility company adopted the drainage system. OFWAT had been satisfied with the current proposals and that negotiations were continuing between Thames Water and the developer.

The Committee considered this item in conjunction with the minutes of the previous Knowle Hospital Sub-Committee meeting (report PDC521 refers, below). The Acting Director of Development Services updated the Committee that subsequent to the publication of the report, officers had clarified that the total number of dwellings to be constructed on site, including the final three phases, was 673 units and confirmed these plans would be forwarded to the Residents' Association. The overall density of the village was therefore 33 dwellings per hectare. The Acting Director also clarified that the applicant had provided the required 20% of affordable homes across the village with a total of 135 units. The Committee noted that following Members' comments at the Sub-Committee, the height of some of the three storey blocks had been reduced by 1.2 metres as a consequence of the introduction of dormer windows.

During discussion, the Acting Director of Development Services explained that the public consultation period had closed subsequent to the publication of the report and that a further six representations had been received from local residents and the Parish Council. In summary these representations commented on density, the height of the proposed blocks, parking, sustainability issues, open space provision and sustainable drainage systems.

Regarding Members' concerns over the safety of the swale, the Acting Director reported that the Landscape Architect had advised that to fence the area could encourage children to trespass.

The Committee also heard from the Traffic Engineer who had visited the site and had concluded that although there some incidents of residents' parking on-street, the roads were relatively free and accessible to emergency vehicles.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to the recommendation as set out in the report, with the addition that the Acting Director be granted delegated authority, in consultation with the Chairman, to draft an additional condition to ensure that development of the sports pavilion be brought forward.

RESOLVED:

1. That the decisions taken on the development control applications, as set out in the Schedule which forms an Appendix to the minutes, be agreed.
2. That in respect of item 2 – Bumble Cottage, 6 Liberty Road, Newtown, the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee visit the application site to assess siting and highways issues and that Councillors Busher, Baxter, Bennetts, Johnston and Read be appointed to serve on the Sub-Committee at 9.30am on Monday 21 March 2005.
3. That in respect of 5 – Knowle Village, Knowle Avenue, Knowle, the application be agreed as set out, and that authority being delegated to the Director of Development Services (in consultation with the Chairman) to agree an additional condition to ensure that the development of the sports pavilion be brought forward.

957. **PLANNING APPEALS (WEST) – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS**
(Report PDC519 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

958. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (KNOWLE HOSPITAL) SUB-COMMITTEE**
(Report PDC521 refers.)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Knowle Hospital) Sub-Committee held on 22 February 2005 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Knowle Hospital) Sub-Committee held on 22 February 2005 be received.

959. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (LOWER HOUSE, WINCHESTER ROAD, WICKHAM) SUB-COMMITTEE**
(Report PDC 522 refers.)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Lower House, Winchester Road, Wickham) Sub-Committee held on 23 February 2005 (attached as Appendix B to the minutes.)

The Acting Director of Development Services explained that the developer had submitted an amended plan in response to comments at the Sub-Committee. It was explained that in summary this had resulted in a change in the footprint of Block F, a resultant increase in car parking spaces and internal changes to ensure that no habitable rooms overlooked neighbouring properties. The amended plans proposed a reduction in the ridgeline of Block F by 0.6m and the bringing forward by 2.0m of the proposed row of terraces to further segregate the terraces from the existing building.

The Acting Director reported that nine letters of objection had been received in response to the amended plans. Representations had also been received from the consultees who had raised no objection subject to concerns regarding cycle provision, low-key landscaping around the listed house, and limits to the construction process being addressed.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Clohosey spoke as a Ward Member on this item. He advised that there remained a large public interest in the scheme and that concerns remained regarding traffic issues. The Chairman read to the Committee an email from the other Ward Member, Councillor Evans which commented on the height of Block F, the incompatibility of the terraced housing with the Village Design Statement, overlooking and that the Lower House should be subdivided into more than the proposed two units.

RESOLVED:

1. That planning permission be granted, subject to authority being delegated to the Acting Director of the Development Services in consultation with the Chairman to determine conditions relating to the landscaping and the protection of the wall along the south-east boundary, as set out in the Schedule of Development Control decisions which forms an appendix to these minutes.

2. That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Lower House, Winchester Road, Wickham) Sub-Committee held on 23 February 2005 be received.

The meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and concluded at 6.00 pm.

Chairman

APPENDIX A**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (KNOWLE HOSPITAL) SUB-COMMITTEE****22 February 2005****Attendance:****Councillors:**

Bushier (Chairman) (P)

Bennetts (P)
 Chapman (P)
 Clohosey (P)
 Davies (P)

Evans (P)
 Pearson (P)
 Read (P)
 Sutton (P)

Officers in Attendance:

Mrs S Proudlock (Team Manager Planning)
 Mrs J Pinnock (Senior Planning Officer)
 Mr N Baldwin (Housing Enabling Officer)

960. **KNOWLE VILLAGE, KNOWLE AVENUE, FAREHAM**
 (PDC512 refers)

The Mayor, Councillor Sutton, declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in this item as the applicant (Berkeley Homes, Southern, Ltd) had made a donation to the Mayoral Charity.

The Sub-Committee met at the Chapel at Knowle Village and the Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately forty members of the public and Mr Shepherd who represented the applicant, Berkeley Homes, Southern, Ltd.

Mrs Pinnock explained that the previous meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 13 December 2004 (report PDC502 refers) had considered the final three phases of the Knowle Village development and had recommended a number of amendments to the proposed application. The application outlined within report PDC512 took account of the comments raised at the previous meeting and subsequent negotiations between the applicant and officers.

The amended application comprised phases 3, 6 and 8 and proposed the erection of 106 no. dwellings, in two and three storey blocks comprising 18 no. one bedroom, 28 no. two bedroom, 29 no. three bedroom, 15 no. four bedroom, and 15 no. five bedroom dwellings with associated roads, garages, parking areas and landscaping.

Members noted that the applicant had withdrawn the application regarding the sports pavilion as they had agreed to embark on a public consultation programme with the City Council to identify the sports provisions that were required by the local community. In response to Members' concerns that the creation of the sports facility should not be delayed, it was anticipated that this process would take 2-3 months to complete.

Following the publication of the report, Mrs Pinnock updated the Sub-Committee that representations had been received from the Council's Conservation Officer. In summary, he had concerns relating to:

- Phase 6 of the development that was originally intended as Open Space;
- The size and massing of the proposed new terraces and their relationship with the Victorian South Block;
- That it would have been preferable to develop a vista through the "greenlink";
- Concerns relating to the proposed development along the ring road;
- That it would have been preferable to develop the blocks of flats in a symmetrical relationship to each other, but he acknowledged that this was not possible due to the position of a number of protected trees in the area;
- That the style of the developments within Phase 8 should not be pseudo-Victorian.

Mrs Pinnock also reported to Members the comments of the Landscape Architect who had raised concerns with regard to the lack of information relating to the levels of the site and the development's relationship with the listed southern boundary wall. The Open Space Officer had confirmed that the amount of Open Space proposed by the applicant met the required standard. Furthermore it was noted that the Highways Engineer had raised no objection to the application as it met highways standards. However, he had advised that the conditions of the permission, if granted, should include the erection of bollards along the ring-road to discourage car parking.

Mrs Pinnock also explained that four public representations had been received in relation to the amended application. These had had raised concerns with regard to the over-development of the site, that the replacement blocks near the South Block did not address all the concerns raised at the previous meeting, that the proposed four storey development was out of character and concerns with regard to the lack of infrastructure at the village. Mrs Pinnock added that the period of public consultation had not yet closed and any further comments received would be reported to the next meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee, to be held on 10 March 2005.

On behalf of the applicant, Mr Shepherd explained that the amended plans retained the best elements of the original application and he illustrated to the Sub-Committee the proposed amended application.

In summary, he advised that the amended application had repositioned the proposed development away from the listed wall and that the blocks had been re-orientated to enhance views from the village to the surrounding woodland. The amended application had also responded to criticisms of the proposed 14 no. flats in Phase 6 as Mr Shepherd explained that these had been replaced by 5 no. two storey townhouses. Mr Shepherd stated that these dwellings, along the green link, would be smaller in scale and of a lower density than the original plans, but would still retain a sense of balance with the four-storey Victorian South Block.

With regard to Phase 8, Mr Shepherd explained that the application remained unaltered but for the removals of flats above garage buildings as a response to officers' concerns about poor outlook.

Mr Shepherd illustrated to the Sub-Committee the long distance views of the proposals and it was noted that there was no difference in the effect of the amended plans.

Mr Baldwin explained that the applicant had offered affordable housing units in one large block as part of phase 8 and as a smaller block in phase 3. Negotiations were currently on-going, but Mr Baldwin explained that there would be at least 35 units which would comprise a mixture of housing and tenure types. In response to questions, Mr Baldwin stated that 20% (as required by the legal agreement) of the entire village would be affordable housing units (including the provision of Low Cost Home Ownership) and Mr Shepherd confirmed that provision of affordable housing Units on site had been planned as part of the overall development of the village.

During its discussion on the architectural style of the proposed development, Mr Shepherd explained that to introduce a contemporary style would result in the introduction of new materials that would be alien to the village.

The Sub-Committee considered the proposed sustainable drainage swell in the area of Open Space in front of South Block. Mr Shepherd explained that the swell would appear as a gradual dip in the green with a maximum depth of approximately 1 metre. The area would be used as an overflow flooding site to deal with one in fifty years flooding and had been developed with the advice of the water authority. During debate, Members were concerned at the potential hazard to small children the swell could pose when it was flooded and suggested that the area be fenced.

It was noted that although the number of car parking spaces had not been increased, the decrease in the number of dwellings had increased the proportion of car parking spaces per dwelling to 1.65. These figures did not include the proposed parking at the sports pavilion.

In response to a Member's question, Mr Shepherd explained that the rising bollards system (that restricted access from Mayles Lane into the village for buses only) had been tested by the bus operators. He added that the bus contract to serve the village was currently being put out to tender and he confirmed that the bus route within the village could be used by large buses.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Shrive as Chairman of the Knowle Village Residents' Association addressed the Sub-Committee. He presented to Members a paper that set out the residents' concerns. In summary these were:

That the infrastructure of the village would not be able to adequately support any further development. The electricity supply was already erratic with frequent power-cuts and there were further issues regarding the sewerage and drainage facilities. Mr Shrive underlined that as the village was a managed development, with additional charges above the usual Council Tax, the residents could carry a potential financial liability as a result of any shortfall in infrastructure investment by the developer.

Mrs Proudlock stated that these issues were covered by planning condition and confirmed that Hampshire County Council, as the Highways Authority, would not adopt the roads in the village until the surface water drainage maintenance had been adopted by a water authority and Mr Shepherd reported that the negotiations with Thames Water were on-going. With regard to the electricity supply, Mr Shepherd commented that Scottish and Southern Electric had enquired about the creation of an additional electricity sub-station on site although it was noted that the developer had no control over this.

The residents reported that there was already excessive roadside parking and a survey that they had conducted found that 20% of existing households were currently parking on the roadside. They suggested that the proposed increased development would only exacerbate this problem and that there would be a likely increase in off-site parking along Mayles Lane, following the creation of a new pedestrian link into the village. They continued that the village's relatively isolated location and lack of facilities (such as public transport links and on-site facilities) further increased the residents' dependence on the private car. Following discussion, Members agreed that the City Council's Engineer should be invited to inspect the site and to consider the residents' concerns.

In response to Mr Shrive's comment on the access to the car parking areas, Mr Shepherd explained that the County Council had advised against developments with private drives with access onto the main loop roads and that for this reason access roads to the rear had been created.

In response to further comments, Mr Shepherd confirmed that the results of the developer's Safety Audit would be available, once completed, and it was noted that this was part of the road adoption process.

The paper prepared by the Residents' Association also commented that the proposed application would be an over-development, too dense a development, and was in excess of the original plans for the site for which approximately 500 dwellings were anticipated. This highlighted a debate between the developer and the residents over the exact number of dwellings that would be built in the village as the residents suggested that the total number would be 730 dwellings and the developer suggested 672. Following debate, it was agreed that this issue should be clarified at the next meeting of Planning Development Control Committee.

With regard to densities, it was noted that for the three phases proposed, the density would be 52 dwellings per hectare and at 33 dwellings per hectare across the entire village. Mrs Proudlock added that changes in planning policy as a result of PPG3 had resulted in a denser development than originally envisaged.

Concerns were also raised by the Residents' Association in regard to:

- views through to the ancient woodland and that the positioning of the proposed buildings in this area should be re-considered;
- Affordable housing, its location, number and management;
- Open Space – the application did not include an assessment of Open Space and play areas and that there was inadequate provision of play areas for older children;
- The sustainability of the village. The residents suggested that the further development of the village was not consistent with the South East England Regional Assembly's "Vision" for 2006 onwards and highlighted the conflict between the application and national and local planning policies.

During general debate, other members of the public spoke in opposition to the application and raised further concerns regarding the height of the proposed blocks near South Block. In response to these comments, Mr Shepherd confirmed that there was little difference between the ridge heights of the proposed amended plan and the previous application, because of the need for these buildings to address the four-storey Victorian South Block.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Members raised concerns in regard to the following issues which they concluded required further consideration at the 10 March 2005 meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee.

- the height of the two blocks near South Block;
- their orientation to facilitate views to the countryside;
- road drainage issues and further information on the proposed drainage swell and whether it should be fenced;
- the creation of more access points into the village to prevent the creation of peak-hours traffic jams;
- and, the need for play areas for older children.

RECOMMENDED:

That the above issues be considered further at the 10 March 2005 meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee.

The meeting commenced at 7.00pm and concluded at 9.20pm.

Chairman

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
(LOWER HOUSE, WICKHAM) SUB-COMMITTEE****23 February 2005**Attendance:

Councillors:

Bushier (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
 Bennetts (P)
 Clohosey (P)
 de Peyer (P)

Evans (P)
 Jeffs (P)
 Mitchell (P)
 Pearson (P)

Officers in Attendance

Mrs S Proudlock (Planning Team Manager)
 Mrs E Patterson (Planning Officer)

961. **LOWER HOUSE, WINCHESTER ROAD, WICKHAM**
 (Report PDC513 refers)

The Sub-Committee visited the site prior to commencement of the meeting to familiarise themselves with the detail of the application. Representatives of the architect and applicant were available to answer questions.

The Sub-Committee met at Wickham Community Centre and the Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately 35 local residents. Also present was Mr Moreton (Chairman of Wickham Parish Council) Mr Carter (also a Wickham Parish Councillor and Chairman of The Wickham Society) together with representatives of the applicant and architect, Mr Henry Evans and Mr Guy Goodman (HGP Architects), Mr John Bell (John Bell and Partners) and Mr Steve Bolton (Try Homes).

In introducing the proposals to the Sub-Committee, Mrs Patterson reminded Members that this was a second revised application for the site, the first application in September 2004 having been withdrawn. The current application sought planning permission for the erection of 20 dwellings and conversion of the Grade II listed 'Lower House' building into two dwellings. Mrs Patterson updated the Sub-Committee on the details of the proposals and any revisions or requests following consultation with Council Officers.

Update on the Proposals

- (i) A revised Landscape Plan was circulated although results of consultation with the Conservation Officer regarding the landscape scheme and from the Highways Engineer regarding the provision of cycle storage on site was awaited. It was reported that it had been requested that the brick pillars at the existing entrance onto Winchester Road should be removed.

- (ii) A revised Method Statement was to be produced regarding the impact from the construction of the access road/driveway on the Sycamore and Birch trees to the rear of Lower House that were both under Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs).
- (iii) Details of the proposed communal play-area were also awaited. A programme of archaeological recording in mitigation of the development was also required by condition.
- (iv) The Housing Enabling Officer had requested that the affordable units include the ground and first floor flats in Block F and one of the three bedroom terrace houses, Swaythling Housing Association (as the registered social landlord) was satisfied that the transfer of the 7 units in Block F, without a lift, would deliver 32% affordable housing on site.
- (v) Any contaminants on-site would need to be addressed by impact assessments and remedial recovery, subject to condition, should planning permission be granted. The applicant was submitting a contamination assessment for consultation with the Environmental Health officers.
- (vi) A draft Section 106 Agreement had been submitted. This would facilitate the repair of the listed 'Lower House' building, affordable housing provision and the provision and management of open space. This draft would require further internal consultation within the Council.
- (viii) Mrs Patterson confirmed that service agencies had been consulted and would report back to the Planning Development Control Committee regarding service provision for the site.

Presentation from HGP Architects

Mr Cooper, representing HGP Architects, detailed his client's proposals for the site and introduced some of its integral schemes such as 'home-zoning' (regarding the access road/driveway), the provision of car parking and bicycle storage and location of refuse storage. Reference to the Wickham Village Design Statement had been taken into consideration during design.

Mr Cooper introduced to the Sub-Committee the detail of the individual buildings including their forms, internal layouts and elevations. He explained that many of the new buildings were of varying themes and heights and that the terracing was mainly staggered along its length. He reported that the existing 'Lower House' was of seventeenth century construction with nineteenth century additions and that the fabric of the building was of considerable disrepair, with severe damp problems. It was proposed to repair this building and to divide it into two separate dwellings.

Mr Cooper detailed landscaping proposals for the site. It was explained that the access road/driveway was to be gravelled, with clearly defined parking areas and conservation paving installed round 'Lower House'. Communal and private lawns were to be integrated within the development and a 1.8 metre brick wall was to be constructed at the rear of the site that backed onto the properties called 'Meonpool', 'The Jays' and numbers 1 and 3, Tanfield Park.

In conclusion, Mr Cooper advised that the revised application was proposing a scheme that had embraced a number of elements. These included those of sustainability, density issues and architectural influences from Wickham Village, as well as working within the constraints of the site, that included the shared access with Upper House Court, the two large TPO trees and the existing listed building.

Overlooking and bulk

Following questions regarding the proximity of Block F to 'The Jays', Mr Cooper confirmed that by reducing its originally proposed elevation towards the site boundary and by the construction of a 1.8 metre boundary wall, it was considered that there would not be considerable overlooking.

Following further discussion of the potential of overlooking of 'Meonpool' from Block F and the new terrace, Mrs Patterson advised that the nearest corner of 'Meonpool' was approximately 12 metres to the boundary and approximately 20 metres to Block F. It was confirmed that the windows to the rear of Block F backing onto the site boundary and 'The Jays' were comprised of living rooms and bedrooms on both the first, second and ground floors. The Sub-Committee was reminded that the second floor was, in fact, set back into the roof with dormer windows. Mr Cooper advised that he would provide drawings (inclusive of the 1.8 metre high wall) indicating visibility lines to 'The Jays'. He advised that should the top floor of block F be removed from the proposals, two affordable housing units would be lost from the scheme. Further to comments regarding the height and massing of block F within the Conservation Area, Mr Cooper advised that Block F was effectively two storeys with windows in the roof. Mrs Patterson advised that there were other buildings of this height on Winchester Road.

Reference was made to the bulk of Block F in relation to the existing Upper House Court fronting Winchester Road. Several residents considered that a three storey block was not appropriate in a Conservation Area. It was requested that the plans for Block F should not be shown in isolation to the neighbouring buildings and that revised plans detailing this should be provided.

A local resident and owner of the property 'The Jays' referred to the Wickham Village Design Statement and advised that he considered that this development was not appropriate. He advised that his property would be overlooked and that the development, especially Block F was out of sympathy with other development in the area.

Mr Morton (Chairman of Wickham Parish Council) stated that the Parish Council considered that the proposals represented over-development of the site.

Mr Cooper confirmed that the existing beech hedge on 'The Jays' side of the site boundary would be protected from root damage during construction of the new brick wall

Site Contamination

Responding to a question, Mr Bolton (Try Homes) advised that the diesel tank in situ beneath the site had been drained and that the surrounding soil had been tested for contaminants. This had proved negative. However, there would be a condition of remediation of any contamination as part of any planning agreement.

Parking and Traffic issues

Following discussion of the provision of parking spaces, reference was made to current planning guidelines that promoted sustainability of all new schemes. However, comments made regarding parking constraints at Wickham Square (resulting in it not being an acceptable alternative for visitor parking) were acknowledged.

Several residents from Upper House Court were present and expressed concern at the access and egress of traffic to and from the site from the shared access to Winchester Road, particularly its narrowness. They also referred to the parking provision adjacent to Lower House fronting Winchester Road and that this would be hazardous. The Chairman of Upper House Court Residents' Association commented that the proposed parking provision would inevitably result in parking on the access road/driveway.

Mr Carter suggested that parking provision for the site must be increased to two parking spaces per dwelling, as the majority of residents did not work in Wickham and were required to drive.

Mr Morton (Chairman of Wickham Parish Council) stated that the Parish Council was concerned with the access and egress to Winchester Road.

Affordable Housing

A Member was concerned at the lack of integration of the affordable housing with the rest of the development. In reply, Mr Cooper stated that Block F was positioned due to the constraints of the site and the desirability to maximise provision. He added that registered social landlords generally preferred units separated to assist with their management.

Lower House

Mr Cooper stated that it was originally intended for the 'Lower House' to be divided into four units. However, the Council's Conservation Officer had asked this to be reduced.

Neighbouring Sites

A number of residents and representatives of the Parish Council referred to future proposals for the neighbouring laboratories site. There was concern over the inevitability of additional traffic movement through the Lower House site to the second site and the pressures of access and egress onto Winchester Road. It was suggested that the application under consideration today could not be determined in isolation to any future proposals for the neighbouring site.

Responding, Mrs Proudlock reported that there were no current applications for the laboratories site and explained that the local authority was obliged to determine the proposals for the Lower House site in isolation.

Mr Morton (Chairman of Wickham Parish Council) requested that there should be no right of access/egress at this point for any second site development of the laboratory site. Furthermore, it was requested that as the road/driveway through the site currently stopped at the south-east corner by the boundary to the laboratories, a turning circle be provided to clearly show that this was the end of this development.

Conclusions

At the conclusion of debate, the Sub-Committee acknowledged the concerns raised by members of the public, representatives of the Parish Council and Wickham Society.

Members expressed concern regarding the massing and potential of overlooking from Block F. A Member requested that Block F be reduced to two storeys. The Sub-Committee also requested that highway issues be revisited by officers, especially the access and egress to and from Winchester Road. Concern was also expressed at parking issues and a Member requested that parking provision on site should be increased. Some Members were also concerned at the massing and bulk of the terraced houses and the maintenance of the un-adopted driveway/road.

The Sub-Committee also acknowledged the comments made regarding the neighbouring laboratory site and the impact that any future development of this would have upon this site.

RESOLVED:

That the comments and issues as detailed above be forward to Planning Development Control Committee for consideration.

The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and concluded at 7.10 pm.

Chairman