

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

Councillors:

Busher (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 Enablement Officer)

1. **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Members noted that the applicant had withdrawn the application regarding the sports pavilion as they had agreed to embark on a public consultation programme with the City Council to identify the sports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 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 14no. flats in Phase 6 as Mr Shepherd explained that these had been replaced by 5no. 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 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 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 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