

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (KNOWLE HOSPITAL) SUB-COMMITTEE**

**9 May 2005**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

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

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

Deputy Members:

Councillor Mitchell (Standing Deputy for Councillor Sutton)

Officers in attendance

Mrs S Proudlock (Team Manager, Planning)  
Mrs J Pinnock (Planning Officer)

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Sutton.

2. **PHASE 4 - ERECTION OF 40 NO. DWELLINGS COMPRISING OF 20 NO. ONE BEDROOM FLATS, 20 NO. TWO BEDROOM FLATS, PROVISION OF PUBLIC SQUARE AND ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING (DETAILS IN COMPLIANCE WITH OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION W1097/33) – W1497/42/ - 05/00912/REM**

The Sub-Committee met at the Chapel, Knowle Hospital, Wickham. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately fifteen members of the public, together with representatives of the applicant, Berkeley Homes.

Mrs Proudlock explained that the application was retrospective in that an identical application had been approved by the City Council in 2003 subject to the satisfaction of the County Council over the provision and future maintenance of a bus gate.

The bus gate was a control system of telescopic bollards that could be raised and lowered automatically by sensors on buses as they passed over. The bus gate was located at the entrance from Mayles Lane into The Square, Knowle Hospital and would only be used by buses. Berkeley Homes had installed a bus gate as required. However, the County Council was not satisfied with the future maintenance proposals of the bus gate. Hampshire County Council's legal advisors had taken a cautionary approach as the bus gate was the only one of its type to be installed in Hampshire and therefore the County Council needed to be satisfied that its future maintenance would be secured. Berkeley Homes had asked Hampshire County Council to adopt it

but Hampshire County Council had not supported this course of action due to its concerns over future maintenance. Negotiations between the two parties were protracted, and Berkeley Homes had submitted this new identical application in order that the matter be forced and a suitable agreement be reached. Hampshire County Council have now re-opened negotiations by suggesting that a Section 106 legal agreement could be entered into between Hampshire County Council and Berkeley Homes to secure the future maintenance of the bus gate.

Mr Shepherd, representing Berkeley Homes, stated that Berkeley Homes would be pleased to discuss the matter with Hampshire County Council to ensure that the bus gate was operational at all times in perpetuity. It was Berkeley Homes' intention that the charge for the bus gate's future maintenance would be met by the management company formed from the residents of the Knowle Hospital development. The management company would also be the successors in title to Berkeley Homes once the Section 106 Agreement had been signed.

In reply to Members' questions, Mrs Proudlock explained that it had been necessary to install a temporary barrier at the access road to The Square from Mayles Lane as the buses operating on the Mayles Lane route were already fitted with the technology to operate the bollards. Occasionally the buses had caused the bollards to lower to the floor, but because the bus did not pass over the bollards failed to rise, leading to the entrance to Knowles Hospital at Mayles Lane to be open and operational to regular vehicular traffic.

Members of the public commented that the bus gate had been installed for approximately twelve months and buses had been unable to enter due to the failure to secure an agreement on future maintenance. It was explained that the lack of use of the route to Knowle Hospital was not known, although the bus company could in theory operate the system. Officers had initially been advised that the bus company would operate this route from April 2005. Even though the route through Knowle Hospital would add approximately ten minutes to journey times, it was also noted that Hampshire County Council was intending to provide a small subsidy to the bus companies for the extra time taken. It was not known whether this subsidy was delaying the bus company operating the route..

The Chairman of the Residents Association added that the loop intended for circulating the bus route through the Knowle Hospital development was not complete and that additional rising and falling bollards were also located outside of the shops; these would also need to be taken into consideration when Hampshire County Council adopted the highway.

In reply Mr Shepherd stated that the loop route through Knowle Hospital would be constructed to a standard to be adoptable by Hampshire County Council. The loop would be completed once the construction of Phase 3 of the development was finished in August 2005, but the loop could be used previous to that if required.

A resident also commented that he would favour Hampshire County Council adopting the maintenance of the bollards, as at present he would have to pay twice, once through Council Tax to Hampshire County Council for highways and transport provision and secondly through the Residents' Management Charge at Knowle Hospital.

In conclusion, the Sub-Committee supported the speedy resolution to the completion of the Section 106 Agreement between Hampshire County Council and Berkeley Homes over the future maintenance of the bus gate to allow buses to operate the

loop route at the earliest opportunity. The officers were also asked to check whether the rising and falling bollards in the Central Square also need to be included as part of any legal agreement. The Sub-Committee requested that a further update on progress be reported to the next meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee.

RESOLVED:

That the officers report to the next meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee on progress over the signing of a Section 106 Agreement between Hampshire County Council and Berkeley Homes over the future maintenance of the bus gate as outlined above.

3. **PHASE 4A – ERECTION OF 3 NO. THREE BEDROOM DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING (DETAILS IN COMPLIANCE WITH OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION W14097/33) – W14097/43 – 05/01000-REM**

Mrs Pinnock explained that the application was for the provision of 3 three bedroomed units to the front of East Mews within Phase 4A of the Knowle Hospital development. The proposal had been advertised with the close of public representation being 19 May 2005. She was therefore unable to report on consultation received until the expiry of the consultation period.

However, a similar application had been previously assessed by the Sub Committee when it had been included as 2 three bedroom houses as part of Phase 4. At that time, in 2003, the Sub-Committee had supported the officers' advice that the space proposed for the dwellings would be better integrated into the adjacent proposed car park (minutes of the meeting of the Knowle Hospital Sub-Committee held on 13 June 2003 and Report PDC.330 refer). The application had since proceeded with the dwellings not included.

Mr Shepherd for Berkeley Homes explained that the developer had been unable to understand why the units had been excluded at that time. The proposals related to the formal square and would provide balance to the development. Views from vantage points would be preserved by existing archways. Mr Shepherd added that the existing space was not required for car parking as the scheme already provided surplus car parking, with three spaces being unallocated.

In response to Members' questions about possible overlooking from the proposed dwellings of properties in Knowle Avenue, Mrs Pinnock explained that the proposals would not present material overlooking but of more concern would be issues of overshadowing and loss of amenity.

Members of the public commented that when purchasing their properties they had been advised that the area proposed for the three dwellings would be utilised for car parking. What was proposed would result in overlooking and would be out of character with surrounding dwellings. There was not an over-provision of car parking as there was already evidence of indiscriminate parking on pavements and roads at peak times.

Mrs Proudlock added that the provision of 2 three bedroom houses had been taken out of Phase 4A, and the developer advised that the area would be suitable for car parking or public open space, but this had not been tied down as part of the consent.

In conclusion the Sub-Committee asked that a report on the application be submitted to the next meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee, to include the results of formal consultation and an officer recommendation for Members' consideration.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm and concluded at 8.10 pm.

Chairman