

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
(1-7 CHILBOLTON AVENUE, WINCHESTER) SUB-COMMITTEE

28 February 2005

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
 Bennetts (P)
 Beveridge (P)
 Davies (P)

Johnston (P)
 Mitchell (P)
 Read (P)
 Tait (P)

Others in attendance:

Councillors Love, de Peyer and Saunders

Officers in attendance:

Mr J. Hearn (Team Manager, Planning)
 Mrs S. Leonard (Principal Planning Officer)
 Mr M. Edwards (Arboricultural Officer)
 Mr N. Culhane (Traffic Engineer)
 Mr N. Baldwin (Affordable Housing Officer)
 Mr S. Dunbar Dempsy (Landscape Officer)

1. **ERECTION OF 49 DWELLINGS COMPRISING 5 NO. 1 BEDROOM, 26 NO 2 BEDROOM, 11 NO 3 BEDROOM AND 7 NO 4 BEDROOM DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND NEW ACCESS FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING PROPERTIES ON LAND 1-7 CHILBOLTON AVENUE, WINCHESTER**
 (Report PDC514 refers)

The Chairman welcomed approximately thirty members of the public to the meeting together with Mrs A. Hauser, the applicant, and Hampshire County Councillor Dickens. Prior to the meeting, Members had visited the site with the officers.

Mrs Leonard introduced the application as set out in report PDC514. The site was bordered by a belt of mature trees fronting Chilbolton Avenue and existing vehicular accesses onto Chilbolton Avenue would be blocked up and new pedestrian access created. The proposals included 90 car parking spaces, of which 80 would be provided by a new underground car park, the entrance to which would be from Sarum Road. The density was 45 dwellings per hectare, which met Planning Policy Guidance Note (PPG) 3 criteria. The property at No. 9 Chilbolton Avenue was not included in the proposals at present, but in the interests of comprehensive development provision had been made within the scheme's design for its future inclusion should this become a reality.

Mrs Leonard continued that the proposed dwellings nearest Chilbolton Avenue would be approximately one metre higher than the existing dwellings to be demolished, and

would utilise shallow roofs. The design would be of a Classical and Arts and Crafts style with either pitched roofs or mansard roofs with parapet detail. The elevations of the town houses would have simple design with quality materials used throughout. No. 11 had not been included in the scheme as this property had already been developed into multiple units. The property at Pheasants Way fronting Sarum Road would be retained.

The development would contain 30% affordable housing, which equated to 14.7 units and the applicant was prepared to provide 15 units on the site in two blocks one fronting Sarum Road, the other at the corner of Sarum Road and Chilbolton Avenue.

Mr Edwards stated that in terms of the impact on trees it was proposed to retain the significant belt of pine and beech trees fronting Chilbolton Avenue. The proposals included a woodland walk footpath to weave between these trees and the officers would need to be satisfied that the materials to be used for the footpath's surface were appropriate for the trees' long-term retention.

Mr Edwards added that the proposals also provided a great opportunity for further landscaping and tree planting within the site. For example, at the rear boundary of the site there was the opportunity to plant more substantial trees which in time would break up the development from long-distance views. Further detail was also required as to tree species proposed within the scheme. More thought needed to be given to the positions of the trees and the species to ensure the longevity of mature large trees within the site which would be visible from distant views as the site was on a ridge. He added that management of the existing trees in Chilbolton Avenue was required, but overall the scheme was satisfactory provided these additional details were submitted by the applicant.

Mr Culhane stated that in terms of highways issues, the responsibility for the scheme rested with Hampshire County Council as Highway Authority. The applicant had carried out an impact assessment on traffic flows in Chilbolton Avenue and the scheme was satisfactory. The proposals included provision to widen Sarum Road to 5.5 metres in width and to provide a 2 metre pedestrian footpath to accommodate the new access for the development onto Sarum Road. The visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 90 metres accorded with Hampshire County Council standards and further off-site works for junction improvements would be carried out in conjunction with contributions received from Linden Homes for their development at 8-22 Chilbolton Avenue, or by direct contributions from the applicant if the Linden Home development did not proceed. The applicant would enter into a Section 278 agreement with Hampshire County Council making a contribution of £135,000 for off-site pedestrian and highway works.

Within the scheme, the applicant was providing parking at a standard of 1.63 spaces per unit together with cycle storage. Basement parking would be provided by means of an underground car park and further detail was required as to whether the parking provision on site met the needs of the residents. In addition, there was provision for service vehicles on-site, but the turning area provided of 7.8 metres was inadequate and needed to be increased to 9.4 metres. This amendment might lead to further adjustment of the buildings on the site. Further details were also required of the form of the access road, including proposals that long-term parking on the access road did not take place. Details of access for fire appliances and arrangements for pedestrian access on the site were also required.

Mr Dunbar-Dempsey stated that the proposals met the open space requirement but that the opportunity for planting larger trees on the site would be welcomed. He also stated that a small scale local area of play would be provided.

Mr Baldwin confirmed that the requirement for 30% affordable housing was met by the application. In addition, the housing mix accorded with housing needs data. The affordable housing would be provided in the two blocks at the entrance to the site rather than being integrated across the development to ease maintenance by the housing association that was working in conjunction with the applicant.

In answer to Members' questions, Mr Edwards stated that the trees to the front of the site adjacent to Chilbolton Avenue would not be affected by the excavation for the proposed underground parking. A protection zone would be provided around the trees and the excavation of the site would not interfere with the root feeding area of the trees.

Mr Culhane commented that although there was peak hour traffic congestion at the Chilbolton Avenue and Sarum Road and Romsey Road junctions, Hampshire County Council was satisfied that the developer contributions received would be available to carry out highway improvements to alleviate the situation. It was also confirmed that lifts would be provided from the underground car parking into the three storey housing above.

In answer to a Member's question regarding comprehensive development, Mr Hearn stated that a number of previous applications at properties in Chilbolton Avenue had been refused as the proposals put forward to the Authority would have prevented the potential for further development of neighbouring plots in the future. This was not the case with this present application as the future potential to integrate No. 9 Chilbolton Avenue within the scheme at a future date had been included. No. 11 Chilbolton Avenue had already been re-developed and therefore need not be included. He added that Matrix Planning (urban design consultants) had been employed by the Authority to draw up a Local Area Design Statement (LADS) for Chilbolton Avenue. - The statement would include general design principles and guidance to applicants who were proposing to develop plots within Chilbolton Avenue. The LADS was in its initial stages and would undergo public consultation and in due course would be considered by Cabinet. A public meeting to discuss the LADS was to be held on the 8th March 2005. The LADS would have to comply with PPG3 if it was subsequently to be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) by the Council. The intention of a LADS was not to promote the comprehensive re-development of Chilbolton Avenue, but rather to act as a guide for applicants and also a development control tool which would be a material planning consideration if adopted as SPG. Matrix Planning had also been consulted on initial redevelopment proposals for this site (at pre-application stage) as the Council was not satisfied with the earlier proposals. The scheme now before the Council largely adhered to the design advice given by Matrix.

Mr Hearn continued that policy EN1 in the local plan had not now been included in the Local Plan Review as it did not accord with PPG3. The Local Plan Review provided guidance that the character of an area should not be harmed by inappropriate development. This could be achieved by providing space between buildings and the planting of mature trees. In the proposals before the Sub-Committee, the inclusion of 31 two and one bedroom units increased the density but in his opinion the character of the area was not harmed.

Mrs Leonard added that Building Control and a Southern Water condition would provide for adequate sewerage capacity on the site. It was proposed that the belt of trees fronting Chilbolton Avenue and the open space on site would be under the ownership of a single body, for example a management committee, or alternatively these areas could be managed by the Council on receiving a commuted sum.

Mrs Leonard continued that the potential for overlooking of No. 9 Chilbolton Avenue and Pheasants View on Sarum Road had been taken into consideration in the application. Small secondary windows would be included on elevations of the new development facing these properties, and the applicant confirmed that these could include obscure glazing if required. There was also sufficient provision for bin storage within the development.

The applicant, Mrs Hauser, stated that she had commissioned an arboricultural report for the development to ensure that the trees on site were protected. The development would be approximately 8 metres away from the trees on Chilbolton Avenue, which was well outside the recommended 5 metre distance for their protection. The principal rooms of the development would face onto the open central courtyard and therefore bedrooms would face onto Chilbolton Avenue, which would reduce the conflict between the development and the tree belt. It was proposed that a management company would look after the trees and the open space. No. 9 Chilbolton Avenue was not included in the scheme as the occupier was unwilling to sell the property, but the design had made provision for its future inclusion. The density of development was less than 40 units per hectare if car parking was excluded, and the footprint of development in terms of the size of the site was low. There were technical solutions to providing adequate sewage capacity on-site, for example the provisions of holding tanks, but negotiations on this point were continuing. The need to control parking on the site was recognised and the clamping of owners' vehicles would be utilised if necessary. The windows facing No. 9 Chilbolton Avenue were secondary, with high sills, and could be obscure glazed if required. Bin storage was provided between buildings and was well screened and integrated.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Hampshire County Councillor Dickens stated that the character of Chilbolton Avenue would be affected by the proposals and that a Local Neighbourhood Design Statement to protect the area, together with a comprehensive traffic scheme, was required. Before proceeding, the Sub-Committee should be satisfied on the details of road improvements proposed by Hampshire County Council and that visibility splays should be looked at carefully. Details of bus stops should also be provided. She also asked why the scheme at 1.63 parking spaces per unit was above the County Council standard of 1.5 spaces. There was also concern about the junction between Chilbolton Avenue and Sarum Road and the Winchester Movement and Access Plan Panel had discussed improvements to this junction. However, the proposals at 8 - 22 Chilbolton Avenue had added to the traffic to be generated, and the Sub-Committee now needed to satisfy itself that a comprehensive road improvement scheme was in place before proceeding with the application before it.

In reply, Mr Culhane stated that Hampshire County Council's concerns had been met by the developer and that parking was in excess of the 1.5 standard, as this was the average for the district and was not site-specific. It was accepted that it would be of benefit for the Sub-Committee if an officer from Hampshire County Council Highways Section was present at the meeting to answer the Sub-Committee's questions.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a number of local residents spoke on the application. In summary, points raised included the effect on the character of the area of the proposals, the precedent that would be set and that the proposed dwellings would be three storeys in height. There were potential problems from the accumulated effect of additional cars in the area following completion of this and other schemes. These added to the change of character to the local area. Members of the public asked why policy EN1 had been ignored and whether the Local Design Statement would add additional protection to the area. Additional comments were

made on the proposals for traffic calming on Chilbolton Avenue, including central refuges; why a cycle lane had not been provided; whether Kilham Lane had been included in any traffic survey and the present problems encountered by motorists accessing Chilbolton Avenue from Sarum Road.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Love, a Ward Member, added that if this application was approved, then approximately 200 new houses would have permission for construction in the Chilbolton Avenue area and the infrastructure of the area would be put under strain. The local schools were already full and the hospital was experiencing problems. The accumulated effect of development was too much and he asked that any final decision only be taken after the 8 March meeting to discuss the design principles for the Chilbolton Avenue area.

In reply to points raised, Mr Hearn stated that the guidance in PPG3 was a material consideration and where there was conflict with the adopted local plan and PPG3 then PPG3 would take precedence. This was the case with EN1 which did not allow the subdivision of plots. However it was important to appreciate that although PPG3 promoted an increase in density it also emphasised the importance of good design and protecting the character of an area.

Mr Culhane added that two pedestrian refuges would be provided on Chilbolton Avenue and that a cycle lane had not been provided as this had not been requested by the Cycle Advisory Panel when consulted. He added that Hampshire County Council in its traffic studies had not taken into consideration traffic in Kilham Lane due to the nodal split of traffic volumes, but had mostly concentrated on Chilbolton Avenue. However, the Sarum Road access into Chilbolton Avenue had been taken into consideration in traffic assessments and was judged to be satisfactory within the proposals. Every effort would be made to have a representative of Hampshire County Council in attendance at the Sub Committee's next meeting to answer questions on the wider traffic implications of the proposals on the Chilbolton Avenue area.

Following debate, it was agreed that a further Sub-Committee meeting be held to address a number of issues. These included the wider traffic implications to be addressed by Hampshire County Council; the arrangements for the long-term maintenance for trees on the site and to address issues of overlooking of No. 9 Chilbolton Avenue. In the meantime the applicant would be invited to submit amendments and further information.

RESOLVED:

That a further meeting of the Sub-Committee be held to consider amended plans and to address issues as identified above.

The meeting commenced at 10.45 am and concluded at 13.20 pm.

G Busher
Chairman