

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

27 July 2005

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter

Bennetts (P)

Beveridge (P)

Chapman (P)

Davies (P)

Evans (P)

Jeffs (P)

Johnston (P)

Mitchell (P)

Pearce (P)

Pearson (P)

Read (P)

Saunders (P)

Sutton (P)

Deputy Members:

Councillor Lipscomb (Standing Deputy for Councillor Baxter)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Allgood, Cook and Verney

237. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Baxter.

238. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That subject to Councillor Chapman being shown as present for the meetings of the Committee held on 22 and 23 June 2005, the minutes of the previous meetings of the Committee held on 6 April, 7 April, 27 April, 28 April, 25 May, 26 May, 22 June and 23 June 2005 be approved and adopted.

239. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (POLICE HEADQUARTERS, WINCHESTER) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC561 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Police Headquarters, Winchester) Sub-Committee held on 9 June 2005 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

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

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item as a member of the City of Winchester Trust which had commented on this application and he spoke and voted thereon.

The Director of Development reported that further to the meeting of the Sub-Committee, the applicant had discussed a number of amendments with the City Council. These included the impact of the proposals on West End Terrace and the effect of the proposals on the setting of Winchester, where more detailed photo montages of mid and long distance views were being compiled. Also, the level of car parking required was being discussed with Hampshire County Council. Once these details had been finalised the scheme would be re-advertised. It was intended that the application be brought to the September meeting of the Committee if possible.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Police Headquarters, Winchester) Sub-Committee held on 9 June 2005 be approved and adopted.

240. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**
(Report PDC563 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 17 June 2005 (attached as Appendix B to the minutes).

The Committee noted that Report PDC569 – The Dower House, Springvale Road, Headbourne Worthy, Winchester, was also associated with this item.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 17 June 2005 be approved and adopted.

241. **THE DOWER HOUSE, SPRINGVALE ROAD, HEADBOURNE WORTHY, WINCHESTER**
(Report PDC569 refers)

The Committee noted that this report was associated with Report PDC 563 – Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee meeting held on 17 June 2005.

The Committee noted that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 17 June 2005 had been approved and adopted, and therefore planning permission had been granted for the scheme in respect of The Dower House, Springvale Road, Headbourne Worthy.

RESOLVED:

That the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to vary the 1980 Agreement to release the remainder of the application site from the covenants contained in the agreement.

242. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (CHILBOLTON AVENUE) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC574 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Chilbolton Avenue) Sub-Committee held on 30 June 2005 (attached as Appendix C to the minutes).

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

Councillor Pearce stated that he had commented on this application as a Ward Member and he left the meeting during consideration of this item.

Councillor Saunders declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item, as she was a nearby resident to the application site in Chilbolton Avenue and she left the meeting during consideration of this item.

RESOLVED:

That subject to the inclusion of an additional condition to cover offsite highway works by means of a Section 278 Agreement, the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Chilbolton Avenue) Sub-Committee held on 30 June 2005 be approved and adopted.

243. **PLANNING APPEALS (EAST) – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS**

(Report PDC575 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

244. **PROGRESS REPORT ON THE APPEAL AGAINST THE NON - DETERMINATION OF THE OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE RESERVE MDA – (NORTH WINCHESTER)**

(Report PDC580 refers)

The above item had not been noted for inclusion on the agenda within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept the item on to the agenda as a matter requiring urgent consideration, in order that the Committee could be brought up to date on the current arrangements for the Planning Appeal in respect of the reserve MDA - North Winchester.

The Director of Development stated that the dates for the appeal had now been set over a period of twelve days from 11–14 October, 25–28 October and 1–4 November 2005, to be held in the St John's House, The Broadway, Winchester.

RESOLVED:

That the current situation be noted.

245. **MORN HILL – SECTION 106 AGREEMENT**
(Report PDC578 refers)

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

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

Councillor Sutton informed the meeting that she was a member of the South Downs Committee Planning Board, who had considered this application, and she spoke and voted thereon.

In the public participation part of the meeting, Mr Windsor-Aubury representing the Upper Itchen Valley Society, the City of Winchester Trust and the Winchester Residents' Association and Mrs A Matthews, representing Itchen Valley Parish Council and Chilcomb Parish Meeting spoke in objection to the application, and Mr C Ward, agent from BJC Planning, representing the applicant, spoke in support.

The Director of Development summarised the objections to the application and also made reference to representation in support, including written notes submitted at the meeting by the City Council's Head of Tourism.

The Committee debated the proposals and the merit of providing a three month extension to the Section 106 Agreement.

A number of Members considered that due to changes in planning policy, the site was now unsustainable for hotel development and the applicant's request should therefore not be supported and the site returned to countryside. These Members also suggested that the application would allow the applicant a method to circumnavigate the Secretary of State's call-in of the application, therefore negating the need to take a sequential approach to assessing the application against planning policies aimed at limiting out of town development.

However, the majority of Members supported the application, stating that the applicant had been a victim of circumstance, in that the determination by the Secretary of State had been delayed by the General Election in May 2005 and that the timing of the Secretary of State's decision, the expiry of the Section 106 Agreement and the applicant's request to meet with the City Council to discuss the options available, had all been within a matter of days and therefore the three month extension as suggested in the report was not unreasonable. There was also majority support for the provision within the district of a hotel facility of the type suggested.

Following debate, on balance, the Committee supported the recommendation as set out in the report subject to the deletion of the reference to Ward Member in recommendation 2.

RESOLVED:

1. That the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to agree a variation of the Section 106 Agreement dated 4 June 1999 for land at Morn Hill, Alresford Road, Winchester, by further extending the implementation period for the hotel element by three months to 30 October 2005.
2. That the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman, be authorised to agree any changes to the design of the approved development (W01706/07) which do not require planning permission.

246. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**
(Report PDC572 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 Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 9 as he was a member of the Council of the City of Winchester Trust, who had commented on this application and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Lipscomb spoke as a Ward Member in respect of item 8, sitting apart from the Committee and not participating in the decision on that item.

Councillor Lipscomb declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 6 as the speaker on behalf of the Kings Worthy Parish Council (Mr S Howell) was known to himself and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Jeffs declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 6 as the speaker on behalf of the Kings Worthy Parish Council (Mr S Howell) was known to himself and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Jeffs declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 3 as he was a member of Alresford Golf Club, the applicant, and he withdrew from the meeting for consideration of this item.

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

In respect of item 1 – No. 3 Oaks Farm, Furzeley Corner, Denmead, at the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Allgood, a Ward Member, spoke on this item. In summary, Councillor Allgood stated that he objected to the application as the application site would diminish the protection of the Denmead Strategic Gap; that the proposals would impact on the amenity of residents, that access roads and traffic junctions were inadequate for providing satisfactory transport links and there was strong local opposition to the application. He concluded by stating that if the Committee were minded to approve the application, then conditions agreed should be enforced, including a previous condition that a close-boarded fence should be provided. The Director of Development stated that Condition 8 should be amended to refer to Mr Medlam to have the personal use. Following debate, the Committee agreed to approve the application, subject to the inclusion of an additional condition that vehicle movements be limited to one return journey per day.

In respect of item 2 – land to the rear of 16/20 Grange Road, Alresford, at the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Cook, a Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application and Mr Moody, planning agent, spoke in support. In summary Councillor Cook stated that although the scheme would be difficult to refuse after the Planning Inspector's decision, it could be improved upon by the provision of a footpath to Perin's School and improvements to the access in Grange Road, which was narrow and lined with trees forcing traffic into the middle of the road. There were also concerns that there were difficult sight lines at the access and that factors such as the safety of children going to school had not been fully assessed.

The Director of Development stated that an additional condition was being requested that a drop crossing to increase pedestrian safety be provided within Grange Road, which addressed some of Councillor Cook's concerns. Also, in response to points made by Mr Moody, the Director of Development stated that there would be no objection to Conditions 12 and 13 being re-worded to the effect that the landscape scheme be approved in writing by the local authority before the scheme reaches slab level. Following debate, the Committee approved the application as set out, subject to the amendment and addition to the conditions as stated above and Committee also requested the Director of Development to negotiate with the applicant that the affordable housing element be integrated across the site.

In respect of item 3 – Alresford Golf Club, Cheriton Road, Tichborne, Alresford, at the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Verney spoke on this item. In summary, Councillor Verney stated that the applicant now proposed to change the sign to be white lettering on a green background rather than white lettering on a blue background, as was presently the case. The Director of Development commented that this proposal was satisfactory and the Committee supported the application as set out, subject to the changing colour of the sign if this was put forward by the applicant.

In respect of item 4 – Sutton Court, Bishops Sutton Road, Bishops Sutton, Mr Jay and Mrs Miller representing Bishops Sutton Parish Council spoke in objection to the application and, at the invitation of the Chairman Councillor Verney, a Ward Member, spoke on this item. In summary, Councillor Verney stated that the proposed detached garage would be constructed a long way outside of the building line and was visible from a public right of way. It was also out of keeping with the character of the area and that the existing planning permission was satisfactory and should be supported. Following debate the Committee approved the application as set out.

In respect of item 5 – Crosslanes Farm, Warley Lane, Morestead, Winchester, Mr Horn, applicant, was present at the meeting, but following the Director of Development's presentation stated that he did not wish to comment. The Director of Development requested the Committee to amend Condition 2 to refer to persons employed in agricultural business rather than the stud business as specified. The Committee agreed to this request and also approved the application as set out.

In respect of item 6 – land at 37 Ramsay Road, Kings Worthy, Mr S Howell, representing Kings Worthy Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. The Director of Development made reference to amended plans which demonstrated more accurately the elevations of the development. The Director also stated that a public open space payment was required. Following debate, the Committee approved the application as set out, subject to the requirement of the applicant to make an open space payment.

In respect of item 7 – land to the rear of Sutton Court, Bishops Sutton Road, Bishops Sutton, Mr Nankivell and Mrs Miller, representing Bishops Sutton Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Verney, a Ward Member, stated that despite the advice of a previous Council Enforcement Officer that the land was a school playing field, it was agricultural land and had a lease to that effect. The applicant had mowed the land every week to a condition where it was virtually a garden and this was resisted by Bishops Sutton Parish Council, who wanted it to remain as agricultural land. Arising out of debate, the Committee made reference to a previous application considered by the Committee, when similar circumstances had arisen. It was agreed that the conditions relating to this previous application should also be included in any approval of the current application and that therefore the Director of Development be given delegated authority in consultation with the Chairman, to approve the application, subject to the inclusion of appropriate conditions. The objective of these conditions was to stop the land being absorbed into the curtilage of the dwelling house.

In respect of item 8 – Byrony Cottage, Rook Lane, Micheldever, Winchester, Mr Critchley spoke in objection to the application and Mr Wright spoke on behalf of the applicant in support. Councillor Lipscomb spoke on this item as a Ward Member sitting apart from the Committee and not participating in the decision on the item. In summary, Councillor Lipscomb stated that he supported the objections as the application site did not link to Dever Close and provided unsatisfactory access into Rook Lane, which was only partly metalled and had poor visibility splays into Church Lane, Micheldever. The access into Church Lane could not be improved due to listed buildings fronting each side of the access to Rook Lane. There were also Police objections to the application and there would also be the loss of some trees and part of the ancient hedgerow, which would affect the rural character of the setting of the application site. He asked that a Viewing Sub-Committee visit the application site if the Committee was minded to approve the application.

The Director of Development updated the Committee on the objections received to the application, including those from Councillor Godfrey, who was also a Ward Member, together with Micheldever Parish Council who also objected to the application. Following questioning of the Director of Development over the adequacy of the access arrangements, the Committee agreed not to appoint a Viewing sub-Committee and approved the application as set out.

The applications not subject to public participation were approved as set out.

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 7 – land to the rear of Sutton Court, Bishops Sutton Road, Bishops Sutton, authority be delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to agree appropriate conditions to stop the application site being absorbed into the dwellinghouse curtilage.

The Committee passed a vote of thanks to Mrs S Leonard, Principal Planning Officer, and Mr J Hudson, Planning Technician as this was the last meeting at which they would be in attendance prior to leaving the Authority.

The meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and concluded at 7.45 pm.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
(POLICE HEADQUARTERS, WINCHESTER) SUB-COMMITTEE

9 June 2005

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Beveridge (P)
 Davies (P)
 Evans (P)
 Jeffs

Mitchell (P)
 Pearson (P)
 Read (P)
 Sutton (P)

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Bennetts and de Peyer

Officers in attendance:

Mr D Dimon (Acting Planning Team Manager – DC West)
 Mr J Hearn – Planning Team Manager (DC East)
 Mr H Bone – Assistant City Secretary & Solicitor (Legal)
 Mr R MacCullagh – Principal Conservation Officer
 Mr N Marsden – Project Officer
 Mr G Brady – Urban Design and Architect (Matrix Partnership)
 Mr C Gardner – Urban Design and Landscape Architect (Matrix Partnership)
 Mr S Jenkins – Hampshire County Council, Highways

248. **DEMOLITION OF ALL EXISTING BUILDINGS: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (OUTLINE) (W04090/19) – HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY POLICE HEADQUARTERS, ROMSEY ROAD, WINCHESTER**
 (Report PDC554 refers)

The Sub-Committee met in The Guildhall, Winchester. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting representatives of the applicant (Hampshire Constabulary: Deidre Wells - Redkite Development consultancy), James Bevis (Highway Consultant – WPS): Stojian Kalik (Architect – Andrews Kalik Harris), Jeff Aston (Hampshire Police Estates) and Mr Attenborough - Cox (Chairman of the Hampshire Police Authority). The Chairman also welcomed approximately ten members of the public to the meeting, including representatives of the City of Winchester Residents' Association and the Winchester Preservation Trust.

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on this application, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as he was a member of the Council of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on this application, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Mr Hearn explained that the application was to replace the existing Police Headquarters buildings on Romsey Road, Winchester, with a residential development of three hundred dwellings. As it was an outline application, only the details of the access to the site from Romsey Road was before Members for approval and all other matters were reserved for the detailed application stage.

The application followed a recent refusal by the Planning Development Control Committee of an application by Hampshire Constabulary for the refurbishment and additional building to the existing Police Headquarters building in Romsey Road, and the appeal for this application would be heard in September 2005.

Mr Hearn continued that the Matrix Partnership had been appointed by the City Council to provide urban design advice on this significant application. The application was in accordance with planning policies, and although the local planning authority would have preferred to have received a full application, it had been agreed after negotiation that an outline application would be acceptable as long as supporting information was provided. Issues to be evaluated included how the built form would sit on the site without harming the Conservation Area or the setting of Winchester and in particular the proposal's visual impact, from a number of vantage points within and outside the city.

Mr Attenborough - Cox, Chairman of the Hampshire Police Authority, introduced the applicant's planning team. Mrs Deidre Wells from Redkite Development Consultancy, who were acting as agents for the applicant, detailed the application to the Sub-Committee.

In summary she stated that the application site on Romsey Road had been in continual ownership by the Police from 1840. The present multi-storey Police Headquarters building dated from 1963/64 and was in need of renovation. There was a mixture of views as to whether the Police should remain on the site or seek a new administrative headquarters building elsewhere in the region.

In order to ensure that the Police continued to have accommodation for its Headquarters staff a twin track approach had been taken, hence the appeal on the refusal to refurbish and extend the existing Police Headquarters building.

The City Council supported residential development on the application site as it accorded with national and local planning policies. The site represented a windfall of three hundred houses which had not been envisaged in the Local Plan process. The Police had continued in a dialogue with the local authority to stay in the local area but this had not been easy. The present building had a useful life of less than three years, and with advancements in technology and modern office requirements the present building was not fit for its purpose. A headquarters building to accommodate approximately six hundred staff was required, but the budgetary constraints imposed on a public service body needed to be recognised.

Mrs Wells continued that it was the intention of the Police to sell the site to a developer once planning permission had been granted. Matters for consideration in the outline application were access and site capacity. A single access to Romsey Road was proposed from the existing access and three hundred units were considered as being the capacity of the site. The applicant had undertaken an appraisal of the site, considering factors such as long views into the site and how it fitted in with the context of the city and the site environment, including impact on the Conservation Area and the adjacent hospital buildings, the prison.

The applicant had assessed the character of the area. This included the Conservation Area at West End Terrace and the more urban character of Romsey Road. There were large institutional buildings in the nearby vicinity, including the hospital and West Downs student accommodation. Tree cover, ground levels, building heights, neighbour relationships, skyline, together with views into the site (both those in the neighbouring locality and long distances including St Giles Hill) had been taken into consideration. The site itself was contained by embankments with retaining walls.

The conclusion was that there was a wide divergence of character around the site. The approach taken, therefore, was that the site could be self-contained but needed to take into account its surrounding environment.

To one side would be the prison wall. From discussions with the Prison Governor a new building could not be built within twenty-five feet of the wall, and there could be no rear gardens or trees above four metres in height that would compromise the security of the prison. The proposal was to utilise lower level landscaping at the base of the prison wall and car parking.

The site was naturally sub-divided into compartments by existing trees. The buildings would be formally grouped into the natural landscape. On the City Council's advice a high density scheme was proposed. This would include a landmark tower on the corner to Romsey Road, the inclusion of play areas and open greens, with the existing vehicular access to West End Terrace being closed and to become a pedestrian and cycle access only.

Sixty percent of the car parking would be underground. Central courtyard areas would contain large box trees and other trees would be retained, although some would require surgery. The units on the site would be largely one and two bedroomed, with ninety of the three hundred units being affordable. This would be particularly useful for the large public service employers within the immediate vicinity.

The proposed units would be four to five storeys in the centre of the development, with three to four storeys facing West End Terrace. A space of approximately thirty metres would be retained from West End Terrace to the first block of development. A design principle had been to link the development at first floor level but with a variation in roof levels and to retain a high degree of light penetration into the development. Although this was an outline application, a more modernistic design had also been sketched.

A requirement of the demolition of the existing Police Headquarters building would be to find a replacement for some of the sensitive telecommunications mast equipment that was presently situated on the roof. Therefore part of the development facing Romsey Road would be retained to provide the option of erecting a replacement mast for the existing operators, which would have a line of sight to Winchester for it to be functionally acceptable.

Mr Bevis from WPS Consultants spoke on the traffic issues arising from the application. In summary he stated that due to the sub-standard visibility and potential problems regarding on-street parking the decision had been taken to close vehicular access to West End Terrace. Instead, this would remain as a pedestrian and cycle access. The only vehicular access would be from Romsey Road. With respect to car parking, negotiations with Hampshire County had resulted in a proposal to provide one car parking space per dwelling, which was below the County Council standard of 1.5 car parking spaces in accordance with PPG.13. One car parking space per dwelling had been advised because of the sustainability of the site due to its good pedestrian, cycle and public transport links, including accessibility to the railway station. Traffic movements were anticipated as being less than average and perhaps could be limited to weekly shopping trips. Negotiations had also taken place on the level of contribution to improve traffic schemes in the local area. These included improvements to Sparkford Road to improve access to the University College Winchester, surfacing of the High Street, pedestrian schemes on Jewry Street and North Walls, and improved real time information on bus timetables.

Mr Kalik, consultant architect, explained the design principles of the scheme. These were governed by the height of the site in relation to the topography of Winchester and also the slope of the site. There were constraints on the site imposed by existing trees and the requirement to provide a pedestrian access to West End Terrace. The height of the buildings was explained, of which the highest point would be nine to twelve metres tall. The site was well screened and pitched roofs had been included within the design. Open space equated to approximately thirty-three square metres per unit and with the substantial screening the ambience would be one of high density development in a park setting.

Mr Dimon outlined to the Sub-Committee the consultations received to date, which were set out in Report PDC554. He highlighted that it was anticipated that a contribution in excess of £500,000 would be made towards the cost of bringing significant transportation improvements in the vicinity in order to reduce the need to travel, especially by car. A written representation was still to be received from the South-East Regional Design Panel, but a preliminary e-mail had indicated that the design was acceptable in principle, and that the residential content needed further work to knit it into the surroundings. Southern Water was yet to respond on its investigations as to whether the scale of development would overload the existing water and waste water services.

Mr Dimon continued that thirty-seven representations had now been received, four more than set out in Report PDC554. The nature of the representations was as set out on page eight of Report PDC554, with the most frequent representations being that the scale and density and form of development would require careful consideration in terms of its impact on the Town and the Conservation Area.

In terms of assessing the application, the main issues were the principle of development, where forward plans had commented that the site was within the settlements boundary of Winchester, and therefore residential development was acceptable in principle. There was also no policy objection to the loss of employment provision. The development utilised the maximum potential of the site and would provide much needed smaller housing units within Winchester. The development was close to the town centre and therefore car parking provision could be at a lower level, due to the sustainability of the site's location. In assessing design it was noted that this although this was an outline application, the mass facing West End Terrace was inappropriate. However, as an outline application, once planning permission had been granted, the site would be disposed of on the open market to a developer and a new design might be forthcoming. An unknown factor was the height and design of the communications mast that needed to be retained. There was also a concern that parking on the site was excessive and could be reduced. Negotiations were continuing on these points.

Mr Brady from The Matrix Partnership commented on the urban design and architecture. In summary he stated that the trees on the site were very important, as the skyline defined the edge of Winchester. At present this was broken by the cupola on the adjacent prison, together with the Police Headquarters building. The design also needed to be sensitive to the buildings opposite the site at West End Terrace in the Conservation Area. The layout of the trees on the site led to a logical position for new development. Mr Gardner, Urban Design and Landscape Architect for the Matrix Partnership, added that the information provided so far made it uncertain what the effect on inward views to the development would be. The proposed development would present a significant mass and would be broad in its width. There was also uncertainty over the size of the communications mast. Precise measurements would be required. He also explained that there would be some loss of trees, including one significant copper beech tree.

Mr Jenkins, Hampshire County Council Highways, explained that he broadly agreed with the applicant's transport assessment. There would be an impact, but this would be based on residential vehicular trips rather than those associated with the present business use. There were eight buses per hour on Romsey Road and through calculations a minimum standard for provision of spaces on site would equate to 248. There was, therefore, flexibility if there was a requirement to reduce the car parking space provision within the development, but the position on appeal would be awkward and the negotiation leading to 300 space provision was acceptable to the County Council.

Mr MacCullagh, Principal Conservation Officer, commented that the site provided a background to a number of significant listed buildings in the town, including the Cathedral and The Guildhall, which were key landmark buildings. There were also views from St James's Cemetery, and the proposals required much more assessment from views around the town.

Mr Marsden, Communities Project Officer, stated that the housing mix proposed was acceptable and that thirty per cent of the units (ninety in total) would be for affordable provision. At the time of a detailed application the scheme would need to reflect the housing need within the town. At present there was a reduced requirement for one bed units but an increase in demand for three bedroom family and two bedroom units. Also at the detailed application stage the affordable housing would need to be well integrated within the scheme and, if at all possible, to be pepper-potted throughout.

Mr Hearn stated that following consultation with the Council's Arboriculturalist it was confirmed that there would be a loss of a copper beech tree and that tree protection measures needed to be adequate. Due to the closeness of some of the buildings there could be future pressure to cut back trees where they resulted in darkened rooms. Careful consideration also needed to be given on the effect of available ground water if significant underground parking was constructed beneath the site.

In the public participation part of the meeting the following points were made:

Mrs Meeson, of 1 Step Terrace, stated that she would be living opposite the proposed pedestrian access. She had concerns over the proposed height of the buildings and their impact on the Conservation Area; the implications for parking within Zone J and whether sufficient provision would be made for visitor parking within the site.

Mr B Taylor stated that he supported the refurbishment of the existing Police Headquarters tower. He stated that the tower was elegant and well proportioned and was a good example of a modern movement of architecture. The sketched proposals before the Sub-Committee were not dynamic or of sufficient quality.

Mr Weeks, representing the City of Winchester Residents' Association, stated that there was support for the demolition and redevelopment of the site. The site capacity was an issue. Three hundred units in four to five storey blocks would have an effect on views. 269 units to be one and two bedroom flats was inappropriate to housing need as there was a greater need for family homes within the area. A play area had been provided for children but there was no community use and the predominance of one and two bedroom flats could result in a lack of children on the site to utilise the play equipment. There were no garden areas and no natural life retained that could be enhanced. The site would be cramped and a less dense development would be welcomed. He also questioned whether the demolition and relocation of Police Headquarters would be more financially beneficial to the Police Authority over the costs associated with the refurbishment of the present Police Headquarters building.

Mrs K Mackintosh, a resident of West End Terrace, commented on the point taken to assess height for the proposed development. She also encouraged the control on limitation of cars on the site and suggested that a car pool scheme could be utilised within the development. She commented on the public open space created by the blocks of development which had not been treated with sensitivity or regard. In many cases the open spaces would be filled with car parking. The communications mast would be also very prominent and she asked if there a possibility to absorb it within the tallest part of the new development.

Mr N Meeson, of 1 Step Terrace, spoke in favour of retaining the existing Police Headquarters building and having it re-clad. He was in favour of the Police being accommodated within the present site rather than having to relocate. The site presented a major local employment opportunity and it would be a loss to the town if the Police moved out. He also expressed concerns at the height of the proposed buildings and car parking issues. Although supporting the single access to Romsey Road, he concluded that in terms of site capacity the scheme represented over-development and was out of proportion to the surrounding character of the area.

In response to the points raised, Mrs Wells stated that in terms of height, although the block opposite West End Terrace would be elevated, it would be set thirty metres

back from the present development. With regard to costs, the expense of finding a new headquarters for the Police within Hampshire was significant. The proposals for relocation were intended to be cost neutral, whereas the cost of refurbishing the existing building would be at additional cost to the Police Authority, including an estimate £3-4m to decant existing staff while a refurbishment took place.

Mrs Wells continued that with regard to the communications mast, its relocation on top of the highest building within the new development would be a sensible approach. However, for the development to proceed, it was for the Police to guarantee that alternative provision could be made, and this could not be achieved unless a separate parcel of land was retained on which a communications mast could be erected. However, if a successful scheme was achieved then a developer could be encouraged to take this approach.

The point on the relocation of employment was noted but the Council's Local Plan policies encouraged residential development of this site together with high density development. In terms of parking the calculation on provision took into consideration visitor car parking, therefore effectively provision was below one per dwelling. It was envisaged that for example in the affordable housing element, uptake on car parking provision would be below one per unit. If the site was not sustainable then five hundred car parking spaces would need to be provided.

The applicant had negotiated with the City Council the removal of one copper beech tree which was in a healthy condition. In the overall context of the development of the scheme this had been acceptable.

Mr Hearn added that negotiations with the applicant would continue and there would be an opportunity for further public participation as the scheme progressed. The detailed scheme, when submitted, would also need to come to Committee, and there would be a requirement for details in compliance at the outline stage.

In answer to Members' questions, Mr Hearn stated that the matters for determination by the Sub-Committee were the capacity of the site, that is whether three hundred units was appropriate, and the principle of a single access from Romsey Road. It was acknowledged that there were problems in the relationship of the proposals with West End Terrace, but a proper assessment could not be made as only sections had been submitted at present. Further detail was also required on crucial issues, for example to assess the development's setting with respect to viewpoints around Winchester and to assess relationships with surrounding development.

Mr Hearn explained that the Council had refused the application for re-cladding of the existing Police Headquarters building and this was subject to appeal. Subsequently, the City Council had assisted the applicant in trying to find a solution, and this included encouragement towards a higher density residential development on the site. Consideration needed to take place on the urban grain of development around the site, including Step Terrace and West End Terrace. This had led to a hard urban development of a high density, with streets and enclosures, which had been supported in its approach by the Council's urban design consultants, The Matrix Partnership.

Mr Brady from the Matrix Partnership added that the applicant had been encouraged to look at similar schemes within the town where five and six storey development had taken place, such as Northgate House at Staple Gardens and St Paul's. However, it

was for the developer to show that the height of the block and the density of development would work.

Mr Dimon explained that the area of the site was actually 2.33 hectares and not 2.44 hectares as stated in the report. This resulted in a density of 129 units per hectare and not 123 as stated. The height of the communications mast was yet to be assessed. Mr Jenkins added that the local planning authority could not insist that the applicant run a car club with pool cars on the site. However, if the applicant was willing to negotiate on this point then the County Council could provide advice.

It was also noted that other issues on the site such as layout in relation to existing landscaping including the trees and the positioning of affordable housing within the site were all subject to further negotiation.

During debate, Members commented that further detail was required before a decision on a suitable capacity for the site and acceptance of a single access from Romsey Road could be properly assessed. The detail of the scheme was vitally important and could be a lot different if the scheme was sold by the Police to a third party developer, as was intended. There were positives in the scheme, such as the provision of affordable housing close to the town, but questions such as the relationship of development with trees on the site and the effect on Winchester's skyline, space between development and the ration of car parking provision for the number of units proposed, together with effects on the Conservation Area all required further detail.

In conclusion, the Sub-Committee was appreciative of the difficulties that development of the site and options for the future location of a Police Headquarters presented to the applicant. It was an important decision for Winchester as a whole, both in terms of employment and residential provision. Members encouraged continuing dialogue between the applicant and its officers in order that the opportunity that the proposals presented could be fully embraced. The objective was to provide a development of which all parties could be proud and this would require careful consideration due to the sensitivity of the site. Therefore, after debate, the recommendation to defer for further negotiation was supported by the Sub-Committee.

RECOMMENDED:

That the application to demolish all existing buildings and provide residential redevelopment (outline) (W04090/19) be deferred for further negotiation.

The meeting commenced at 2.30 pm and concluded at 5.25 pm.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**17 June 2005****Attendance:**

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter
Davies (P)Bennetts (P)
Beveridge (P)**Others in Attendance who Addressed the Meeting:**

Councillors Johnston and Steel

Officers in Attendance:Mr J Hearn: Planning Team Manager
Ms L Hutchings: Planning Officer**249. DEVELOPMENT OF 2 NO. TWO BEDROOM AND 1 NO. THREE BEDROOM COTTAGES WITH EXTENSION AND ALTERATION TO EXISTING BARN TO PROVIDE GARAGING; RE-PROVISION OF CAR PARKING (AMENDED DESCRIPTION): THE DOWER HOUSE, SPRINGVALE ROAD, HEADBOURNE WORTHY, WINCHESTER**

The Sub-Committee met at the application site to consider the proposals. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Councillor Steel (as Ward Member), County Councillor Porter, Councillor Johnston, the applicant (Mrs Lywood) and her agent (Mr Smallman of Drewett Neatt) and approximately ten local residents.

Ms Hutchings explained that the Viewing Sub-Committee had been formed following consideration of the application at the Planning Development Control Committee on 25 May 2005. The application sought to develop three cottages (1 no. three bedroom and 2 no. two bedroom) within the grounds of The Dower House residential home for the elderly in Headbourne Worthy. The proposed dwellings had rendered elevations with stone cornering, pyramid-style slate roofs and timber windows. Each of the three dwellings would be effectively split into two separate two-storey square buildings joined by flat roofed two storey link. The architect, Huw Thomas, had split the design so as to reduce the appearance of the buildings' bulk. Members also noted that none of the proposed properties would feature a private garden.

The site contained a significant change in levels rising away from the Springvale Road frontage and that part of one and all of the other two proposed developments would be cut into the bank between an existing row of residential flats and the road.

The Sub-Committee noted that most of the significant trees on the site carried tree preservation orders and Ms Hutchings confirmed that the development did not propose that any trees should be felled. Furthermore, a condition of the recommendation stipulated that the trees would be properly protected during the construction process.

Members also noted that the proposed development would be partly built on an existing car park and that this car park would be re-located to a new site, nearer the Dower House. The application also sought the slight re-positioning of the existing wooden barn, associated with the Dower House.

Access to the Dower House and two of the three new proposed properties would be achieved through re-opening an access onto Springvale Road and it was noted the Engineers had raised no objection to these proposals.

With regard to the site's history, Members noted that three previous applications to develop dwellings in the grounds had been refused as they had not adequately taken account of the site constraints and the tree belt. One of the refusals had been taken to appeal, where the Inspector had upheld the decision as he considered the proposed buildings to be too large and detrimental to the character of the area and because of the need to retain the tree belt. However, Ms Hutchings underlined that the Inspector had approved the principle of the development.

In response to questions, Ms Hutchings clarified that the current application differed from the previous in that size of the proposed dwellings had been reduced, there was greater protection of the trees and less encroachment into the bank.

It was explained that the site had been subject to a Local Authority Section 52 legal agreement. Signed in February 1980, this agreement related to the occupation of the dwelling and set out an area that should be retained as amenity space which included the area proposed for development. However, Mr Hearn explained that subsequent developments had been permitted through variations in the agreement. He added that in considering the recent appeal, the Planning Inspector had concluded that, given that the site fell within the development boundary of Headbourne Worthy, the introduction of Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 and that it had been identified in the Urban Capacity Study, the existence of this legal agreement was not an over-riding factor. Legal advice had recommended that if the application were approved the developer would need to seek a variation in the Agreement before works began.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Steel (as the Ward Member) raised concerns regarding the status of the 1980 legal agreement, and the access arrangements. County Councillor Porter questioned the character of the development. In response, Mr Smallman explained that there was no one single or strong architectural theme on the site which had freed the architect to develop a design which they considered to be unobtrusive, modern and attractive.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mrs Lywood explained that the proposed dwellings would be sold to families (one of whom must be 55 years or older) and who, she envisaged, could have an interest in using the residential care facilities of Dower House.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a number of Dower House residents spoke against the proposals. In summary, they raised concerns regarding loss of light, loss of view,

massing, and proximity to the existing properties. Mr Robson (a solicitor acting on behalf of one of the residents) explained that it had been assumed that the legal agreement would protect the open space and that the proposed development would adversely effect the residents' enjoyment of their properties. He added that the residents' age and lack of mobility accentuated this problem and that the proposals were an over-development of the site. He added that disturbance caused during the construction period was likely to cause an additional stress.

During the debate on these concerns, Mr Hearn explained that the proposed dwellings would be between 17 – 22 metres from the existing flats and, at its closest, 2.3metres from the hedgerow between the proposed and existing buildings. It was noted that the rear elevations of the proposed buildings, facing the existing flats, had no windows at the first floor level so as to prevent overlooking.

With regard to the concern of the loss of views, Mr Hearn explained that this was not a material planning consideration and Members noted that because of the considerable separation between the buildings and the pyramid design of their roofs, glimpses of the view of the field opposite were likely to remain.

In response to concerns regarding the size of the dwellings, Mrs Lywood confirmed that the buildings had been designed to accommodate wheelchair users and so that the downstairs studies could be easily converted into a bedroom.

At the conclusion of the debate, whilst Members were sympathetic to the concerns raised by the residents they agreed with the officers' recommendation that there were no sustainable planning reasons to refuse the application. However, Members also agreed that a suitable additional condition should be included to restrict the construction hours of the development and that the Committee should receive further legal advice regarding the Section 52 Legal Agreement to prevent any delay during the construction.

RECOMMENDED:

That permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

01 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.

01 Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

02 No development shall take place until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwellings hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

02 Reason: To ensure that the development presents a satisfactory appearance in the interests of the amenities of the area.

03 The existing trees shown as being retained on the approved plan shall not be lopped, topped, felled or uprooted without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. These trees shall be protected during building

operations by the erection of fencing in accordance with details specified within Barrell Tree cares report ref: 5017-AIA-MW and plan BT1 and in accordance with BS 5837, before development commences.

03 Reason: To retain and protect the trees which form an important part of the visual amenity of the area.

04 The Local Authority Arboricultural Officer shall be contacted once the protective fencing measures are in place prior to the commencement of development of the site on 01962 848102.

04 Reason: To ensure that the trees are adequately protected.

05 No development shall take place until details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include the following, as relevant:

05 - means of enclosure, including any retaining structures:

05 - hard surfacing materials:

05 - minor artefacts and structures (eg. street furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc):

05 - planting plans:

05 - written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment:

05 - schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate:

05 - implementation programme:

05 Reason: To improve the appearance of the site in the interests of visual amenity.

06 All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out before the use hereby permitted is commenced and prior to the completion of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed with the Local Planning Authority. If within a period of five years after planting any tree or plant is removed, dies or becomes, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged, defective or diseased another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally approved shall be planted at the same place, within the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

06 Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscape in accordance with the approved designs.

07 A landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, specifically the woodland area to the front of the site, shall be submitted

to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the development or any phase of the development, whichever is the sooner, for its permitted use. The landscape management plan shall be carried out in accordance with the details hereby approved.

07 Reason: To ensure that due regard is paid to the continuing enhancement and maintenance of amenity afforded by landscape features of communal, public, nature conservation and historic significance.

08 No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the buildings are occupied. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

08 Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

09 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Classes A, B, C, E of Parts 1 of Schedule 2 of the Order, shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

09 Reason: To protect the amenities of the locality and to maintain a good quality environment.

10 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order, with or without modification), no windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall, at any time, be constructed in the east elevation(s) of dwellings hereby permitted.

10 Reason: To protect the amenity and privacy of the adjoining residential properties.

11 Details of provisions to be made for the parking and turning on site of operative and construction vehicles during the period of development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and fully implemented before development commences. Such measures shall be retained for the construction period.

11 Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

12 The parking area including the garage shall be provided in accordance with the approved plans before the dwelling is first occupied and thereafter permanently retained and used only for the purpose of accommodating private motor vehicles or other storage purposes incidental to the use of the dwelling house as a residence.

12 Reason: To ensure the permanent availability of parking for the property.

13 Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage shall be passed through an oil bypass interceptor designed and constructed to have a capacity and details

compatible with the site being drained. Roof water shall not pass through the interceptor.

13 Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment.

14 The method of demolition and construction for the development shall be carried out in accordance with a scheme to be approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to any development commencing.

14 Reason: The site is in a very sensitive location with respect to groundwater and in order to protect the quality of drinking water supplies the working methods will need to be carefully considered.

15 No development shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision of a surface water regulation system is designed and implemented to the satisfaction of the planning authority and supported by detailed calculations. The regulation system for the site must ensure that the runoff from the 1% probability storm is controlled and will restrict the outflow to that which would have occurred had the site been a green field. The scheme shall include a maintenance programme and establish ownership of the storage system for the future.

15 Reason: To prevent flooding and ensure future maintenance.

16 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no dwelling hereby permitted shall be used otherwise than to provide residential accommodation for persons where at least one member of the household is aged fifty five (55) or over (the "specified age") save that such restriction shall not apply to the continued occupation of any of the dwellings by a surviving spouse or partner or member of the household under the specified age after the death of the member of the household who was of the specified age.

16 Reason: To ensure that the development is retained in the terms of the application as housing for the elderly in the interests of the amenities of the area and as the floor area proposed for the small dwellings hereby permitted would otherwise not have been allowed.

17 All work relating to the development hereby approved, including works of demolition or preparation prior to operations, shall only take place between the hours of 0800 and 1800 Monday to Friday and 0800 and 1300 Saturdays and at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining properties during the construction period.

Informatives

01. This permission is granted for the following reasons:

The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB3, H7, E6, E16.

Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: H1, H7, EN1, EN4, EN5, EN8, T9.

Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: H2, H7, DP1, DP3, DP4, DP5, T1.

03. If dewatering of the site and discharge of associated water is necessary during construction operations, the Environment Agency should be notified regarding the dewatering and consulted regarding the need for discharge consent.

04. Any watercourse within a development should have ownership fully resolved before work commences, this is to ensure that during development and in the future any problems can be resolved quickly. Upon completion of the development, riparian owners must be informed of their rights and responsibilities particularly regarding future maintenance, to prevent the situation arising where no-one admits to owning a watercourse with subsequent maintenance problems.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 11.20am.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (CHILBOLTON AVENUE) SUB-COMMITTEE**30 June 2005**Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Bennetts (P)
 Beveridge (P)
 Chapman (P)
 Davies (P)

Jefferies (P)
 Johnston (P)
 Mitchell (P)
 Pearson (P)

Others in attendance:

Councillors Pearce and Saunders

Officers in attendance:

Mr J Hearn (Team Manager Planning)
 Mrs S Leonard (Planning Officer)
 Mr N Culhane (Traffic Engineer)
 Mr N Baldwin (Enabling Officer)
 Mr S Dunbar-Dempsey (Landscape Officer)

250. **ERECTION OF 49 DWELLINGS COMPRISING 5 ONE BEDROOM, 26 TWO BEDROOM, 11 THREE BEDROOM AND 7 FOUR BEDROOM DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND NEW ACCESS FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING PROPERTIES ON LAND AT 1-7 CHILBOLTON AVENUE, WINCHESTER**
 (Report PDC566 refers)

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting 11 members of the public together with the applicant, Mrs A Hauser.

In introducing the proposals, Mrs Leonard and Mr Hearn reminded Members that amended plans had been submitted by the developer following consideration of the original application by the Sub-Committee on 28 February 2005 (report PDC514 and minutes PDC524 refer).

The submission of the amended plans had followed consultation and negotiations with relevant officers regarding the issues relating to: highways, landscaping and trees, residential amenities and affordable housing. Hampshire County Council's Highway's Department had submitted a detailed response to the amended plans but had been unable to have a representative at the meeting.

Mr Baldwin stated that he was satisfied with the positioning of the affordable housing on site and that a suitable mix of tenure for the two and three bedroom apartments would be negotiated in due course. A Member questioned why affordable housing could not be provided in the town houses on site, as the plans indicated that the square footage of the town houses was significantly more than that of the three bedroom apartments. Mr Baldwin advised that colleagues in the Strategic Housing Section had indicated that three storey townhouses were generally not popular with young families.

Following further discussion, Mr Hearn advised that the provision of private space associated with the affordable housing blocks could be delineated by a form of boundary treatment and that this could be considered as part of the landscaping scheme.

Mr Culhane referred to the previous concerns of the Sub-Committee regarding traffic distribution at peak periods, particularly at the junction of Sarum Road and Chilbolton Avenue. He advised that Hampshire County Council had undertaken a recent monitoring exercise that had concluded that there would only be a modest increase in traffic movements and that therefore no objection was raised. He also reported that officers were satisfied with the proposed positioning of the two pedestrian refuges on Chilbolton Avenue and that an additional five pedestrian refuges were now to be funded by the applicant.

Mr Culhane responded to a number of further questions regarding highway matters. Members were advised that the amended plans made provision for possible future integration with a neighbouring site at 9 Chilbolton Avenue. Mr Culhane reported that he was satisfied with the provision and positioning of turning-space for service vehicles. He also clarified that a site management company would enforce parking on-site and that this could be controlled by condition. The potential for the future signalisation of the junction at Sarum Road would be secured by the safeguarding of land by the County Council for its installation and this would be specified within the conditions of the application.

Mr Culhane also advised that the applicant was to contribute £135,000 (via a Section 106 agreement) for wider transport and highway improvements within the vicinity of, and associated with, the application area. Other off-site highway improvements would be funded and implemented by the developer under supervision from Hampshire County Council and secured by a Section 278 Agreement that would determine that the works would need to be completed prior to occupation of the new dwellings.

A Member expressed concern at the positioning of the affordable housing block adjacent to the Sarum Road access with regard to the safety of children and other pedestrians. Although there was no specific demarcation for pedestrians, Members were generally satisfied that designated shared-surface areas on-site would generate low speeds and that the majority of parking would be underground.

Mr Hearn also drew Members' attention to the curtilage of the dwelling blocks as shown on the plans as well as the provision of open space and a play area. Mr Hearn suggested that fenced open space (in addition to the play area) could be considered as part of the landscape proposals for the site at a later date.

Referring to the Chilbolton Avenue Local Area Design Statement, Mr Hearn clarified that once finalised, the document would form supplementary planning guidance. However, in the meantime, submitted planning applications for the area should be determined in accordance with present policies.

Mr Hearn advised that the architecture and urban design of the proposals was satisfactory and that detail of materials such as quality traditional brick, stone and slate (as shown on the drawings of the submitted application) would be controlled by condition. Officers were satisfied that architecturally there was no difference between the private and the affordable units.

Mr Dunbar-Dempsey reported that the amended plans addressed the previous concerns regarding landscaping and trees on site. He clarified that landscaping along the existing boundary with Winchester Golf Course to screen long distance views of the site would be by the planting of native trees to supplement existing mature trees.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mrs Hauser addressed the Sub-Committee. She commented on some of the points raised during discussion of the amended plans including safety of pedestrians on-site, particularly children. She clarified that the town houses would be accessed by the shared surface road by means of an electronic control barrier to be policed by the site management company. The basement parking would also be barrier controlled and therefore not accessible to children. The play area and other open spaces were located towards the middle of the site to allow access to children from throughout the development.

Mrs Hauser detailed proposals for a management company to maintain the open space, trees, lifts, and also to deal with parking matters. Both leaseholders and Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) normally contributed to the funding of such schemes. She advised that lifts were generally not favoured by RSLs and therefore had not been proposed for the three storey apartment blocks.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Pearce addressed the Sub-Committee as a Ward Member. In summary, he advised that he still had concerns regarding highway matters, particularly the increased traffic movements at the junctions with Sarum Road and Chilbolton Avenue. He also still considered that the proposals represented an over-development of the site.

Following debate, the Sub-Committee recommended the application be approved subject to the addressing of the matters raised as detailed above and as highlighted by officers. In particular, the recommendation should specify the requirement for a Section 278 Agreement for an off-site highway work programme and a timetable for its implementation. The conditions should also specify a requirement for a contribution of £45,229 towards the provision of public open space *and its fencing*. In addition it should be specified that legal agreements should secure the on-site public open space, including the play area, and its future maintenance *including the design of the play area and its future maintenance and management*.

RECOMMENDED:

THAT PROVIDED APPROPRIATE LEGAL AGREEMENTS ARE ENTERED INTO WITH:

(A) HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO SECURE:

- A contribution of £135,000 towards an off-site highway improvement programme and the agreement of a timetable for its implementation

(B) WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL TO SECURE:

- Provision of affordable housing (15 units)
- Contribution of £45,229 towards the provision of public open space and its fencing
- Provision of on-site public open space, including a LAP play area, and its design and future maintenance and management
- The provision of a free 6-month bus pass for each new dwelling

THEN PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:-

(Note: If the legal agreements are not completed within 6 months then the application may be refused without further reference to committee)

Conditions/Reasons

01 The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiry of 5 years from the date of this permission or before the expiration of 2 years from the date of approval of the last reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

01 Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

02 No development shall take place until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

02 Reason: To ensure that the development presents a satisfactory appearance in the interests of the amenities of the area.

03 No development shall take place until fully annotated elevations and sections at a scale 1:20 showing the following details: all windows and all doors; rainwater goods; eaves; ridges; chimneys; window cills; window heads; door heads; roof lights; dormer windows; balconies; brick detailing; porches; garden gates, walls and fences; steps; have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with approved details before the dwellings are occupied.

03 Reason: To ensure that the development presents a satisfactory appearance in the interests of the amenities of the area

04 Details of measures to be taken to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site during construction works being deposited on the public highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and fully implemented before development commences. Such measures shall be retained for the duration of the construction period. No lorry shall leave the site unless its wheels have been cleaned sufficiently to prevent mud being carried onto the highway.

04 Reason: In the interests of highway safety

05 Details of provisions to be made for the parking and turning on site of operative and construction vehicles during the period of development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and fully implemented before development commences. Such measures shall be retained for the construction period.

05 Reason: In the interests of highway safety

06 Before the development hereby approved is first brought into use, the access shall be constructed with a non-migratory surfacing material for a minimum distance of 15.0 metres from the highway boundary.

06 Reason: In the interests of highway safety

07 The existing accesses to the site shall be stopped up and abandoned and the footway crossings shall be reinstated to the requirements of the Local Planning Authority, immediately after the completion of the new access hereby approved and before the new access is first brought into use.

07 Reason: In the interests of highway safety

08 Prior to the completion of development a cut off drain shall be provided to prevent the egress of surface water onto the public highway.

08 Reason: In the interests of highway safety

09 Before the development hereby approved is first brought into use, a turning space shall be provided within the site to enable vehicles using the site to enter and leave in a forward gear. The turning space shall be retained and kept available for such purposes at all times.

09 Reason: In the interests of highway safety

10 The parking areas shall be provided in accordance with the approved plans before the dwellings are first occupied and thereafter permanently retained and used only for the purpose of accommodating private motor vehicles or other storage purposes incidental to the use of the dwellings as residences

10 Reason: To ensure the permanent availability of parking for the properties

11 Details of the car parking management company an scheme shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, prior to first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved and the parking shall,

thereafter, be managed in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

11 Reason: In the interests of highway safety

12 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Classes A, B, C, D and E, other than small garden sheds, which are no greater than 12 square metres floor area measured externally and no greater than 2.5 metres in height, of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Order, shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority

12 Reason: To protect the amenities of the locality and maintain a good quality environment

13 No development shall take place until details of any electricity sub station or gas governor has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before the dwellings are occupied.

13 To improve the appearance of the site in the interests of visual amenity

14 Details of the proposed bin and cycle stores shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before the development hereby permitted is commenced. The provision shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details before the dwellings are occupied

14 Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the locality

15 Detailed proposals for the disposal of foul and surface water shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, before commencement of the development. The approved details shall be fully implemented before the dwellings hereby approved are occupied.

15 Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment

16 A detailed scheme for landscaping, tree and/or shrub planting and boundary treatment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The scheme shall specify species, density, planting, size and layout. The scheme approved shall be carried out in the first planting season following the occupation of the building or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. If within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, any trees, shrubs or plants die, are removed or, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or defective, others of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, in the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

16 Reason: To improve the appearance of the site in the interests of visual amenity.

17 No development shall take place until a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of 5 years has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The schedule shall

include details of the arrangements for its implementation. Landscape maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.

17 Reason: To ensure that due regard is paid to the continuing enhancement and maintenance of amenity afforded by landscape features of communal and public interest

18 The existing trees shown as being retained on the approved plan shall not be lopped, topped, felled or uprooted without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. These trees shall be protected during building operations by the erection of protective fencing in accordance with BS 5837

18 Reason: To retain and protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the area

19 No development, or works of site preparation or clearance, shall take place until details, including plans and cross sections of the existing and proposed ground levels of the development, levels at the boundaries of the site, ground levels adjacent to existing vegetation to be retained, and the height of the ground floor slab and damp proof course in relation thereto, have been submitted to and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority

19 Reason: To ensure a satisfactory relationship between the new development and adjacent buildings, amenity areas and trees

20 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that order, with or without modification) no further first floor or second floor level windows, other than those permitted as part of this approval, shall, at any time, be constructed in the west side elevation of Pelham House, the south side elevation of the townhouse adjacent to Pheasants Way, the north side elevation of Elm House and the north side elevation of the townhouse adjacent to no. 9 Chilbolton Avenue, without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

20 Reason: To protect the amenity and privacy of the adjoining residential properties

Informatives

01 This permission is granted for the following reasons:

The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), planning permission should therefore be granted

02 The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB1, UB3, T4, T5, T6, H1, H2, H7, H8, R2, E6, E8, E19

Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: H.1, H.5, H.7, RT.3, RT.6, T.8, T.9, T.11, EN.1, EN.5, EN.7, EN.8, EN.9, EN.13, W.1, W.27, W.29

Emerging Development Plan – WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: H.2, H.5, H.7, RD06.17, RD06.23, RT.3, T.1, T.2, T.3, T.4, T.5, T.8, W.1, W.6, DP.1, DP.3, DP.5, DP.6, DP.10, DP.11, DP.12

03 All work relating to the development hereby approved, including works of demolition, or preparation prior to operations, should only take place between the hours of 0800 – 1800 Monday to Friday and 0800 – 1300 Saturdays and at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays. Where allegations of noise from such works are substantiated by the Health and Housing Service, a Notice limiting the hours of operation under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 may be served

04 No materials should be burnt on site. Where the Health and Housing Service substantiate allegations of statutory nuisance, an Abatement Notice may be served under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The applicant is reminded that the emission of dark smoke through the burning of materials is a direct offence under the Clean Air Act 1993

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 11.50am

Chairman