

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

Winchester City Council  
Planning Department  
Development Control

TEAM MANAGER  
SIGN OFF SHEET

## Committee Decision

<b>Case No:</b>	06/02931/FUL	<b>Valid Date</b>	21 September 2006
<b>W No:</b>	06883/19	<b>Recommendation Date</b>	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Mr Dave Dimon	<b>8 Week Date</b>	<b>16 November 2006</b>
		<b>Committee date</b>	<b>21 December 2006</b>
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>Application be REFUSED</b>	<b>Decision:</b>	<b>Committee Decision</b>

<b>Proposal:</b>	Demolition of industrial buildings; de-contamination of site; construction of 10 no three and 8 no two bedroom live-work units comprising class B1 industrial accommodation and ancillary residential; re-landscaping of site including relocation of principal vehicle entrance
------------------	--

<b>Site:</b>	Old Park Wood Industrial Estate Old Park Road Bishops Sutton Hampshire
--------------	--

Open Space Y/N	Legal Agreement	S.O.S	Objections	EIA Development	Monitoring Code	Previous Developed Land
OS	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N

### DELEGATED ITEM SIGN OFF

<b>APPROVE</b> Subject to the condition(s) listed	<b>REFUSE</b> for the reason(s) listed	
	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>		
<b>TEAM MANAGER</b>		

**AMENDED PLANS DATE:- 6/12/06**

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

**Item No:** 01  
**Case No:** 06/02931/FUL / W06883/19  
**Proposal Description:** Demolition of industrial buildings; de-contamination of site; construction of 10 no three and 8 no two bedroom live-work units comprising class B1 industrial accommodation and ancillary residential; re landscaping of site including relocation of principal vehicle entrance  
**Address:** Old Park Wood Industrial Estate Old Park Road Bishops Sutton Hampshire  
**Parish/Ward:** Bishops Sutton  
**Applicants Name:** Mr D M Docherty  
**Case Officer:** Mr Dave Dimon  
**Date Valid:** 21 September 2006  
**Site Factors:** Site for Nature Conservation  
**Recommendation:** REFUSE

### General Comments

This application is reported to Committee at the request of Bishops Sutton Parish Council, whose request is appended in full to this report. Additionally it is a departure from the provisions of the development plan and is for major development.

Amended plans received 6-12-06 have made the following changes: Revised layout providing for improved landscaping to northern boundary, provision of tennis court and adjustment to allotments design including provision of access to service central area and addition of implement stores, also omission of previously shown greenhouses and chicken coup, provision of play area and terracing of levels change in place of previous retaining wall.

### Site Description

The site is in the countryside and extends to about 1.33 hectares. It is situated midway between the A31 and A272 roads approximately 3 kilometres south east of Bishops Sutton and is in an isolated rural location adjacent the C127 Old Park Road with arable farmland to the north and west and woodland to the south. There are currently two large industrial buildings on the site plus various ancillary outbuildings and areas of outside storage. The nearest dwelling lies 300m to the south beyond Old Park Wood and thereafter is Bramdean Common which is in the AONB and around which there is a scatter of dwellings.

Physically the site has been cut into the contours from Old Park Road and it comprises two different levels with the southern end being nearly three metres higher than the northern end. Some tree planting exists along the northern boundary and there are more mature trees, which are an important feature of the site, along the eastern roadside boundary but otherwise there are no trees within the main body of the site. The eastern side of Old Park Road is also defined by a belt of trees opposite the application site and beyond which is further arable farmland.

The site is visually unattractive and incongruous in the local sense due to the type of use, appearance of the buildings and extent of open storage, set as it is within an otherwise attractive area of countryside, but it is something that one comes upon when travelling along Old Park Road rather than being visible from a wide area.

The nature of the uses that have operated at the site over many years have also resulted in a

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

significant level of contamination.

### Proposal

The proposal is for total redevelopment of the site to provide 18 live/work units set around a central landscaped square on three sides and includes various features to create a sustainable environment, including the provision of allotments, greenhouses and energy conservation aspects.

The dwellings are arranged in 3 terraces plus a separate pair providing 10 x 3 bed dwellings of 180 sq m GIA with 49sq m of work space and 8 x 2 bed dwellings of 120 sq m GIA with 47.5 sq m of work space. Overall the density of the site is 13.77 dph.

The dwellings are of contemporary design with metal standing seam and mono pitched roofs incorporating solar panels and partly 'green' roofs and with striking wind cowl features, while elevations are of glass, render and timber weather boarding.

### Relevant Planning History

- W6883/06** Use of factory to galvanising plant:- REFUSED 27-03-86.  
**Appeal dismissed 27-02-87.**
- W6883/07** Light industrial building:- REFUSED 23-06-86. **Appeal dismissed 16-02-87.**
- W6883/08** Change of use of factory to galvanising plant:- REFUSED 28-07-86.
- W6883/09** Change of use from unused land to open storage area:-  
REFUSED 03-11-86. **Appeal dismissed 09-07-87.**
- W6883/10** Construction of light industrial building:-  
REFUSED 17-06-87. **Appeal dismissed 22-07-88.**
- W6883/12** Three 2 storey blocks of B1/B2 accommodation:- REFUSED 03-01-90.
- W6883/13** 12 dwellings and vehicular access. (OUTLINE) (Departure):-  
REFUSED 04-01-90.
- W6883/14** Construction of light industrial units (B1), car parking and associated landscaping (OUTLINE) (Departure):- REFUSED 22-5-98.
- W6883/15** Construction of general industrial units (B2), with car parking and associated landscaping (OUTLINE) (Departure):- REFUSED 6-12-99.
- W6883/16** (AMENDED DESCRIPTION) Change of use of Nissen Hut building from B8 Storage and Distribution to B2 General Industrial:- GRANTED 03.02.2000
- W6883/17** 2 No: five bedroom houses, triple garages and studio over, 2 No: five bedroom houses, triple garage and one garage/workshop and 2 No. four bedroom houses, triple garages and studio over, landscaping and alterations to existing accesses  
REFUSED 01.02.2001 **Appeal dismissed 06-01-03**
- W6883/18** Residential development comprising 9 no dwellings: Old Park Wood Industrial Estate, Old Park Road, Bishops Sutton:- REFUSED 31.08.2001 **Appeal dismissed 06-01-03**

### Consultations

#### Engineers: Drainage:

No objection subject to the EA giving discharge consent, details of the treatment plant to be installed and the position and size of the drainage field being submitted for approval and Building Regs being granted.

#### Southern Water:

No adverse comments on the application.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

Engineers: Highways:

Old Park Wood Road is classified (C127) and runs north/south between the A31 and A272. The road is rural in character with no pedestrian footways or street lighting and the site is not conveniently located to any residential settlements or close to any significant facilities or services. There are no nearby bus services, which make the site wholly reliant on private cars, and having regard to the TRICS database it is concluded that the proposed development will generate significantly more traffic than the existing use.

The Transport Assessment makes no reference to any forms of sustainable transport but merely compares the possible (but not actual) current traffic generation with the possible maximum generation from the new development. Car parking is also provided at a very high level (3 spaces per unit), which affirms the schemes reliance on private cars.

To enable the development to be a 'sustainable' one it should have regard to all modes of sustainable transport, including buses, walking and cycling and be in a position to demonstrate that access to a range of goods and services, facilities (health, education, employment, retail and leisure) can be achieved by sustainable modes. To be able to demonstrate such non-car sustainable modes the plans should include proposals for 'best practice' in terms of sustainable car based transport. Car access should be provided on a 'shared-basis' both in terms of parking and use. This should be based on a car club providing 'eco friendly' vehicles. Without such provision being secured by a legal agreement the development should be considered non-sustainable in transport terms.

Additionally the visibility splays shown on the supporting plans, which are not to a recognised scale, appear to be inadequate.

Highway reasons for refusal RRH101 (see reason 4 sight lines) and RRH115 (see reason 5 location).

NB. At The time of writing this report the applicant was pursuing discussions with the Engineers to try and address these concerns.

Environmental Protection:

Has some concerns re contamination issues on the site, which are highlighted in the risk assessment, but are satisfied that these can be adequately dealt with through conditions if consent is granted. Therefore condition and informatives are recommended.

Environment Agency:

EA fully supports development that aims to achieve high quality sustainable development and welcomes the detail in which the application considers various forms of energy and resource efficient designs. No objection raised subject to a number of conditions.

Strategic Planning:

The proposal conflicts with planning polices at various levels. The Local Plan Review is recently adopted and up to date and the scheme is in serious conflict with key aspects of its policies. Any 'other material considerations' would need to be very substantial in order to justify an exception to policy.

Strategic Housing

There will be an affordable housing requirement of 30%, which equates to 5.4 units. The Local Plan allows for an equivalent off site payment, which could be considered in rural areas that are unsustainable for affordable housing. The Housing Register does not record interest in residing in live / work affordable accommodation so the likely take up for such accommodation is unknown. However, the affordable housing element should be representative of the scheme as a whole and in this respect provide 2 three bedroom and 3 two-bedroom units to make up the

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

affordable housing, whether providing on site or taking a financial contribution for offsite provision.

Landscape:

Site lies just to the north of the AONB. It is fairly enclosed to the south and east by woodland and to the west by rising landform. However on approaching from the north the site is quite open despite some well-established vegetation. No tree survey has been provided but there are some significant trees to the boundaries and the re-positioning of the access could potentially affect trees along the road frontage. A tree survey and impact assessment should be carried out to assess any impact on existing trees.

Question whether a retaining wall between the upper and lower levels of the site is the best way of dealing with the levels differences, it could be a prominent feature if taken to a height to give privacy to the gardens of plots 1-6. A more natural change in levels and hedge planting would soften the visual impact of green houses etc.

There is little room for reinforcement of the planting to the northern, visually sensitive boundary. Plots 15-18 turn their backs on the large central area of open space and if turned around to face the green would allow a wider landscape strip along the northern boundary further re-enforced by landscaping within back gardens.

The layout of the allotments is questioned and the accessibility of the central space for maintenance. Would wish to see a management plan for the site for the shared maintenance areas. There are also some conflicts between the layout and landscape plans but the form of development being proposed is not objected to subject to further clarification on the above issues

Open Space

There is no shortfall of on-site useable play and general recreation open space but no specific play space is allocated on the "social open space" area. More detail of this space is therefore needed.

The sports component of the open space funding policy will need to be met by a financial contribution of £15,542.

Urban Design

The sustainable features of the scheme are commendable but need to be assured by condition or legal agreement to avoid cost cutting omission at implementation stage.

In urban design terms the schemes success or failure will depend on securing and enhancing the landscape framework. A tree survey is essential as buildings are in close proximity to trees and sight line requirements and levels changes may affect trees.

Important that landscape reinforcement of west, north and east boundaries is incorporated in the proposals. This should ensure that buildings, roof cowls and turbines are not seen as visually intrusive features that appear out of character with the area.

Retention of the abrupt step in the site levels is unfortunate and a more gradual change would be better visually and aid connectivity between the two parts of the site. The formality of the allotment design is unlikely to be appreciated from eye level and access to the central area needs to be provided for maintenance of the wind turbines. The closeness of allotments to the tall trees of Old Park Wood on the southern side could have an overshadowing affect. It is also unlikely that all households would use an allotment so allotment area could be provided according to demand with the space maintained as amenity area until required for allotment use, a less formal design approach might therefore be better. The central public open space should also have more thought and units 15-18 should be turned to face the open space.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

The contemporary architectural style, forms and terracing are supported but the overall tones of the materials need to be “quiet” and the appropriateness of render is questioned as is the sustainability of such extensive use of aluminium cladding.

Architects Panel

This is a secluded site, which has long been used for industrial use and is now very run down and contaminated. The south part of the site is higher than the northern area. The site has a history of unsuccessful appeals for intensification of industrial use. Subsequent housing applications were refused on grounds of being contrary to policy and not being sustainable. This proposal is for a series of live-work units to meet the sustainability argument. The design of the live-work buildings follows current good practice for low energy consumption and use of sustainable materials. The site is some distance from shops and schools.

The concept and design is to be applauded and policy should be relaxed to encourage its development. The siting of the allotments next to the shade of the woodland needs to be reconsidered. The alternative is to refurbish the buildings as small industrial units. The planning authority should be bold and see this scheme as an experiment that should be supported.

Crime Prevention Officer

Recommend that all parking be in view of windows of dwellings to provide security and lighting to BS 5489. The perimeter of the site other than the frontage to Old Park road should be planted to a thickness, height and type sufficient to stop people entering the site. Various upgrading of window and door locks and means of ensuring secure cycle storage and work space security recommended. No provision has been made for the secure storage of tools and equipment to be used on the allotments.

**Representations:**

Bramdean & Hinton Ampner Parish Council:

The proposal is innovative in design and concept, and as such, much more acceptable than previous plans. However, we are concerned as to who may be enticed into such house/units, and whether they will be fair rent or purchase. The Legal Agreement must be strictly controlled to prevent the 3-bed properties being converted to 5-beds. The change of site use will lower HGV movements but is likely to generate 54 extra cars using Wood Lane or the A31 access. Since the former is very narrow and already causing problems, this clearly needs to be addressed urgently.

The Parish Council would welcome technical confirmation that the “wind energy” on site will be sufficient to manage the ventilation requirements. It is surrounded on two sides by tall trees with a hill behind.

Bishops Sutton Parish Council

Requests, because of the extreme importance and impact this superb application has for our community, that it is judged on its merit by the planning committee, our elected representatives. A change of use on this site with the work/accommodation mix would bring about social and employment benefits to the local community.

Bishops Sutton Parish Council totally supports this application.

It is the most environmentally imaginative, and user-friendly scheme proposed over the last 30 years.

Proposals retain employment element and the live/work arrangement will reduce car journeys, which other uses could not. Decontamination of the site would be a permanent bonus especially as neighbouring properties draw their water from bore holes. The community has for at least 30 years sought to get the adverse impact of the present site use reduced, which

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

currently can be undertaken 24 hours a day 7 days a week. This may be the last opportunity to do so.

The site is not an ideal location for the sort of industrial use that the current situation permits and the planning committee is requested to support the change of use, which could possibly be an award winning scheme.

Winchester Ramblers

Object to the indiscriminate building of houses in the countryside, which should be preserved for farming, forestry and recreation.

2 letters received objecting to the application for the following reasons:

- No environmental impact assessment.
  - Proposal will introduce risk of trespass into woodland.
  - Proposal will have an adverse impact on amenity presently enjoyed.
  - Development proposed too large.
  - Highway safety concerns as traffic increase will be enormous.
  - Control of use in terms of nature and extent of commercial activity and conversely conversion to entirely residential use.
  - Water supply – existing properties are served by boreholes and additional development could adversely affect our water supply.
  - Question that the proposed development will be beneficial to local community – it may cause more problems than it solves for neighbours.
- 
- Adverse impact on existing business's operating from the site which will force them to relocate and could result in the need to close down
  - Tenant business has recently had lease renewed until 2008. Would purchase if landlord willing to sell.
  - 4 of the 5 existing staff are from local area.
  - The proposed development should be located close to existing settlement where people would have access to services.
  - The site could be made more attractive by improving the existing buildings.

Comment

- Pleased to see the environmental measures proposed but suggest that a biomass boiler district heating scheme be utilised in preference to a ground source heat pump Here you should include objections raised that are not material to planning, such as property value, race, competition. This was from someone promoting wood fuel in south east.

**Relevant Planning Policy:**

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review:

C1, C2, EC3, EC4, H8, H10, E3, E4, E7, T5, R2

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006

DP.1, DP.3, DP.5, DP.6, DP.9, DP.13, DP.15, CE.18, E.2, E.4, H.4, H.5, H.7, T.1, T.4, RT.4,

National Planning Policy Guidance/Statements:

PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS 3 Housing

PPS 7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

PPG 13 Transport

PPG 17 Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation

PPS 22 Renewable Energy

Other Planning guidance

Guide to the Open Space Funding System

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

Technical Paper: Open Space Provision and Funding  
Housing Monitoring Report  
Rural Housing Information Booklet

## Planning Considerations

Principle of development  
Sustainability  
Highways  
Affordable Housing,  
Design / layout  
Open Space  
Landscape  
Impact on character of area and neighbouring property

### Principle of development

This proposal is not provided for by the provisions of the development plan so must be considered to be a departure there from.

Occasionally developments are proposed which by their nature are unique and require special consideration. The present proposals arise as a result of various previous unsuccessful attempts to secure planning permission for redevelopment of the site either for industrial / business use or for residential and in response to the Inspectors comments on the last appeal. It also follows subsequent liaison with Bishops Sutton Parish Council, officers of WCC and a public meeting in May 2005 when 4 options were discussed. These options included, do nothing, commercial redevelopment, live/work units, housing and other options such as gypsy site, hotel / holiday /recreation / leisure use and equestrian centre. A vote was taken at the meeting, which resulted in a preference being expressed for housing and live/work units. The applicant chose to work up this scheme as being that which most closely met local and policy considerations.

As can be seen from the planning history there has been a succession of applications and dismissed appeals for different expansion / redevelopment proposals, the most recent being in January 2003 for two alternative residential schemes for 6 (W6883/17) and 9 (W6883/18) dwellings respectively.

The Inspector then identified the main issues as (a) the suitability of the proposal for the site having regard to local and national policies relating to housing in the countryside and the protection of employment land and (b) the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside. On the first point he concluded as follows:

*"I conclude on the first issue that the proposals would not be suitable for the site because of their conflict with policies C2 and H10 of the SP and proposals C1, C14, H3, and H7 of the LP, as well as with the Council's SPG and with advice in PPG3 and PPG7. Appeal A would also conflict with policy H8 of the SP and proposal H5 of the LP, because of the absence of affordable housing. I also conclude that problems caused by HGV traffic on local roads are not so overriding as to justify the loss of this employment site, and that the proposals would therefore be contrary to proposal E2 of the LP. However, even if the advantages of removing HGV traffic would warrant the loss of employment land, that would be outweighed by the unsuitability of these proposals for the site due to their conflict with housing and countryside policies."*

On the second point he concluded

*"that the proposal s would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside. They would therefore be contrary to policies C1 and UB3 of the SP and proposals C2, C7 and EN5 of the LP."*

The site does comprise previously developed land as defined in PPG3 (now PPS3) but its



WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

location is unrelated to any settlement and cannot be considered to be sustainable. Nonetheless the use of the site for B2 purposes is lawful and the buildings in which such use can occur extend to approximately 2,800 sq m, in addition to which there is a large area of external storage.

Replacement of the existing buildings on a like for like basis in terms of area could accord with the development plan provisions (policy CE.18 WDLPR) and PPS 7, however the cost of this has always been stated not to be viable having regard to the need to clean up the site which has a serious contamination issue as a result of the previous heavy metal processes that have occurred on parts of the site. The applicant has thus always sought to intensify the use to achieve viability but this has been resisted for countryside policy reasons, non-sustainability, visual impact and traffic issues.

This proposal therefore represents an attempt to find a viable form of re-development that will support the cleaning up of the site and address the sustainability concerns so far as is possible and retain employment use but minimise associated commercial traffic. It also does not increase the existing overall floor area being for a total of 2,760m<sup>2</sup> floor space, 31.5% of which would be work space.

The merits of the proposals are discussed in a comprehensive supporting statement, which includes an access and design statement, an architectural philosophy for the design, renewable energy proposals, landscape proposals, land contamination risk assessment and transport assessment. These are referred to further in the following sections of this report. Additionally a supporting report on the commercial property market in the area concludes that there is very limited demand for the present industrial accommodation on the site due to its location and the availability of better competing floorspace.

The concept is to produce a small community of people living and working on the site in small work areas that will be for B1 Use purposes i.e. uses that by their nature are compatible with residential. These will be largely office or research and development uses, but can include light industrial uses that do not involve any processes that would be detrimental to residential amenity due to noise, dust, smoke etc. The seclusion and isolation of the site offers the opportunity for a distinctive contemporary design that will reflect the low energy credentials of the scheme.

Although the application site has long been a problem site due to the nature of its use, its isolated location in the countryside and the inadequacies of the access roads to take the type and amount of traffic generated, it is not a site that is appropriate for residential development. The provision of residential development in the countryside, other than to meet essential agricultural and related needs and for essential affordable housing needs related to existing settlements, is contrary to the countryside policies of the development plan and to national policies set out in PPS1, PPS 3 and PPS7.

It is also clear from the history of the site that further expansion for commercial purposes is not appropriate and this view has been consistently supported at appeal in the case of previous applications for intensification of the existing site use. The present industrial use is however lawful and the working hours unrestricted, so without re-development the use will continue and could become more intensive if longer working hours were adopted by the tenant firms.

The site may be considered as previously developed land under the provisions of PPS3 (Annex B) but it is explained therein at paragraph 41 that when identifying previously developed land for housing development, Local Planning Authorities and Regional Planning Bodies will, in particular, need to consider sustainability issues as some sites will not necessarily be suitable for housing. The importance of sustainability considerations is further emphasised in PPS1 and 7.

The site is not in a sustainable location and does not relate to an existing community, the nearest settlements being Bramdean, Ropley or Bishops Sutton which are all well over a mile away from the site and there is no public transport or footpath from the site. Moreover the site does not represent the efficient use of land in terms of density guidance since it is 13.76 dph,

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

although this includes the southern open space area. Furthermore the site does not have good infrastructure for residential needs and is potentially seriously constrained by existing contamination.

Development as proposed does not therefore meet national or local policy guidance but the proposals respond to this by attempting to make the development as sustainable as possible in an attempt to override the very strong policy objections provided both by national planning guidance and development plan policies which indicate that this development should be resisted.

#### Sustainability

The application for Live / Work units responds particularly to the comments made by the Inspector in dismissing the last appeals for alternative housing re-development schemes. This application accordingly seeks to address the 'non-sustainable' shortcomings of the site in the following ways.

By providing a use that will minimise the need to travel for employment purposes. The design of the units and the layout also embraces many features to maximise the sustainability credentials of the development by reducing its carbon footprint and promoting self-sufficiency.

These include building to the highest standards of insulation to reduce heat loss, use of triple glazing, reducing air permeability and increasing thermal mass. All services would also be to best efficiency standards and renewable energy sources would be used including ground source heat pump, 3 x wind turbines (not part of application), solar hot water from roof mounted panels, passive ventilation using roof cowl exhausts. Rainwater harvesting to provide grey water for WC's and irrigation plus reduced new water usage by use of restrictors,

The self-sufficiency proposals include provision of allotments for each unit.

#### Highways /Parking

The supporting transport assessment indicates that there will be no significant net change in peak hours trip rates or total movements per day between the current and proposed usage, although the HGV movements will be significantly reduced.

The closure of the existing northern vehicular access and its re-siting 50m to the south is stated to improve visibility by a factor of 3. This more central location and the provision of necessary sight lines could however adversely affect the existing trees to the site frontage. The Engineer is discussing this further with the applicant to obtain accurate plans of the effect on visibility of the access relocation and the applicant has commissioned a tree survey to be undertaken.

Parking provision is high at 3 spaces per unit but given that this assumes one space per dwelling, 1 for the work space and one for visitors and allowing for the absence of any public transport to serve the site, it is not an unreasonable level of provision. Moreover the parking is accommodated satisfactorily within the layout. It is questionable however whether there will be a need for more staff parking as it would be unrealistic to assume that the work space will be confined to only people living in the associated dwelling and in reality employees will travel to the site.

The applicant has responded on the issue of car sharing and would consider setting up a car club, but does not believe that this should be required by legal agreement. However, a scheme of this kind would normally be required to set up a management company to be jointly responsible for maintaining common parts and this would be secured through a 106 agreement to ensure that satisfactory provisions are in place in the interests of good planning. The management of a car club could, it is considered, be embraced within such provision.

#### Affordable Housing

The provisions of policy H5 of WDLPR normally require that 30% affordable housing provision

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

be made in developments of 5 or more dwellings. In this case 18 dwellings are proposed which would generate an affordable housing requirement of 5 dwellings. However, in view of the unsustainable location of the site and the live/work nature of the development, with its likely very limited demand for affordable units of this type, the strategic housing section has recommended that a financial contribution in lieu be sought which could be used towards the provision of affordable housing in a local settlement such as Bishops Sutton or New Alresford.

The applicant argues that an affordable housing requirement is inappropriate and cannot be supported by the development. Firstly, because Live/Work developments comprise a mixed use they are sui-generis in use class terms (Paragraph 79 Circular 03/2005) so are not subject to the provisions of policy H5. Secondly, the very high cost of the development due to its carbon neutral design and the expense of clearing and decontaminating the site, make it unable to bear the cost of affordable housing.

Officers believe that the provisions of H5 should be applicable to Live / Work developments particularly, as in this case, where the proposal constitutes a policy exception which, if supported, should be clearly justifiable in terms of community benefit. Furthermore proportionally the residential use is the predominant use of the site in this case. The option to take a financial contribution in lieu and the consideration of the viability of schemes is referred to in the advice set out in circular 6/98, although this is now replaced by the newly published PPS3 – Housing (paragraph 29 refers and in the Local Plan paragraph 6.60). In this case however the applicant has not addressed this issue.

#### Design / layout

The layout is arranged formally around three sides of a square of open space with the main vehicular access separating the buildings from the open space on the southern and western sides. The higher southern part of the site is separated by a retaining wall and provides allotments and a tennis court and the site for three wind turbines that are not included as part of this application. Separate application for the wind turbines will be made if this proposal is successful. The north west corner of the site accommodates the rainwater storage tank and sewage treatment plant.

The Live/Work units are of contemporary design and include part sedum 'green' roofs and part metal standing seam roofs. The elevations include part white render, part timber weather boarding and part aluminium louvers and solar panels. A striking feature of all the units is the large aluminium wind cowls that are part of the 'passive stack' ventilation system that draws air through the building and exhausts it through the cowl.

#### Open Space

The proposals include a central open space area, which could act both as a courtyard feature for the development, and as an area for community social activity as well as a Local Area of Play for small children and it would have excellent surveillance. No details of a LAP have been provided however.

The application has been amended to include provision of a tennis court as part of the sports contribution requirement of the open space funding policy. However, this is of questionable merit as a public open space benefit as other residents of the parish would have to reach the site by car and there would be consequent implications for parking provision, the need for pavilion facilities and lighting.

#### Landscape/Trees

Revised landscape proposals address the concerns about screening to the northern boundary and reinforce planting to the other boundaries. The layout of the central open space has also been amended and a separate play area provided, but units 15-18 have not been turned to address the open space because of the desire to retain the southern aspect to the gardens and

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

exclude cars from the third side of the central open space. A wall with gates has been provided to reinforce the north boundary of the open space and the footpaths narrowed and trees added to reinforce the formal nature of the central open space.

The step between the two parts of the site has also been softened by removing the retaining wall and terracing the levels change.

Impact on character of area and neighbouring property

Although this site is currently an incongruous feature that is out of keeping with the character of the countryside it is only really noticeable as an incident when travelling along Old Park Road. It is not visible from public footpaths or from any distance and is reasonably well contained in the landscape. The nearest neighbour to the site is some 300 metres away and separated from it by Old Park Wood. The site does not therefore impact adversely on neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

This proposal is undoubtedly an imaginative attempt to address the objections of previous redevelopment schemes and to provide an environmentally sound development employing current good practice for low energy consumption and use of sustainable materials. It would also allow for the appearance of the site to be substantially improved and for the contamination to be cleaned up. Against these benefits however must be considered the conflict with national and local policy that the development involves. There is no overriding justification for the development, which is contrary to the countryside policy provisions of the development plan, and the non-sustainable location of the site makes the proposal unacceptable both in terms of local policy considerations and national planning guidance as contained in PPS13, PPS7, PPS 3 and PPS1.

**Recommendation**

That Planning Permission be REFUSED for the following reasons.

- 1 The proposed development does not accord with the requirements of policies **C1, C2, EC3, EC4, H.8, H10, E3**, of the Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996-2011 (Review) and **CE.18, E.2, E.4, H.4, H.5, T.1**, of the Winchester District Local Plan Review, in that it:-
  - (a) represents the undesirable establishment of residential development, for which there is no overriding justification, in an area of countryside that is unrelated to any existing settlement or facilities;
  - (b) would result in the loss of an existing site in lawful use for B2 employment purposes to the detriment of rural employment opportunities in the district; and would introduce a predominantly B1(a) office use contrary to policy E4 of the local plan;
  - (c) fails to provide for affordable housing as required by SP policy H8, LP policy H5 and PPS3
  - (d) does not comprise re-use of existing buildings or meet the needs of existing established businesses but constitutes speculative new development in the countryside which would be reliant of use of private cars and for which there is no evidence of an overriding need in the interests of the rural economy. Such development would therefore fail to satisfy the sustainability requirements of the local plan and government guidance as set out in PPS13, PPS7, PPS 3 and PPS1.
- 2 The proposal is contrary to policies R2 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996-2011 (Review) and RT4 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that it fails to make adequate provision for public recreational open space to the required standard, and would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the area.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

- 3 The available length of frontage to Old Park Road is insufficient to enable a satisfactory road junction, with adequate visibility splays to be provided.
- 4 In the opinion of the Planning Authority the proposal involves development that cannot be reconciled with national planning policy guidance in PPG13 in that it would result in development that would be inappropriately located away from existing urban areas and would thus over-rely on the private car for access and transport purposes. This would result in an unacceptable increase in the number and length of car journeys to the detriment of the environment and the locality. The proposal therefore conflicts with the Strategy of the Draft Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review) particularly policies T1 to T5.

**Informatives:**

The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: C1, C2, EC3, EC4, H8, H10, E3, E4, E7, T5, R2

Winchester District Local Plan Review: DP.1, DP.3, DP.5, DP.6, DP.9, DP.13, DP.15, CE.18, E.2, E.4, H.4, H.5, H.7, T.1, T.4, RT.4,

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

Please return this form to the Case Officer, Mr Dave Dimon.

From: **Bishops Sutton Parish**

Case No: **06/02931/FUL**

Closing Date for comments:

**31 October 2006**



Location: Old Park Wood Industrial Estate Old Park Road Bishops Sutton Hampshire  
Proposal: Demolition of industrial buildings; de-contamination of site; construction of 10 no three and 8 no two bedroom live-work units comprising class B1 industrial accomodation and ancillary residential; re landscaping of site including relocation of principal vehicle entrance

**Comments:**

*See attached letter.*

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL Development Services	
23 OCT 2006	
ACTION	
PASSED TO	
FILED	
CLEARED FOR FILING	

**Request for application to be considered by Committee:**

(NB: Case Officer to forward form to Head of Planning Control if this section completed)

THE BISHOP'S SUTTON PARISH COUNCIL REQUESTS, BECAUSE OF THE  
EXTREME IMPORTANCE, AND IMPACT, THIS SUPERR APPLICATION HAS  
FOR OUR COMMUNITY THAT IT IS JUDGED ON ITS MERIT BY THE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE, OUR ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES. A CHANGE  
OF USE ON THIS SITE WITH THE WORK / ACCOMMODATION MIX  
WOULD BRING ABOUT SOCIAL AND EMPLOYMENT BEDEFITS TO  
THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

Signed: R. Carrick

*23/10/06*

dcpctest.rtf