PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

26 June 2007

Attendance:

Councillors:

Jeffs (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)	Lipscomb (P)
Busher (P)	Pearce (P)
Evans	Ruffell
Huxstep (P)	Saunders (P)
Johnston (P)	Sutton (P)

Deputy Members in Attendance:

Councillor Read (Standing Deputy for Councillor Ruffell)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Allgood and Stallard

---

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Evans and Ruffell. Apologies were also received from Deputy Members Councillors Beveridge and Izard.

2. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT**

The meeting was held in the Council Chamber at the offices of Havant Borough Council.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Members and Officers from Winchester City Council, Havant Borough Council and Hampshire County Council, in addition to representatives from statutory consultative agencies (Environment Agency and Natural England). The Chairman also welcomed approximately 25 members of the public, Ward Councillors and representatives of amenities groups and of the applicant, Grainger Trust plc.

The Head of Legal Services explained the format of the meeting. The Winchester Planning Development Control Committee and Havant's Development Management Committee would each separately open its own formal meeting, to consider procedural items and then adjourn for informal discussions. Following these informal discussions, each Committee would formally reconvene to determine the application submitted in respect of its own administrative area.

The Chairman accordingly opened and adjourned the Winchester Planning Development Control Committee. Following the opening and adjournment of the Havant Development Management Committee, informal discussions (including officer

presentations, public participation, representations by the applicant and questions and debate between Members of both Committees) took place, the detail of which is attached as an Appendix to the Minutes.

Following the conclusion of these informal discussions, the Winchester Planning Development Control Committee reconvened to formally consider the Recommendations on page 78 of Report PDC696 and appendices A – G. Following the closure of the Winchester meeting, the Havant Development Management Committee reconvened and dealt with the application submitted with respect to land within the Havant Borough.

3. **THE DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES TO PROVIDE 1550 DWELLINGS (INCLUDING A PORTION OF AFFORDABLE UNITS), THE PROVISION OF 12.5 HECTARES OF EMPLOYMENT LAND (INCLUDING B1, B2 AND B8), 85 LIVE/WORK UNITS, MIXED USE LAND INCLUDING 7.19 HECTARES OF COMMERCIAL USES, LAND FOR PRIMARY SCHOOL, A LOCAL CENTRE, LAND FOR ALLOTMENTS, LAND FOR A CEMETERY, OPEN SPACE, RECREATION AND PLAY AREAS, CONSTRUCTION OF THREE VEHICULAR ACCESS POINTS TO THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY AT MAUREPAS WAY, LONDON ROAD AND MILK LANE, AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE INCLUDING A VEHICULAR LINK TO OLD PARK FARM – 06/02538/OUT WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL REFERENCE NO. W19499/01 AND HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL NO. 06/40002/000.**
(Report PDC696 refers – Winchester reference)

The Head of Planning Control reported that since publication of the Report, further detail to the provision of mitigation land for Brent Geese outside the development area (via the Section 106 agreement) had now been agreed. Twenty hectares of land could be purchased from the adjacent Southwick Estate to provide a resting place for the birds, and a four year programme would monitor use of the land by the geese. When the study had been completed, the land would be managed in perpetuity. Natural England had confirmed that they found these arrangements acceptable.

Referring to page 58 of the Report, the Head of Planning Control advised that the Environment Agency had confirmed that the conclusions of the technical assessment of worst case groundwater scenarios at the proposed cemetery were acceptable, and no additional conditions requiring site investigation and mitigation were required.

The Head of Planning Control drew Members' attention to an error in the Report (Winchester only). The final sentence on the first page of the Report should continue to read as follows:

'…administrative area, the other to be determined by Havant for the remainder of the site which falls within Havant Borough).'

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that, subject to the granting of outline planning permission, the West of Waterlooville Forum would be consulted on the design codes for each phase of the development. The design codes would require approval by both planning authorities and would embrace matters on the national agenda, such as climate change. They would not necessarily be prescriptive on architectural design.

In reaching its decision, the Committee took into consideration the representations received through formal consultations, together with those matters raised in public participation during the informal meeting. The Committee also had regard to questions from Councillors from both Havant and Winchester, and from matters raised during the ensuing debate.

In conclusion, the Committee agreed to grant outline permission as set out in the report, subject to certain amendments to the conditions and heads of terms for the legal agreements, and a proviso that any further revisions to legal agreements and conditions be delegated to the Head of Planning Control, *in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee* (additional words in italics added).

The Committee agreed that in respect of the Heads of Terms as set out in Appendix A to the report, under the heading "Other Items covered in the S106 Agreement" (page 82), the following provisions be added:

> *"**Integration with Waterlooville town centre***
> *Appropriate links to secure the integration of the MDA with Waterlooville town centre"*.

It was also agreed that in respect of Conditions as set out in Appendix B, under the heading "Conditions of Outline Planning Permission…", the following provisions be added under 07 (ii) (page 5) 'Other matters':

> *"(t) Provision be made for public conveniences"*

The Committee also agreed to support a new Condition 07 to be added as follows (with remaining Conditions at Appendix B subsequently renumbered):

> "07. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority each phase of the development shall provide for 40% one or two bedroom dwellings, details of which shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the development of that particular phase commences"

At conclusion of the meeting, the Chairman thanked all those present for their attendance, especially the members of the public who had observed the proceedings or had spoken during the informal session.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Head of Planning Control at Winchester City Council be authorised to GRANT PERMISSION for application 06/02538/OUT (W19499/01) subject to:-

   (a) The completion of legal agreements under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other relevant legislation, incorporating the terms set out in Appendix A to report PDC696, as amended above, (attached as amended as an appendix to the minutes), subject to such changes as the Head of Planning Control (in consultation with the Chairman) may determine, such agreements to be to the satisfaction of the Head of Legal Services (Winchester City Council);

(b) Conditions incorporating the terms set out in Appendix A to report PDC696, as amended above, (attached as amended as an Appendix to the Minutes), subject to such changes as the Head of Planning Control (in consultation with the Chairman) may determine.

2. That in respect of application 06/02538/OUT (W19499/01) (Winchester City Council) the Head of Planning Control (in consultation with the Chairman) be authorised to include any additional conditions which it is considered appropriate in the light of the decision taken in respect of application 06/40002/000 (by Havant Borough Council) and to make any amendments to conditions subsequently so as to ensure that they have the purpose and effect intended.

3. That further to the resolution of Winchester City Council's Planning Development Control Committee of 30 November 2006 to grant permission in respect of application 05/00500/OUT(George Wimpey development - northern section of the West of Waterlooville Major Development Area), the Head of Planning Control (in consultation with the Chairman) be authorised to amend and add to the conditions and planning obligation requirements set out in the resolution so that they are consistent with the objectives of the conditions set out in Appendix B of Report PDC696 and with the principles of current planning policy and guidance.

The meeting commenced at 10:15am, adjourned at 10:20am, reconvened at 4:20pm and concluded at 4:25pm.

Chairman

APPENDIX (i)

HEADS OF TERMS

The figures quoted below represent the current state of negotiations, and are liable to change. However they do give a reasonable picture of the level of developer contributions being sought for the MDA as a whole. It should be noted that in many cases there will be no actual financial contribution as the developers will be providing the relevant item of infrastructure themselves to a specification to be agreed by the local authorities. The developers have agreed to split the cost of providing the infrastructure for the financial contribution on a 22.5%: 77.5% basis, to reflect the number of units on each development site. Grainger with the largest part of the MDA are therefore expected to contribute 77.5% of the costs.

Delegated authority is sought in the Recommendations for officers to finalise negotiations and enter into appropriate legal agreements.

Infrastructure for which a financial contribution is being sought

Transport

Off site junction improvements;

- London Road/Hulbert Road roundabout
- Hulbert Road/Purbrook Way/ Asda hypermarket roundabout

Total costs; £1,287,000

Other off site mitigation works/traffic calming;
(including potential junction improvements in Portsmouth providing a case is made demonstrating significant impacts on the junction by MDA generated traffic)

Total contribution; £1,665,000

Passenger transport services and infrastructure;

- Including improved services
- Improved shelter with real time information

Total contribution; £1,407,000

Sports Provision

- Enhanced football facilities
- Artificial Turf Pitch (off site)

Total contribution; £310,000

Children's play provision

- Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAPS)
- Local play areas

Total contribution; £533,375

Youth provision

- Multi use games area
- Youth shelter
- BMX/skateboard facilities

Total contribution; £219,625

Education

- Financial contribution towards the provision of a new primary school and enhanced secondary provision

Total contribution; £7,068,000

Community development officer

Total contribution; £350,000

Extension to the Waterlooville leisure centre

Total contribution; £950,000

Percent for Art

Total contribution; £400,000

Employment skills development

- Either on site training administered by the developers; or a financial contribution

Total contribution; £200,000

Access to the countryside

Total contribution; £100, 000

Household Waste Recycling Centre

- Free serviced land, and financial contribution towards construction costs

Total contribution; £68,000

<u>Infrastructure being provided by the developers; for which no direct financial contribution is currently being sought</u>

Transport

Off site junction improvements;

- Stakes Road/Stakes Hill Road/Purbrook Way/Crookhorn Lane roundabout
- College Road/Purbrook Way

3 new pedestrian crossings

Safe routes to Crookhorn School and South Downs College

New bridleway (plus possible commuted sum for maintenance)

Green Travel Plan (Including free bus passes and a Car club)

Open Space

- Cricket pitch
- Multi-use sports facility, (including tennis and 5 a side football)
- Changing and storage facilities

Free serviced land for new allotments together with water supply, a fence, gates a central roadway, pathways and hard standing.

Cemetery

- Free serviced land
- Disabled parking
- Drainage scheme to the satisfaction of the EA
- Shared parking and storage facilities

Free serviced land for three form entry primary school (3ha)

Community centre

<u>Other items covered in the S106 Agreement</u>

Affordable housing

Transport

- Construction of the main access junctions at Maurepas Way, Milk Lane and the Ladybridge roundabout.
- Off site diversions
- Construction traffic
- Measures to ensure the timely completion of the link between the two parts of the MDA; to provide a continuous route from the Hambledon Road, to the southern access at the Ladybridge roundabout
- Routing and signage to the HWRC from Maurepas Way.

Open space

- Management of open space, with an appropriate commuted sum where it is offered for adoption
- Design and specification for the SUDs system; and future management arrangements
- Design and specification of the river restoration works

Mitigation of environmental impacts; including measures to protect and enhance bio-diversity

Public access across the site

Provision of health centre and nursery facilities

Phasing of the development and the provision of infrastructure

Management of the site and facilities

Survey and Mitigation Measures – Brent geese

Integration with Waterlooville town centre
Appropriate links to secure the integration of the MDA with Waterlooville town centre

APPENDIX (ii)

A. Time and Reserved Matters

Time limit – outline

01 The first application for approval of reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. All subsequent reserved matters applications shall be submitted no later than twelve years from the date of this permission.

02 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of two years from that date of approval of the first of the reserved matters to be approved.

03 No development shall take place until a programme of phasing for implementation of the whole development has been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any amendment to the approved phasing programme must be first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

NB (1): The Local Planning Authority will require the provision of a substantial proportion of the business use floorspace prior to the completion of the residential development.

B. Compliance with the Masterplan and Proposed Design Codes

04 The submission of all reserved matters and the implementation of development shall be carried out in substantial accordance with the Design Statement (August 2006), the Design Addendum (January 2007), the Environmental Statement and supporting Appendices and Appendix (August 2006), and the Addendum to the Environmental Statement – Version 2 (February 2007), Consultation Response Version 2 (February 2007) Environmental Statement Addendum Version 3 (April 2007) Consultation Response Version 3 (April 2007), Proposed Southern Access – Drawing No: GTWVILLE/RD/2212 Rev – PR01, Site Plan, Drawing No: 1304/P/001 and Main access proposal, Drawing No: GTWVILLE/RD/2004 – Rev PR04.

05 Unless otherwise agreed in writing the business element of this permission shall consist of 40% B1, 40% B2 and 20% B8 uses measured by gross floor space,

and shall include provision for start up units and a mix of unit sizes.

06 No development shall take place until a Design Code has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Design Code should be prepared in accordance with the principles set out in the Design Addendum (January 2007). Each subsequent reserved matter application for development should be accompanied by a statement which sets out how that phase has complied with the principles set out in the Design Code. Upon completion of every 500 units of the development the developer shall submit a review of the Design Code to take full account of changing circumstances and technologies; such review to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Matters for inclusion:

General – including climate change

- Principles of quality, colour and texture of external materials and facing finishes for roofing and walls of buildings and structures including opportunities for using locally sourced and recycled construction materials;

- Accessibility to public spaces for the disabled and physically impaired;
- Sustainable design and construction, in order to achieve a minimum Eco-homes standard of 'Very Good' (or other such sustainability standard as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) and equivalent BREEAM rating for office and industrial, maximising passive solar gains, natural ventilation, water efficiency measures and the potential for home composting and food production.
- Measures which show how energy efficiency is being addressed to reflect current practice in policy and climate change, and show the on-site measures to be taken to produce at least 10% (or whatever other figure is within current relevant guidance) of the total energy requirements of the new development by means of renewable energy sources.
- Built form strategies to include density and massing, street grain and permeability, street enclosure and active frontages, type and form of buildings including relationship to plot and landmarks and vistas.

Landscaping and Ecology:

- Principles for hard and soft landscaping including

the inclusion of important trees and hedgerows;
- Structures (including street lighting, floodlighting and boundary treatments for commercial premises, street furniture and play equipment);
- Design of the public realm, including layout and design of squares, areas of Public Open Space, areas for play, the allotments and cemetery;
- Open space needs;
- Conservation of flora and fauna interests;
- Provision to be made for art.

Highways and Transport:

- A strategy for a hierarchy of streets and spaces;
- Alignment, width, and surface materials (quality, colour and texture) proposed for all footways, cycleways, bridleways, roads and vehicular accesses to and within the site (where relevant) and individual properties;
- On street and off-street residential and commercial vehicular parking and / or loading areas;
- Cycle parking and storage;
- Means to ensure casual parking is discouraged and occurs in designated spaces.

Statutory Services

- Integration of strategic utility requirements, landscaping and highway design.

07 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority each phase of the development shall provide for 40% one or two bedroom dwellings, details of which shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the development of that particular phase commences

Composite details condition

08 No development hereby permitted shall commence in any phase until plans and particulars specifying the detailed proposals for all of the following aspects of the same [herein called "the reserved matters"] have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for that phase. Thereafter the development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(i) The reserved matters:

(a) The siting of all buildings and structures;

(b) The design and external appearance of all buildings and structures (including

details of the colour and texture of external materials to be used);

(c) Landscaping including a landscape design showing the planting proposed to be undertaken, the means of forming enclosures, the materials to be used for paved and hard surfaces, the design of street furniture and the finished levels in relation to existing levels;

(ii) Other matters:

(d) Use class specifications for internal and external floorspace areas relating to live work units;

(e) The layout of the development including the positions and widths of roads, cycleways, bridleways and footpaths and routes to

countryside, including horizontal cross sections and longitudinal sections and details of any associated infrastructure;

(f) The finished levels (above ordnance datum) of both the ground floor of the proposed buildings(s) and the surrounding ground levels;

(g) Access facilities for the disabled;

(h) The measures to be taken to protect adjacent areas from excessive noise;

(i) The layout of foul sewers and surface drains and their means of disposal;

(j) The manner of treatment of existing water courses and ditches;

(k) Landscaping including an accurate plan showing the position, type and spread of all existing trees on the site and a schedule detailing the size and physical condition of each tree and, where appropriate, the steps to be taken to bring the tree(s) to be retained to a satisfactory condition; and also details of any proposals for the felling, lopping, topping or uprooting of any tree;

(l) Landscaping including the arrangements to be made for the future maintenance of landscaped and other open areas;

(m) The alignment, height and materials of all walls and fences and other means of enclosure including acoustic barriers;

(n) Hard surfacing proposals including surfacing materials;

(o) The provision to be made for the parking, turning, loading and unloading of vehicles;

(p) The provision to be made for the storage and removal of refuse from the premises;

(q) The provision to be made for street lighting;

(r) The provision to be made for external lighting;

(s) The location, height and appearance of any chimney(s), flues and vents.

(t) The provision to be made for public conveniences.

Samples/details of materials

09 Construction of the building(s) hereby permitted shall not commence until details (with samples where requested) of all external facing and roofing materials shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter only such approved materials and finishes shall be used in carrying out the development.

C. Highways and Access

Refer to Condition 06 for relevant Design Code requirements

10 No development hereby permitted shall commence in any phase until plans and particulars specifying the alignment, width, gradient and type of construction standard proposed for all footways, roads and individual accesses thereto (including all relevant horizontal cross and longitudinal sections) and the related provision to be made for street lighting and for surface water disposal and a programme for the implementation and making up of the same have been submitted to and approved in

writing by the Local Planning Authority for that phase. The agreed details shall be fully implemented prior to the 1st occupation in each phase.

11 The layout of the site shall allow for the possible future extension of the spine road and other linkages into the reserve land to the west, as identified in the application papers, into the MDA land to the north and there shall be no barriers or other restrictions preventing access between the application site and this adjoining land to the north via the spine road unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Diversion of a public right of way

12 Where footpaths or public rights of way will be affected no works shall commence on the relevant phase of development until a phased programme for the closure and/or temporary diversion of footpaths or public rights of way have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No change to this phased programme shall be permitted without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Parking

13 Car and Cycle parking on the site must be provided prior to occupation of the dwellings in accordance with the Hampshire County Council Parking Standard and Strategy or as otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Detail of means of access

14 Details of means of access, including the layout, construction and sight lines for each phase shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before development commences in that phase. The agreed details shall be fully implemented before the 1st occupation in each phase.

Details of the provision of a temporary car park

15 Details of the provision to be made for each phase for the parking and turning on site of operatives and construction vehicles during the contract period shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing and fully implemented before development commences in that phase. Such measures shall be retained for the duration of the construction period of that phase.

Details to prevent mud being deposited on the highway during construction

16 Details of measures for each phase to be taken to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site during the construction works being deposited on the public highway shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing and fully implemented before the development commences in that phase. Such measures shall be retained for the duration of the construction period of that phase.

D. Drainage and Flood Prevention

Control of surface water

17 No development shall begin until details which demonstrate the feasibility of a strategic surface water regulation system for the whole of the application site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Further to this approval, no development on individual plots/phases shall begin until the design of the surface water drainage system for that plot/ phase supported by detailed calculations and implementation program has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. That plot/phase must not be built other than in accordance with the approved details and the strategic water regulation system must be implemented to a point where by that particular plot/phase can be serviced. The strategic surface water regulation system for the whole site must ensure that the runoff is controlled through the use of sustainable drainage systems and that for the range of annual flow rate probabilities, up to and including the 1% annual probability storm, the developed rate of runoff is no greater than the greenfield rate of runoff for the same event. The drainage arrangement should also be such that the volumes of surface water leaving the site are no greater than pre-development. The scheme shall include a maintenance program and establish future management responsibility for the system.

NB If a phased approach is adopted, the downstream system must be completed in order to minimise the risk of flooding. No plots/phases shall be allowed to discharge runoff un-attenuated and untreated into receiving water courses dependant on future phasing downstream.

18 No development, other than the provision of infrastructure for the major development area, excluding any main river crossings, shall be carried out within the zone hatched black on Plan No 1304/P/001/A before a scheme to restore the section of Wallington River from

Brambles Business Park to Newland Bridge, including implementation provisions and timings of restoration works, details of a maintenance program and future management responsibilities, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall

include design calculations, long sections and cross sections of the main river to demonstrate that the works are viable. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.

19 No development of any main river crossing along the section of Wallington River from Brambles Business Park to Newland Bridge, shall be carried out before a scheme detailing the crossings design and implementation is submitted to and agreed in writing by the LPA. The principles of the main river crossing scheme needs to be agreed by the LPA prior to development of any main river crossing and will need to incorporate clear spanning structures designed not to restrict the river restoration design and implementation. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.

Protection of aquifer and general water quality

20 Prior to the commencement of development within any phase approved by this planning permission (or such other date or stage in development as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority), a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination of that phase the site shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. That scheme shall include all of the following elements unless specifically excluded, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority:

(i) A desk study identifying:

(a) all previous uses;
(b) potential contaminants associated with those uses;
(c) a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors; and
(d) potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.

(ii) A site investigation scheme, based on (i) to provide information for an assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.

(iii) The results of the site investigation and risk assessment as set out in (ii) and a method

statement based on those results giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken if required.

(iv) A verification report on completion of the works set out in (iii) confirming the remediation measures that have been undertaken in accordance with the method statement and setting out measures for maintenance, further monitoring and reporting if required.

Any changes to these agreed elements require the express consent of the Local Planning Authority.

21 If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority for, an addendum to the Method Statement. This addendum to the Method Statement must detail how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with.

22 Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods will not be permitted other than with the express consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant risk to groundwater.

Details of drainage design and construction

23 No development hereby permitted shall commence in any phase until plans and particulars specifying the layout, depth and capacity of all foul and surface water drainage systems and sewers proposed to serve the same, and details of any other proposed ancillary drainage works/plant (e.g. pumping stations) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use prior to the completion of all such drainage provision to serve the agreed phase of development in full accordance with such plans and particulars as are thus approved by the Local Planning Authority.

E. Environmental Health

Refer to Condition 06 for relevant Design Code requirements.

24 Development shall not commence in any phase until a scheme to mitigate the effect of any contamination of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing

by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be based upon a detailed site investigation and assessment of the extent of any contamination present and shall specify the measures to be taken to avoid risks to the public, buildings and the environment when the site is developed. The site investigation report is to be included within the scheme details. Unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority the approved scheme shall be completed prior to the occupation of the buildings for that phase.

Details – Measures to control external noise

25 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the Southern Access Road shall not be brought into use until a scheme for protecting the dwellings and gardens where required of The Gables, the Lodge at Woodside House and Marrelswood Gardens from noise from the Southern Access Road has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and subsequently completed in full accordance with all detailed components of such scheme.

26 No relevant phase of the development hereby permitted shall commence until a scheme for protecting proposed dwellings and their gardens from noise from the London Road, the “Entrance Boulevard” and the “Main Street” has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Those dwellings shall not be occupied until the implementation of all works forming part of such approved noise protection scheme has been completed in full accordance with all detailed components of such scheme.

F. Landscaping & Boundary Treatment

Refer to Condition 06 for relevant Design Code requirements.

Details of soft landscaping

27 No phase of development (nor any site clearance) hereby permitted shall be commenced until a detailed soft landscaping scheme for all open parts of that phase not proposed to be hardsurfaced has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme shall specify the proposed finished ground levels in relation to the existing levels, the distribution and species of ground cover to be planted, the positions, species and planting sizes of the trees and shrubs to be planted and timing provisions for completion of the implementation of all such landscaping works. The implementation of all such approved landscaping shall be completed in full

accordance with the approved timing provisions. Any tree or shrub planted as part of the approved landscaping scheme which dies or is otherwise removed within 5 years of planting shall be replaced with another of the same species and size during the first available planting season.

Details of hard landscaping

28 No phase of development hereby permitted shall commence until a specification of the materials to be used for the surfacing of all open parts of that phase proposed to be hardsurfaced has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Each development phase hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the implementation of all such hardsurfacing has been completed in full accordance with that specification.

Details of public open spaces

29 No phase of development hereby permitted shall commence until detailed specifications are submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA of the design and detail of each of the related public open spaces, incorporating specifications for all play equipment, landscaping, street furniture and lighting. The design approach, role and function of each space shall be designed and implemented in accordance with the approved Design Code, as set out in Condition 06."

Landscape maintenance

30 Prior to occupation within a phase a schedule of landscape maintenance, for that phase, for a minimum period of five

years has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation.

Retention of trees and 'Important' hedgerows

31 The existing trees, categorised in line with BS: 5837:2005, as shown in the tree survey report submitted with the Consultation Response Version 2 and indicated for retention on the Tree Location and Quality Plan (Drawing No. 1333/T/01), and any other trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders and "Important" hedgerows (as defined in the Hedgerow Regulations 1999), including those trees planted as part of the A3 Bus Corridor Scheme along the west side of the A3 shall, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the

Local Planning Authority, be retained to a standard consistent with good arboricultural practice. Any trees or sections of hedgerow which die during the construction or first five years following completion of each phase of development shall be replaced during the next planting season unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Replacement trees shall be planted at such times and species as agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

32 Trees to be retained in each phase, in accordance with condition 30 above, shall be the subject of an arboricultural method statement, for each phase, which shall include details of root protection zones, construction exclusion, protection measures, arboricultural supervision and any pre development tree work. The arboricultural method statement shall be approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of any phase to which it relates. Such protection shall be erected prior to the commencement of each phase of development.

Details of boundary screening provided by new landscape buffer

34 No phase of development hereby permitted including any site clearance shall commence until details of the landscape buffers proposed to be provided along the eastern boundary adjacent to London Road including the substantial retention of the existing trees on the highway margin of the application site, and between Marreslwood Gardens and the southern access road and a programme for their implementation, have been submitted to and

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Authority, the development hereby permitted shall not progress other than in accordance with the agreed implementation programme. Thereafter, all such boundary treatment shall be retained in a wholly sound and effective condition for a period of 5 years.

Advance planting

34 Prior to commencement unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority no development (nor any related site clearance) shall commence on the site until details of advance planting has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such approved planting shall be completed in accordance with the implementation timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All such planting shall be maintained to encourage its establishment for a minimum of five years following

contractual practical completion of the development. Any trees or significant areas of planting which are removed, die or become, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective within this period shall be replaced before the end of the next planting season.

G. Ecology

35 Refer to Condition 06 for relevant Design Code requirements.

Ecological survey

36 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no phase of development (nor any related site clearance) shall commence on the site until an ecological survey of that phase, and any other land likely to be significantly effected by the proposed development, has been carried out and details including an assessment of the impact of the proposed development and any appropriate measures to mitigate this impact shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority concurrently with the submission of site layout drawings.

Ecological mitigation

37 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no phase of development (nor any related site clearance) shall commence on the site until details of the provision of ecological mitigation measures for that phase and any other land likely to be effected by the proposed development, including the provision of the wetlands areas, have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The mitigation measures shall include a programme for their implementation specifying start and completion dates and the provision of a management regime for these areas thereafter. Unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the mitigation measures shall be implemented and maintained and managed in accordance with the approved programme.

H. Archaeology

Details of provision for archaeology

38 No development nor any site clearance shall take place in any phase until the implemention of a programme of archaeological works has been secured for that phase in accordance with the written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Hampshire County Council.

39 No phase of development or site preparation shall take place prior to development which has any effect on disturbing or altering the level of composition of the land, shall take place within the site until a programme of archaeological work has been secured and implemented in accordance with a written scheme of investigation to be submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

40 No demolition or alteration to structures on the site shall take places until a programme of archaeological recording has been secured and implemented in accordance with a written scheme of investigation to be submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

I. During Construction

41 No development nor any related site clearance within a phase shall take place until a Method of Construction Statement has been submitted for that phase, and approved by the Local Planning Authority, to include details of:

i. construction traffic routes in the local area
ii. parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
iii. loading and unloading of plant and materials
iv. piling techniques
v. storage of plant and materials
vi. programme of works (including measures for traffic management and operating hours)
vii. provision of boundary hoarding and lighting
viii. protection of important trees, hedgerows and other natural features
ix. details of proposed means of dust suppression and noise mitigation
x. Measures to protect the listed building as necessary

Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction period.

J General

42 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the retail floor space provided for in the Local Centre shall not exceed a maximum of 400m.

(B) That further to the resolution of Havant Borough Council's Development Control Committee of 30 November 2006 to grant permission in respect of application 05/40000/000 (George Wimpey development - northern section of

the West of Waterlooville Major Development Area), the Head of Development and Technical Services be authorised to amend and add to the conditions and planning obligation requirements set out in the resolution so that they are consistent with the objectives of the conditions set out above and with the principles of current planning policy and guidance."

APPENDIX (iii)

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL EXTRAORDINARY DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

AND

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

26 June 2007

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

REGARDING

THE DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES TO PROVIDE 1550 DWELLINGS (INCLUDING A PORTION OF AFFORDABLE UNITS), THE PROVISION OF 12.5 HECTARES OF EMPLOYMENT LAND (INCLUDING B1, B2 AND B8), 85 LIVE/WORK UNITS, MIXED USE LAND INCLUDING 7.19 HECTARES OF COMMERCIAL USES, LAND FOR PRIMARY SCHOOL, A LOCAL CENTRE, LAND FOR ALLOTMENTS, LAND FOR A CEMETERY, OPEN SPACE, RECREATION AND PLAY AREAS, CONSTRUCTION OF THREE VEHICULAR ACCESS POINTS TO THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY AT MAUREPAS WAY, LONDON ROAD AND MILK LANE, AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE INCLUDING A VEHICULAR LINK TO OLD PARK FARM – 06/02538/OUT WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL REFERENCE NO. W19499/01 AND HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL NO. 06/40002/000.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Havant Borough Council

Jackie Batchelor – Head of Development and Technical Services
Paul Griffith –Solicitor to the Council
Peter Marshall – Development Engineer
Sally Smith – Senior Planner

Winchester City Council

Steve Tilbury – Corporate Director (Operations)
Howard Bone – Head of Legal Services
Simon Finch – Team Manager Planning DC West.
Nigel Green – Major Development Project Leader
Dan Massey - Transport Planner
Elizabeth Stewart - Planner

Hampshire County Council

Steve Jenkins – Senior Engineer (Highways)

Environment Agency

Natural England

Rachel Green

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND DEBATE FROM THE INFORMAL PART OF THE MEETING BETWEEN WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL AND HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL TO DISCUSS THE ABOVE APPLICATION.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.

Public consultation and representation on the Grainger Trust application was summarised as set out within the report as submitted to the two Committees.

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION AT THE MEETING

Councillors

Councillor Blackett – Havant Borough Council, referred to the Council's policy for 'good housing for all' and suggested that that proposed for the MDA represented too much cramming. The flat roof buildings represented by the initial plans were too small, including their rooms. This could create future anti-social behaviour problems. Children required space and it would be better for the development to include small terraces with gardens. Councillor Blackett was also concerned about future parking problems if provision was only to be the statutory minimum of 1.5 spaces per dwelling. Finally, she suggested that it may be preferable to create more space in the development by utilising additional land from the outset.

Councillor Allgood – Winchester City Council, congratulated officers from Winchester, Havant and Hampshire County Councils on all their work on pre-application consultation etc that had taken place over the years. It seemed that the Developer had taken into account this work. Consultees were generally appreciative of being involved from such an early stage of the proposals. Councillor Allgood was pleased at the plans for the local centre at the site, inclusive of school provision. He reported that Hampshire County Council was reliant on a 'statement on timing' about which stage of the scheme the school was to be constructed. Councillor Allgood referred to local schools at Purbrook which were full, and whilst there was 14% capacity at present at Denmead, travelling there should be avoided as it would create additional traffic. Therefore, the overall phasing of the development should have regard to the provision for the school. He suggested that the school could initially be single form entry only, and expand later as further residential phases were occupied. The same should apply to medical facilities at the MDA, as the significant delays experienced by the residents of Whiteley must be avoided. Councillor Allgood also requested that the Havant and District Citizen's Advice Bureau be eventually re-located from its cramped offices at Waterlooville town centre to the new local centre.

Councillor Buckley – Havant Borough Council, advised that he represented the area immediately abutting the development area. He recognised the extensive public consultation to date with regard to the proposals. He was also pleased with the amount of proposed open space and that there was less housing on site than had originally been planned. Councillor Buckley welcomed the proposals to fund improvements to the existing Waterlooville Sports Centre (as the only indoor sports centre) and requested that this be scheduled as early as possible so as to be available to the new community as it developed. Councillor Buckley also referred to the need for the MDA to be integrated with Waterlooville Town Centre (to avoid the MDA becoming a 'standalone' community) and suggested that instead of crossings built at the Asda Roundabout on Maurepas Way, underpasses could provide easy access for both pedestrians and cycles.

Objectors

Mrs Pam Cooper (Chair, Purbrook and Widley Area Residents Association) PAWARA, was concerned at the outline plans for the site showing 6 storey buildings, which were not appropriate, especially as the land west of the A3 was approximately 6 metres higher than that to the east. In addition, the overall density was unnecessary, especially as a recent Government study had concluded that one bedroom flats should no longer be a priority. Therefore, she suggested that no buildings at the MDA be any higher than 2 storeys. She was concerned that housing development close to Milk Lane would be intrusive at this location in far-reaching views from Portsdown Hill. Mrs Cooper also requested that Housing Association dwellings should be properly integrated in the phasing of the residential development. She referred to the Grainger Trust's submission that included studies on flooding in the area north of the ridgeline. Flooding remained a problem in the Purbrook area and she suggested that the field north of Purbrook Gardens should remain undeveloped so as to act as a soakaway.

Mrs Sheila Mackintosh, resident of the London Road (facing the development site) accepted that the MDA was to be built but there needed to be assurances regarding environmental matters. Mrs Mackintosh referred to the hedgerow previously planted along London Road (as part of the landscaping for the widening of the road to incorporate a bus lane) that had been subsidised by existing local tax payers. There must be assurances that the amenity and screening value of hedgerow would be protected, in addition to provision for its ongoing maintenance.

Mrs Mackintosh also referred to existing hedgerows, mature trees, blue bells and meadows within the application site. The woodland was part of the historic Forest of Bere. All public footpaths should be preserved and enhanced, and boundary marker trees should be protected during construction. In conclusion, Mrs Mackintosh requested that both Winchester City Council and Havant Borough Council work closely together, and be proactive to ensure that as much of the local natural environment as possible was not compromised, both during and after the development.

Mr Kid (also a resident of the London Road, opposite the development site) was concerned that the plans produced by the developer had been unrecognisable to local people and that many aspects of the development had changed over time, with major decisions taken by those not living in the local area. He suggested that the gap be maintained between Purbrook and Waterlooville, otherwise the character of both areas would be ruined. Mr Kid also referred to bluebell woodland at the site, and was concerned that this special area would be compromised by the development.

Alderman (Havant Borough Council) – Bill Blackett reported that as an ex-Councillor of both Hampshire County Council and Havant Borough Council, he had helped draft the Hampshire County Council Structure Plan that had identified this site as an MDA.

Alderman Blackett was concerned that far-reaching views of the area (from Fort Purbrook on Portsdown Hill) would be compromised by the proposed siting of the cemetery. He suggested that this would be better sited (together with the residential development) towards the north of the site to the south of the ridge line, beyond Milk Lane. However, Alderman Blackett was pleased that the proposed MDA would be fully integrated with Waterlooville town centre.

Parish Council Representatives

Parish Councillor Lander-Brinkley (Denmead Parish Council) reported that the Parish Council was concerned that the MDA had not been discussed as a whole with regard to its impact on traffic in the local area. The Parish Council had had reservations with the traffic models utilised in predicting traffic flow. He specifically requested that further consideration be given to removing potential rat-runs through the MDA. Although he was appreciative that public transport should be encouraged, he was concerned that parking restrictions on-site could potentially create problems within the development area.

Referring to the residential development, Councillor Lander-Brinkley stated that there were many positive elements; however, there was too great an emphasis on smaller unit dwellings. Furthermore, the Parish Council was opposed to the prospect of five storey buildings on site. Also, although 40 per cent of dwellings were to be affordable, the tenure of such should be carefully considered, so as to ensure actual affordability for local people.

Finally, Councillor Lander-Brinkley requested that the construction of the new school be carefully phased.

Commentators

Mr Briggs (Chair of the Waterlooville Community Forum South) was concerned that southern elements of the MDA were not physically integrated to Purbrook. Therefore, development at this location might be better located north of the ridge-line. Mr Briggs requested that vital infrastructure should be constructed prior to residential development, notably the southern access road.

Mr Heck (a resident of the London Road, opposite the development site and a member of the Purbrook and Widley Residents Association) suggested that in addition to the Wimpey development area of the MDA, not enough public open space had been achieved by the proposals so as to meet the minimum standards.

Mr Heck reported that residents were pleased that access and egress to the MDA was to be located at the Ladybridge roundabout. This should be implemented as part of the initial construction phase. He was concerned about the likelihood of additional heavy traffic being generated through the Purbrook area from construction vehicles servicing the Wimpey and Grainger Trust development sites. He requested that vehicles access the MDA site at the Asda roundabout, and not via the southern access route.

Finally, Mr Heck requested that sufficient car parking be provided on site, and he also queried the practicalities of the provision of mitigation land for the Brent Geese.

Applicant

Mr Bateman (Grainger Trust Plc Limited) and Mr Bradley (Fielden Clegg Bradley Architects)

The excellent working relationships with Winchester City Council, Havant Borough Council and Hampshire County Council were reported on. This, together with work undertaken with the local community, had achieved the proposals now under consideration.

Mr Bateman reported that the aims of the proposals were all inclusive of sustainable and ecological matters. Mr Bradley reported on the design led aspects of the scheme.

Mr Bradley demonstrated that the existing rural landscape would become fully accessible to residents of the Waterlooville/Purbrook area by integrating the MDA into existing urban areas. There was much open-space proposed on site and existing bio-diversity would be enhanced where possible, together with recreational opportunities for local people. Proposed community buildings would be fully integrated with open space. Links to existing public rights of way would be established and trees and hedgerows would be protected. Many new trees would be planted.

It was considered that this proposal was part of the 'missing portion' of Waterlooville town and, as such, would be fully integrated to the existing urban areas. The gap between the Purbrook and Waterlooville town would be maintained via the construction of the cemetery at its proposed location.

Mr Bradley reported that the application was very holistic with regards to the ten points of the sustainability strategy. He reported on other schemes elsewhere in the country that had been produced by its firm that had been well commended.

Finally, the overall development was not of a high density, at approximately 42.5 dwellings per hectare. He also indicated that pedestrian routes would be prominent within the streets.

Officers' responses to questions by public speakers

Education

Hampshire County Council had been engaged with regard to school provision at the MDA, and that this would be constructed when the County Council required it to be.

It was reported that the proposal had provision for a three-form entry primary school. However, should an extension to the MDA be triggered, a second primary school would be built with both schools then becoming two-form entry.

The possible phasing of the school was a matter of policy for Hampshire County Council. Members' attention was drawn to the Section 106 provision regarding the construction of the school.

Trees and hedgerow planting along the A3 London Road

The landscaping along the A3 London Road boundary was on land owned by the Highway Authority. It had been understood that the Developers had indicated their intention to retain as much as possible of this planting, and to reinforce it where possible. However, it should be noted that visibility splays (such as at the Milk Lane Junction) might require some removal.

Havant Borough Council tree officers had recently been involved in placing tree preservation orders appropriately over the rest of the development site.

Development north or south of the ridgeline, cemetery/gaps

It was explained that when Havant Borough Council had produced its Local Plan; the Council had sought to make appropriate provision for the retention of a gap between Waterlooville and Purbrook. However, the Planning Inspector had subsequently considered whether this was appropriate, when taking into account the location of a cemetery. The Inspector also

considered the concern about potentially having the cemetery located close to The Rowans Hospice.

Taking into consideration the existing relationships of the development fronting the A3 London Road, the Inspector had also concluded that the retention of a gap would not be consistent as part of the Structure Plan, and therefore it was more sustainable for some development to be integrated to the MDA.

Referring to the far-reaching views from Portsdown Hill, the Inspector had noted that these already included the Brambles Business Park and Waterlooville Town. Therefore, the Inspector had concluded that these views were not vital. However, it had been concluded that the ridgeline was worthy, and therefore the Inspector had stated that it was most appropriate for the addition of a cemetery at this location, with housing to the south and adjacent to Purbrook, and to the north adjacent to Waterlooville town centre.

It had been appreciated that the site could not be retained as open countryside, but some open space should be retained, with the cemetery at the ridgeline to separate the development and housing at their most sustainable locations to the north and south of this.

Sustainability/Timing

It was reported that the sustainability strategy for the site was very important and had influenced the design principles to date. As phases came forward, there would be a review process in place, with the developer required to prove how proposals worked with the national climate change agenda etc.

It was a requirement that the developer meet prescribed sustainable design criteria.

With regard to time scales for the development, it was reported that it was hoped that the design codes were to be submitted for approval by autumn 2007 and any reserved matters dealt with by application by the beginning of 2008.

Preparation for the development on-site could, therefore, potentially commence in 2008. It was expected that the development on the site would take at least five years to complete.

Members' questions and Officers' answers

Councillor Sutton (Winchester City Council)

Question
The South-East Plan suggests that the Reserve Site could be triggered. Are officers satisfied that the framework for infrastructure will be in place for this potential?

Answer
Officers were aware of the 1000 dwelling reserve site. Therefore, all transport and education assessments had been undertaken for 3000 homes as a contingency.

Councillor Hilton (Havant Borough Council)

Question
With regard to integration with Waterlooville Town Centre, when was a decision likely with regard to a permanent link over (or under) Maurepas Way?

Answer
A scheme would need to be produced for the land required for this site, and a separate planning permission also eventually required. The overall timescale would be some years.

Councillor Lipscomb (Winchester City Council)

Question
(i) Was there a proven demand for the construction of live/work units on site, and if this was not the case at the time of construction, was there a 'Plan B'?

(ii) What was the balance between one and two bedroom dwelling units at the MDA, and how could it be proven that the right balance had been achieved?

(iii) Was it possible for the Local Planning Authorities to put pressure on Hampshire County Council to ensure that the school was constructed as soon possible, and not after the development of residential dwellings?

(iv) Will Winchester City Council have any influence on the mix of one or two bed dwellings, or was this determined by market forces?

Answer
It was not possible to put pressure on Hampshire County Council with regard to the school. They were aware of their obligations as education providers and the timing of constructing the school was for their judgement. Hampshire County Council was also appreciative that the school would be a focal part of any development.

With regard to the construction of live/work units, the developer had researched a need for their construction. An alternative scheme might come forward as the development takes place, if latter research showed that the need was less evident. However, it was confirmed that overall housing supply on-site was not inclusive of these units.

The Winchester City Council Local Plan had specified a minimum of 50 per cent smaller units, whilst Havant Borough Council's Plan stated between 40 and 50 per cent. However, following research, officers had negotiated with the developers a lower percentage of 40 per cent. The exact mix of one or two bedroom units had yet to be clarified.

At each phase of the residential construction, there was a strategy in place to determine tenure following a housing need survey undertaken at that time.

Councillor Pearce (Winchester City Council)

Question
There should not be cramming of residential development on site, including that of small properties. Cramming could create future problems of anti-social behaviour. Parking on site must be adequate and proposed road layout mindful of not establishing potential future rat-runs.

Answer
Issues such as this would be considered at the design stage of each phase of the development, should the outline proposal be agreed.

Councillor Busher (Winchester City Council)

Question
What was the proposed 'retirement village' at the MDA, and was this inclusive of the overall percentage of smaller units?

Answer
Provision of the retirement village, as part of the development, had been market tested by the developer and would be located close to community facilities. It was assumed that the retirement village was to be inclusive of the overall total of smaller units at the site.

Councillor Brown (Havant Borough Council)

Question
Why was the link to Waterlooville town centre only now at consultation stage? It was important that the MDA not be a 'satellite area', and its new residents should travel north to the Waterlooville town centre.

Answer
The area of the north part of the MDA was reasonably late in the phasing of the overall development. Residential development should start in the middle of the site.

The West of Waterlooville Forum had recognised that integration with Waterlooville town centre was vital, as had both planning authorities.

Discussions to date had concluded that the area proposed for the integration was the most appropriate place; however, this included land that was not within the MDA area.

In addition to addressing land ownership issues, substantial funding was required and support for the proposed integration. It had been concluded that a decision with regard to most appropriate integration should not preclude the whole MDA proposal coming forward.

Councillor Saunders (Winchester City Council)

Question
(i) Referring to the overall housing density of 42.5 dwellings per hectare, was this inclusive of the open space proposed on site, or was it just the residential areas?

(ii) Were the sustainability proposals agreed by the Developer with regard to the MDA, or the integration of the MDA with Waterlooville town centre as a whole?

Answer
(i) The 42.5 dwellings per hectare did not include anything not designated residential on site.

(ii) The Structure Plan sought the least possible impact on the established communities that the development would extend from (i.e. with regard to local services etc). The Structure Plan would also ensure that the development did not appear to be a "tacked-on" area that was isolated from existing communities. Therefore both existing and new developments should be beneficial to one another.

Councillor Hilton (Winchester City Council)

Question
With regard to the transport assessments of the capacity at roundabouts at the Asda part of Maurepas Way and at Ladybridge, had the Forest End roundabout been assessed?

Answer
The Forest End roundabout had been fully assessed and it had been concluded that there was no improvements necessary.

Councillor Read (Winchester City Council)

Question
Should only a two form entry primary school be eventually required for the MDA, can Members be assured that the remainder of the land in reserve remain in educational use, and not be utilised for other matters?

Answer
Should the 1000 dwelling extension to the MDA be triggered, then two 2 form entry primary schools would be constructed. It was not clear at this time how they would be phased. Should the additional housing be not triggered, there was enough land in place for the proposed three form entry schools.

Councillor Huxstep (Winchester City Council)

Question
With regard to suggestions that there may be five storey dwellings on site (as queried by Denmead Parish Council) was there any flexibility in the Design Codes to reduce such buildings to four storeys?

Answer
The Design Codes would eventually detail the appropriateness for higher buildings (such as along parts of the edge of the common recreational space).

Councillor Hilton (Havant Borough Council)

Question
With regard to wildlife on site, was there any protection proposed for the deer, pheasants and woodpeckers etc that have been observed at the site?

Answer
Natural England (as a statutory consultee) was satisfied that the Design Statement for the MDA had identified ‘green links’ as part of the development infrastructure.

Councillor Saunders (Winchester City Council)

Question
With regard to water courses on site such as the North Purbrook Stream and the River Wallington, what schemes were proposed to improve, and to enhance their biodiversity?

Answer
Environment Agency confirmed that existing concrete sections of the River Wallington were to be removed, and that this would improve biodiversity at these locations.

Councillor Busher (Winchester City Council)

Question
With regard to potential flood risk vulnerability at the site, how long ago was an assessment undertaken?

Answer
Havant and Winchester Councils were working closely with the Environment Agency with regard to this matter, as it had been acknowledged that some parts of the MDA site were at risk. Less vulnerable development (other than residential dwellings) would be placed at those locations identified at most risk. Following the flood risk assessment, the 'de-canalisation' of the River Wallington would be undertaken. This would have the additional benefit of improving biodiversity.

Councillor Lipscomb (Winchester City Council)

Question
With regard to the cemetery on site and burials at this location, could Members be assured that there was no potential risk from ground water?

Answer
The Environment Agency was satisfied with the cemetery's proposed location and that there would be no risk from, or to, ground water. The monitoring of ground water conditions at this location had been carried out over time. The proposed mitigation, as set out in the Report, was for a worse case scenario.

Councillor Hilton (Havant Borough Council)

Question
Referring to a recent High Court decision with regard to a Eastleigh Borough Council proposal, would the allotments proposed for the MDA site be protected from development in perpetuity?

Answer
Provision for the allotments was for the long term: however, it could be not be guaranteed that future legislation or challenge would not overturn this.

Councillor Saunders (Winchester City Council)

Question
Had ecological consideration been given to the design of the cemetery?

Answer
Havant Borough Council was responsible for the eventual management of the cemetery. The cemetery was to be landscaped appropriately (including ecological considerations) and would be inclusive of woodland burials.

Councillor Pearce (Winchester City Council)

Question
Was there a strategy to not exacerbate existing problems of flooding at the Purbrook shops location?

Answer
The Environment Agency had confirmed an on-going strategy with the Developer to maintain and improve sustainable drainage systems.

Councillor Baxter (Winchester City Council)

Question
With regards to sewage works for the MDA, where was this to be located?

Answer
There were no specified sewerage capacity improvements necessary for the MDA. The Budd's Farm Plant had existing capacity and would be linked to the development.

Councillors' Debate

The following issues were raised during debate:

- The phasing of development needed to be done correctly, if it was not to impact on the local road infrastructure. It could be argued that minimal parking standards at other locations had not worked.

- The future relocation of the Waterlooville and Area Citizens' Advice Bureau to the new local centre at the MDA should be progressed as soon as possible.

- The northern access route to the MDA site was less direct, and included more roundabouts. It would be preferable for traffic to enter via the southern access route.

- With regard to the under/over pass at the Asda roundabout on Maurepas Way, this should ideally be incorporated into the overall Highway Plan for the MDA. The possibility of an underpass should not be ruled out as long as it was well designed.

- The development of one bedroom flats might not be indicative of people wishing to stay long-term at this location. There should ideally be an emphasis on the construction of family homes and that this should be revised at each stage of the development. There should be a good balance in dwelling size overall, and the market and social housing should be of a similar like. There should be adequate space between dwellings and the subservience to the car within the residential areas should be progressed within the design codes. This should include the proposals for the pedestrian and cycle routes.

- Flexibility within phasing of the development of the MDA was desirable, with the design codes revised accordingly. This should have regard to whether one or two bedroom dwellings were most appropriate at that time of construction.

- With regard to the proposed public squares within the site, the Developer should be wary of creating 'pastiche'.

- Referring to large financial developer contributions associated with the Section 106 agreements, this should not mean that market housing on site be too costly as a result.

- Hampshire County Council must have regard to ongoing problems associated with the school provision at Whiteley. A miscalculation for the provision of form size there had led

to under-provision, and many children having to be transported to a school out of that area.

- The West of Waterlooville Forum had worked very well to date in engaging with the public, and assisting the design of the MDA. Although one bedroom units were proposed, this was a matter of affordability, and was often the only option for many people to get on the housing ladder.

- Both Havant and Winchester Councillors should be involved, in due course, in determining the detail for future reserved matters.

- There should be provision of public toilets in a central area of the development, in addition to those proposed adjacent to the cemetery. The cemetery should be designed appropriately and sensitively and not appear as the focus of the new development.

- During the construction phase, the impact on surrounding areas from noise and obstruction etc should be dealt with appropriately via regular meetings between construction companies and resident associations. There should be minimal disruption overall, and any problems enforced where appropriate.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee concluded its informal discussion and the formal meetings of both Committees were reconvened.