

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

20 November 2008

Attendance:

Councillors:

Jeffs (Chairman) (P)

Barratt (P)
Baxter (P)
Busher
Fall
Huxstep (P)

Johnston
Lipscomb
Pearce
Ruffell
Tait (P)

Deputy Members

Councillor Weston (Standing Deputy for Councillor Lipscomb)
Councillor Berry (Standing Deputy for Councillor Ruffell)
Councillor Thompson (Standing Deputy for Councillor Pearce)

Others in attendance who did not speak:

Councillor Hollingbery

1. 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 and Havant Borough Council. The Chairman also welcomed representatives of the applicant, Taylor Wimpey Limited and Bryant Homes Southern Countries Limited.

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 applications submitted.

Members were reminded that the proposals under discussion within the Report were located within the administrative areas of both Winchester City Council and Havant Borough Council. The informal discussions would take place on the application site in its totality. The Recommendations of the Report would allow for the delegation of authority to the Head of Planning Control (Winchester City Council) and the Head of Technical Services (Havant

Borough Council) to determine the Reserved Matters application (and other issues as described) with regard to the respective administrative areas.

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 took place (including officer presentations, representations by the applicant and questions and debate between Members of both Committees) on the proposals, the detail of which is attached as an appendix to these minutes.

Following the conclusion of these informal discussions, the Winchester Planning Development Control Committee reconvened to formally consider the Recommendations of the Report. Following the closure of the Winchester meeting, the Havant Development Management Committee reconvened and dealt with the application submitted.

2. **(AMENDED) RESERVED MATTER APPLICATION FOR FIRST PHASE OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (110 DWELLINGS, COMPRISING 74 HOUSES AND 36 APARTMENTS) (OUTLINE PLANNING CONDITION 7 IN PART, WITH PART CLEARANCE OF CONDITIONS 8, 9, 20, 21, 22 AND 33) IN RESPECT OF OUTLINE PERMISSION 05/00500/OUT (WINCHESTER) AND 05/40000/000 (HAVANT) – AT LAND AT OLD PARK FARM, TAYLOR WIMPEY PART OF WEST OF WATERLOOVILLE MDA, HAMBLEDON ROAD, WATERLOOVILLE**
[\(Report PDC775 and Appendix Refers\)](#)

The Head of Planning Control explained that in response to ongoing negotiations and responses from consultees, the applicant had submitted further amendments to the proposals.

Therefore, it was now recommended that the Committees grant delegated authority to determine the reserved matters application, based on a final version of the application that had regard to the further submissions of the applicant received since publication of the Report. These were as set out in a letter received on 29 October 2008, plans received on 13 November 2008, a letter received on 18 November 2008 and in emails received on 19 November 2008. Also, an amendment had been made to Item 8 of Schedule 1 of Conditions in the Report. As a consequence of these submissions and an additional amendment, the schedules of outline conditions being approved (Schedule 1) and conditions to be imposed on the reserved matters approval (Schedule 2) were amended. These changes were circulated to the Committees. In summary, they required further submissions from the applicant with regard to detailed planting (as part of the soft landscaping) and materials (specifically that of roof tiles, cladding of the roof of the flats, bat bricks and railings). The decision would also be subject to any further matters raised during debate.

Attention was also drawn to the fact that the by the Recommendations sought delegated authority to determine the reserved matters application subject to a final version of the Design Code document being agreed to the satisfaction of officers.

The Committee's discussion regarding the above item took place in the informal meeting, the minutes of which are attached as an appendix.

In conclusion, the Committee agreed to delegate to the Head of Planning Control, in consultation with the Chairman, approval of the reserved matters application (subject to the Conditions at Schedule 2 as set out below), and also approval of the details submitted pursuant to the conditions in the outline application as set out in Schedule 1 below.

RESOLVED:

1. That in relation to the affordable housing apartments, officers discuss with potential RSLs the access arrangements for these apartments, given that there were no proposals for a lift to be installed in the block.

2. That in respect of application 08/00350/REM (WCC No. W19499/06) (Winchester City Council) [and in respect of application 08/40000/003 (Havant Borough Council)], the Head of Planning Control (Winchester City Council) [and the Head of Development and Technical Services (Havant Borough Council) respectively] be authorised to DETERMINE the reserved matters application under delegated authority, having agreed the Design Code and any other outstanding details required to ensure the application details are satisfactory subject to:

- a) approval of the Design Code;
- b) receipt of detailed planting plans;
- c) receipt of:-
 - (i) amended plans showing revisions to storage for refuse for the flats on Hambledon Road;
 - (ii) a revised materials schedule including in particular roofing materials conditions to deal with the aspects listed in the conditions 'schedule 2' below, and any other the respective Heads consider appropriate, and to approve details submitted pursuant to conditions listed in 'schedule 1' imposed upon outline planning permissions 05/00500/OUT WCC and 05/40000/000 HBC.

**SCHEDULE 1 OUTLINE CONSENT CONDITIONS
(SUMMARISED) BEING APPROVED**

7 (i) – the reserved matters

- (a) siting
- (b) design and external appearance

- (c) landscaping (subject to receipt of detailed planting plans)

(ii) – other matters

- (d) road and footpath layout
- (e) finished levels
- (f) access for disabled
- (g) noise mitigation
- (h) layout of sewers and drains
- (j) works to trees
- (l) means of enclosure
- (m) hard surfacing
- (n) parking of vehicles
- (o) provision for refuse **(subject to receipt of revised submissions dealing with relocation of bin storage at the apartment building fronting Hambledon Road)**
- (p) provision for street lighting
- (r) chimneys and flues

- 8 **Materials (subject to receipt of revised materials schedule from the applicant)**
- 9 Road details
- 20 Noise Mitigation
- 21 **Soft landscaping (subject to receipt of detailed planting plans)**
- 22 Hard surfacing
- 33 (i) Construction traffic routes in the local area
- (iv) Piling techniques (no piling proposed)

SCHEDULE 2 SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS ON RESERVED MATTERS APPROVAL

Highways

Details of lighting columns

Provision of pedestrian link between the site and the Hambledon Road toucan crossing before the occupation of the first dwelling.

Outside Areas

Details of sheds

Details of short stay cycle hoops

Details of sub station

Provision of protective fencing to open space and trees opposite plots 75 to 81 both during the construction phase and after completion.

Buildings

Details of

- front doors (with surrounds and canopies)
- garage doors
- chimneys
- eaves details
- ridge detailing
- windows and sills (with windows recessed by a minimum of 75mm)
- balconies
- solar panels
- trickle vent details
- bat bricks
- **railings**

Permitted Development Restrictions

Dormers

Conversion of garages and carports to accommodation

Gates and fencing.

General condition to ensure the provision of all details proposed in accordance with the approved plans.

The meeting commenced at 10:00am, adjourned at 10:05am, reconvened at 2.45pm and concluded at 2.48pm.

Chairman

APPENDIX

**HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL EXTRAORDINARY DEVELOPMENT
MANAGEMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

AND

**WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
COMMITTEE**

20 November 2008

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

Councillors' Attendance

Winchester City Council

Councillors:

Jeffs (Chairman) (P)

Barratt (P)
Baxter (P)
Busher
Fall
Huxstep (P)

Johnston
Lipscomb
Pearce
Ruffell
Tait (P)

Deputy Members

Councillor Weston (Standing Deputy for Councillor Lipscomb),
Councillor Berry (Standing Deputy for Councillor Ruffell)
Councillor Thompson (Standing Deputy for Councillor Pearce)

Others in attendance who did not speak:

Councillor Hollingbery

Havant Borough Council

Councillors:

Blacket (P)
Bolton
Buckley (P)
Cheshire (P)
Gibb - Gray
Hart

Hilton (P)
Keast
Pearce
Pierce-Jones (P)
Smith (P)
Stocker (P)
Weekes (P)

Officers' Attendance:

Winchester City Council

Howard Bone – Head of Legal Services
 Simon Finch – Team Manager Planning DC West
 John Hearn - Team Manager Planning DC East
 Nigel Green – Major Development Project Leader
 Lorna Hutchings – Senior Planner
 Stuart Dunbar-Dempsey - Landscape Officer
 Simon Maggs – Housing Strategy & Development Manager
 Jacky Wilson – West of Waterlooville Implementation Officer
 Ian Elvin - Highway Development Control Engineer

Havant Borough Council

Jackie Batchelor – Head of Development and Technical Services
 Sally Smith – Senior Planner

Paul Griffith – Legal
 Peter Marshall – Transport Officer

3. **(AMENDED) RESERVED MATTER APPLICATION FOR FIRST PHASE OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (110 DWELLINGS, COMPRISING 74 HOUSES AND 36 APARTMENTS) (OUTLINE PLANNING CONDITION 7 IN PART, WITH PART CLEARANCE OF CONDITIONS 8, 9, 20, 21, 22 AND 33) IN RESPECT OF OUTLINE PERMISSION 05/00500/OUT (WINCHESTER) AND 05/40000/000 (HAVANT) – AT LAND AT OLD PARK FARM, TAYLOR WIMPEY PART OF WEST OF WATERLOOVILLE MDA, HAMBLETON ROAD, WATERLOOVILLE**
[\(Report PDC775 and Appendix Refers\)](#)

i) **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.**

There were no questions asked or statements made.

ii) **INTRODUCTION AND OFFICER PRESENTATIONS**

Members were reminded that outline planning permission for this part of the West of Waterlooville Major Development Area (MDA) had been granted in June 2007, subject to a series of Conditions and a Section 106 Agreement. The outline permission agreed, amongst other things, the basic framework of the MDA, how it connected to adjoining areas, the green structure plan, density, the maximum building height, key views, sustainability targets, the location of landmark buildings, traffic junctions and the number and location of dwellings and employment space.

Further to this, officers had been granted delegated authority on 16 June 2008 to approve final versions of the Design Code documents for both areas of the

MDA. The Design Code would inform all future reserved matters applications by way of agreeing a number of principles for the site including scale, mix and nature of the development. These were subject to further submissions from the applicants before a final version being agreed by officers.

It was explained that the reserved matters application had been submitted following extensive pre-application discussion. This had included a public consultation exercise undertaken in the local area and a discussion at the West of Waterlooville Forum. The application had also been advertised in local newspapers and residents informed appropriately. Members' attention was drawn to the representations from consultees as summarised on pages 10 – 18 of the Report. These included an objection from Denmead Parish Council. No further letters of objection had been received from residents or amenity groups and there had been no requests for representation to be made at today's Committee meeting.

The main aspects of the application were explained to the Committee by referring to the appendices to the Report and a PowerPoint presentation.

Members were shown the relationship of open spaces to the residential areas, development mix and affordable units, courtyard parking, and also aspects of the architectural design including use of high quality materials in construction. With regard to the latter, it was reported that officers were awaiting further submissions from the applicant, but were generally satisfied that the application was acceptable in terms of architectural design.

Attention was drawn to the concept of 'character zones' and neighbourhood cores which had been considered at outline stage. It was explained that access routes also followed the principles of the draft Design Code. A mixed use character area was to front Hambledon Road. The relationship of the Winchester City Council and Havant Borough Council administrative boundary was also shown. In summary, Members attention was specifically drawn to aspects of siting, design, external appearance and landscape that had not been previously considered at outline stage.

ii) **APPLICANT**

Mr Cramond (representing Bryant Homes Southern Countries Limited) gave a presentation to the Committee on the reserved matters submission for the site.

In summary, Mr Cramond reported that the proposals as submitted comprised of specifically designed forms and layouts that had been modified over a period of time in response to consultation with officers from both Councils, and with the West of Waterlooville Forum and other consultees. Its design followed good practice and densities were compliant with guidance.

During his presentation he explained that the application was intended to be one of traditional layout and architecture, but with a modern contemporary feel. The development would be family friendly and would provide flexible living accommodation that contained attractive public open spaces. The proposed housing mix reflected the demands of the local area. There was to be complete integration of affordable housing as part of the development. Mr

Cramond also drew attention to the fact that, although not mandatory, all dwellings would meet Sustainable Level 3 and that there would be 10 per cent on-site renewable energy via connectivity to sustainable urban drainage (SUDS) and from using solar panels.

In conclusion, Mr Cramond was satisfied that the reserved matters application as submitted represented a high quality design that was a benchmark for the remainder of the MDA.

Mr Barron (Taylor Wimpey Limited) referred to the affordable housing proposed as part of the development. He clarified that this had been submitted following consultation with both Councils' strategic housing officers and also with relevant Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) with regard to viability of delivery and their future management. He also clarified that the scheme's overall viability had recently been reassessed and he was confident that the 40% affordability ratio remained deliverable.

iii) **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

During Members' questions, in summary, the following matters were discussed:

- Officers were satisfied that they were in the advanced stages of securing the required amendments to the Design Code. Therefore, they were confident that they were able to assess the scheme under consideration in the context of the details of a finalised document.

Land use, density and building heights

- It was noted that the outline consent and Design Code set out land use, density and building height strategy across the whole MDA. Members would be able to monitor implementation of the development in line with these concepts at each stage of submission. All buildings (including three and four storey buildings) would be required to conform to building regulation standards with regard to their durability and access.
- Further to concerns that there would be no lifts in the taller apartment buildings, it was explained that lifts could not be specifically required via the planning process. Further to this, as the taller buildings were 50% social housing, the affordability of these units may be compromised, should lifts be implemented, as installing them would be likely to necessitate a service charge. Members were also reminded of the detailed housing allocations procedures would ensure that tenants were placed in accommodation appropriate to their needs. In addition, approximately 60% of dwellings within the development were larger family units. It was therefore likely that the flats would be allocated to mainly single people. Of the apartment building units, it was confirmed that 12 would be allocated for social housing/social rent. Therefore, only a small proportion of these would be at the 3rd or 4th levels. The four storey apartment block fronting Hambledon Road would be 'intermediate' shared equity housing and therefore its future residents would be investing in their homes via mortgages and so would be expected to select units more carefully

according to their long term needs. Following further discussion, it was agreed that officers raise with RSLs the issue of access (given the fact that no lift was currently proposed) as part of their discussions with RSLs on future management arrangements of these units. A requirement for lifts in the four storey building could not be included in the draft Design Code, as this was not a planning matter.

- Officers were satisfied that the design of windows (a sample of which had been provided for Members to view) was appropriate and would meet the usual standards with regard to their quality and durability over time.

Green Infrastructure, Landscaping and Open Spaces.

- An appropriate number of trees on site had been provided to satisfy planting opportunities and also met specific objectives related to the aesthetics of the appearance of the site. This included the 'softening' of the impact of some of the stronger elements of the architecture. Officers were satisfied with the generous open space and tree planting in the development. It was also explained that the trees to be planted had a girth of 18 - 20cms, which would be sufficient in terms of initial impact. They were the 'next size up' from saplings and particular species had also been carefully selected. It was explained that semi mature trees were more likely to fail and would be less vigorous in their growth. Planting would also be complemented by the retention of existing mature trees in the open spaces.
- A Community building had been planned as part of the master planning and would be situated at the 'local centre' within the Grainger part of the MDA. It had been appreciated that this would not be constructed until after the Old Park Farm development. A Community Planning Officer would be employed (utilising S106 monies) for at least 10 years to work closely with the local communities.
- It was noted that officers had assessed both hard and soft landscaping and that this had guided how the whole development would take place and how its phases would appear in the landscape, including from distant views from Portsdown Hill.
- It was reported that the majority of open space would eventually be transferred to the relevant local authority, with a commuted payment to secure its future management and maintenance arrangements. The land that was associated with the affordable housing would be transferred to the appropriate RSL(s). With regard to the Courtyard areas, it was expected that these would be managed by management companies set up by the developer. New owner occupiers would be made fully aware of these arrangements prior to moving in. The S106 agreement had dealt with landscaping and management arrangements and would be the same regardless of which side of the administrative boundary the development was.

Movement and Legibility

- It was explained that CABA had considered an earlier submission of the scheme and had noted that further work was required at that time for the scheme to accord with the legibility principles of the Design Code in this respect. They had yet to consider this revised submission. The Architects Panel had reviewed its detail and made suggestions to address their concerns. The appropriateness of building height at this location had been debated at the outline stage.
- It was explained that the cladding on the flat roofs of the apartment buildings would be a fibrous type of material of traditional appearance and would be robust. With regard to roof tiles on houses, officers were negotiating the most suitable type. Artificial slates may be appropriate as long as the correct type were selected.
- Officers were satisfied that the grey coloured large upvc windows were appropriate in the context of the design and other materials and the overall built form. They would be recessed from the front of the building. Problems of staining from runoff from steel roofs onto rendered walls below had been observed at other recent developments, but the design of buildings in this site was such that this problem should not arise.

Car Parking and Highways

- Parking provision had also been discussed at outline stage and in the Design Code. The concept of courtyard parking with visitor parking on the highway had been supported. The development as a whole was based on principles of sustainability, including minimising use of the private car. It also matched usual parking standards, albeit visitor parking was located on the highway away from that specifically allocated for residents.
- The S106 agreement allowed for the first tranche of money to be paid after occupation of the first 50 dwellings to facilitate bus services through the development.

Waste and Recycling, Sustainability and Buildings for Life

- There was to be bin storage provided in rear gardens adjacent to the courtyards. There was a specific collection point for refuse vehicles, also within the courtyards. The apartments would have internal refuse storage.
- Water meters would be installed in dwellings and Members were reminded that the developer had to demonstrate, as stated within the code of sustainability, how a limit of 105 litres per person could be achieved. With regard to use of renewable energy sources at the development, notably solar energy, there was also an assumption of energy efficiencies. For example, insulation would reduce the actual amount of energy required.

- Officers were satisfied with the aspirations of the developer within the Statement of Conformity with regard to 'Buildings for Life' criteria.
- It was noted that both local authorities were discussing mutual arrangements with regard to refuse collection and other administrative matters, as the boundary between the two administrative areas fell across the site.
- It was noted that distances between the upper floors of the apartment blocks and the refuse storage areas was a building regulation matter. Any storage of refuse on the landings of the upper levels by residents would be a management issue for the RSLs to address. It was reported that building regulations required appropriate chute facilities for apartments that were above four storeys. The regulations also looked at the equivalent horizontal distances to bins and this provided that this should be no more than 30 metres from dwellings. Following further discussion, it had been noted that in the amended plans submitted for the apartment building fronting Hambledon Road (intended to improve its overall design), the location of bins stores had been 'swapped' with the integral cycle storage. As a consequence, it was likely that these distances were to be exceeded. This matter would be addressed so to ensure compliance with building regulations.

iv) **MEMBERS' DEBATE**

The following matters were raised:

- There was some concern that there was an apparent lack of permanent infrastructure, notably community facilities, on completion of this development. This should ideally be completed 'in step' with housing completions. However, provision should be monitored and linkage to the masterplan observed.
- The inclusion of lifts in the apartments was desirable as the development as a whole was intended to be inclusive of 'buildings for life' and accessible to all. Some Members were mindful that a standard should be set from the outset, as this was the first phase of development within the MDA, although it was noted that this sentiment could not be facilitated via the planning process. However, it could be largely addressed via the allocations procedures of the RSLs and officers were asked to liaise with the applicant in their discussions with RSLs, with regard to the fact that no lifts were proposed by the developer. Members also noted that the inclusion of lifts was also likely to affect the 'affordability' of dwellings in the apartment blocks as it would be likely that this would generate an additional maintenance charge.
- A Member was concerned that the architectural design and built form was not in keeping with aspects of traditional Hampshire architecture, as stated by the developer within their submissions. Furthermore, the reserved matters application had not articulated what had been agreed within the Design Code and therefore there was concern that the completed phase may not look like what was aspired to within the drawing and plans. However, the

majority of Members generally agreed that the architectural design, built form and density were acceptable. Members were also appreciative that officers were insistent on the use of good quality materials throughout.

- There was a request that separate phases of the MDA kept their individuality and identities. Therefore each phase should have strong 'border' treatments to keep them distinct from the rest of the MDA. The management companies for unadopted areas should be monitored to ensure their effectiveness. The SUDs should also be maintained and monitored over time. Safe cycle links to each phase should also be considered.
- Both local authorities would need to work to address administrative issues that were likely to arise from the boundary crossing the site. Members were pleased that the 40 per cent affordability ratio was still viable despite the current economic climate and had noted the developer's commitment to achieve this.

(v) **CONCLUSIONS**

At the conclusion of debate, the principle issues were summarised and Members reminded that:-

1) final approval of the reserved matters application (subject to the Conditions set out in Schedule 2) would be delegated to officers (in consultation with the Chairman) subject to following:

- Approval of the Design Code
- Submission of revised plans for the apartment block fronting Hambledon Road to address the provision storage of refuse in line with building regulation requirements
- Submission of revised materials (including roofing materials)

2) final approval of the details under the outline application set out in Schedule 1 (as amended) would also be delegated to officers (in consultation with the Chairman) subject to:

- Receipt of detailed planting plan
- Receipt of further submission with regard to materials, including railings

It was also noted that officers would raise concerns of provision of lifts with the applicant as part of their negotiations with RSLs.

The informal meeting commenced at 10.05am, adjourned for the formal meeting and lunch at 1.10pm, re-convened at 2.00pm and concluded at 2.45pm

Chairman