

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**15 December 2010**

Attendance

Councillors:

Johnston (Chairman) (P)

Evans (P)

Hutchinson (P)

Huxstep (P)

Jefferies

Lipscomb (P)

Mitchell

Pearce (P)

Tait (P)

Deputy Members

Councillor Bell (Standing Deputy for Councillor Mitchell)

Councillor Thompson (Standing Deputy for Councillor Pearce)

Prior to the meeting of this Committee, the Chairman explained the format of the meeting. It was noted that the 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 in respect of its own administrative area.

1. **PLANNING APPLICATION 10/02353/REM (WCC – W19499/12) – TAYLOR WIMPEY SOUTHERN COUNTIES – PHASE 2, DUKES MEADOW, HAMBLEDON ROAD, WATERLOOVILLE**

Proposal: **Second Phase of Residential Development (121 dwellings, comprising 54 houses and 67 apartments) along with 7 Live/Work units and 326 square metres (internal) of A1/A2/A3 floorspace** (Reserved Matters application under outline planning condition 7 with part clearance of conditions 6,8,9,21,22 and 24 of outline permissions 05/40000/000 (Havant) and 05/00500/OUT (Winchester) which provide for the development of land for residential (450 units), live/work(24 units), employment (7.1 ha including B1,B2 and B8 and a Household Waste Recycling Centre), mixed use including retail, food and drink, financial/professional & health, open space/recreational purposes & the construction of two accesses from Hambledon Road.

**(The meeting adjourned at 9.32 am for informal discussions to take place).**

**(The meeting resumed at 1.34 pm)**

The Committee considered:

- (A) the written report and recommendations of the Executive Head of Planning Built Environment at Havant Borough Council and the Corporate Director (Operations) at Winchester City Council;
- (B) the following issues and matters raised whilst the meeting was adjourned
  - (1) The officers' presentation;
  - (2) a deputation from the applicant's agent;
  - (3) details of amendments to the application received on 17 November, and 3, 9 13, and 14 December 2010.
  - (4) Additional information, including plans and elevations, circulated in an addendum prior to the meeting;
  - (5) questions raised by members of this Committee and members of Havant Borough Council's Development Management Committee in relation to this application and application APP/10/00610 submitted to Havant Borough Council as set out in the appendix to these minutes; and
  - (6) the matters raised during a debate with members of Havant Borough Council's Development Management Committee over this and application APP/10/00610 as set out in the appendix to these minutes;

The Committee was recommended to impose additional conditions:

- (i) requiring details of roofing materials to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority to protect the amenities of the locality and maintain a good quality environment
- (ii) requiring details of finishes to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority so as to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details and to maintain a good quality environment.
- (iv) requiring details of the means of enclosure for the car parking courts so as to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details and to maintain a good quality environment
- (v) requiring details of construction measures to be taken to reduce achieve Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and on how the applicants expected to generate a minimum of 10 % of the energy

requirements by renewable technologies to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority so as to ensure a sustainable form of development.

In response to concerns raised about the implications of requiring the developer to generate a minimum of 10% of the energy requirements by renewable technologies, the officers advised that the developer would probably only comply with Building Regulations and was unlikely to provide the additional measures proposed to lower energy consumption and improve the fabric of the buildings.

**RESOLVED:**

that planning application APP/10/00610 be granted permission subject to:

(A) The following conditions:

- (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 as amended by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2008 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Classes A, B or E of part 1 of schedule 2 or Class A of part 2 of the Order shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To protect the amenities of the locality and adjoining neighbours and maintain a good quality environment and having due regard to saved Policy D1 of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 1996-2011 which forms part of the Havant Borough Local Development Framework.

- (2) Each car parking area shall be constructed, surfaced and marked out in accordance with the approved plan before the development served by the car park hereby permitted is brought into operation. That area shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking, loading, unloading and turning of vehicles.

**Reason:** In the interests of the amenities of the locality and to ensure that adequate parking facilities are provided and having due regard to saved policies D1 and T9 of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 1996-2011 which forms part of the Havant Borough Local Development Framework.

- (3) The parking spaces, carports and garages hereby approved shall not be used for any other purpose than the parking of private motor vehicles.

**Reason:** In the interests of the amenities of the locality and to ensure that adequate parking facilities are retained and having due regard to saved policies D1 and T9 of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 1996-2011 which forms part of the Havant Borough Local Development Framework.

- (4) The roads and footways shall be laid out and made up in accordance with the specification, programme and details to be approved by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling erected on the land shall be occupied until there is a direct connection from it completed to the approved specification less the final carriageway and footway surfacing] to an existing highway.

**Reason:** In the interests of highway safety and having due regard to saved policies D1 and T7 of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 1996-2011 which forms part of the Havant Borough Local Development Framework.

- (5) All development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, details and documents hereby approved. Any variation from the approved plans or details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development carried out in accordance with the approved details.

**Reason:** To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details and to maintain a good quality environment and having due regard to saved Policy D1 of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 1996-2011 which forms part of the Havant Borough Local Development Framework.

- (B) A condition to control the sustainability of the design of development to ensure it will be consistent with adopted planning policies, the outline planning permission and the approved Design Code: the wording of this condition to be determined by the Head of Planning Management after consultation with the Chairman of this Committee; and
- (C) conditions requiring details of roofing materials, means of enclosure and finishes to be submitted to and approved by the Council prior to commencement of the development: the wording of these conditions to be determined by the Head of Planning Control.

**(The meeting commenced at 9.30 am and concluded at 2.00 pm)**

**HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL EXTRAORDINARY DEVELOPMENT  
MANAGEMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**  
**AND**  
**WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL  
COMMITTEE**

**15 December 2010**

**INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS**

**Councillors' Attendance**

**Winchester City Council**

**Councillors:**

Johnston (Chairman) (P)

Evans (P)

Hutchison (P)

Huxstep (P)

Jeffer

Lipscomb (P)

Mitchell

Pearce (P)

Tait (P)

**Deputy Members**

Councillor Bell (Standing Deputy for Councillor Mitchell),

Councillor Read (Standing Deputy for Councillor Jeffer)

**Havant Borough Council**

**Councillors:**

Buckley (Chairman) (P)

Buckley (P)

Gibb - Gray

Keast (P)

Mrs Shimbart (P)

J Smith (P)

Wilson

**Deputy Members**

Councillor Turner (Standing Deputy for Councillor Gibb - Gray)

**Officers' Attendance:**

**Winchester City Council**

Steve Tilbury – Corporate Director (Operations)

Howard Bone – Head of Legal Services

Simon Finch – Head of Planning Control

John Hearn – Urban Design Manager

Jill Lee – Principal Planning Officer

Nigel Green – Major Development Project Leader  
 Stuart Dunbar-Dempsey - Landscape Officer  
 Simon Maggs – Housing Strategy & Development Manager  
 Jacky Wilson – West of Waterlooville Implementation Officer  
 Ian Elvin – Highways Engineer

### **Havant Borough Council**

Julia Potter – Executive Head of Planning Built Environment  
 Steve Weaver – Interim Development Services Manager  
 Sally Smith – Senior Planner  
 Shirley Shaw – Deputy to the Solicitor to the Council  
 Peter Marshall – Development Engineer  
 Julie Boschi – Senior Landscape Architect  
 Julia Watson-Cowan – Housing Enabling Officer

1. **PLANNING APPLICATION APP/10/00610HBC/ 10/02353/REM (WCC – W19499/12). – TAYLOR WIMPEY SOUTHERN COUNTIES – PHASE 2, DUKES MEADOW, HAMBLEDON ROAD, WATERLOOVILLE**

**Proposal: Second Phase of Residential Development (121 dwellings, comprising 54 houses and 67 apartments) along with 7 Live/Work units and 326 square metres (internal) of A1/A2/A3 floorspace** (Reserved Matters application under outline planning condition 7 with part clearance of conditions 6,8,9,21,22 and 24 of outline permissions 05/40000/000 (Havant) and 05/00500/OUT (Winchester) which provide for the development of land for residential (450 units), live/work(24 units), employment (7.1 ha including B1,B2 and B8 and a Household Waste Recycling Centre), mixed use including retail, food and drink, financial/professional & health, open space/recreational purposes & the construction of two accesses from Hambledon Road.

i) **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, 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, the Committee was reminded that both Councils had approved a Design Code for the MDA which informed all future reserved matters applications by way of agreeing a number of principles for the site including scale, mix and nature of the development.

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 the residential areas, development mix and affordable units, and courtyard parking to each other and to the open space which would abut this development. Aspects of the architectural design of the proposed apartment buildings fronting Hambledon Road and their relationship to the remainder of the development were also shown.

Attention was drawn to changes made to the design of the parking courts to overcome difficulties experienced with the use of the parking courts in Phase 1. It was proposed that the boundary treatments would enhance the amenity of residents and make these areas more visible to minimise the amount of unauthorised on-street parking in these pedestrian biased spaces.

It was reported that the details of roofing materials, finishes of the balconies and bays and the means of enclosure within the courtyards and the gates into courtyards had not yet been agreed by the officers and that conditions should be imposed requiring the submission and approval of these details to ensure that the development would be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details and to maintain a good quality environment. The affordable housing tenure for this phase had been agreed.

It was explained that the reserved matters application had been advertised in local newspapers and residents informed appropriately. Members' attention was drawn to the representations from consultees as summarised on pages 6 to 7 of the report. These included an objection from Denmead Parish Council. 1 further letter of objection had been received from a resident.

ii) **OBJECTORS**

No deputations opposing the application were received by the Committee. (Denmead Parish Council had requested to make a deputation but did not send a representative to address the meeting)

iii) **APPLICANT**

Mr Hancox (representing Taylor Wimpey Southern Countries Limited) gave a presentation to the Committee on the reserved matters submission for the site.

In summary, Mr Hancox reported that the proposals as submitted comprised 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 the densities were compliant with guidance.

During his presentation he explained that the application was in accordance with the approved Design Code and conformed with the building for life criteria. The second phase of development would involve the construction of a series of streets, squares and pedestrian links which completed connections between the phase 1 development and Hambledon Road to the north, and the open space to the west.

Mr Hancox advised that the South East Regional Design Panel had endorsed the scheme.

#### iv) **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

In the course of the answer and question session, the Councillors considered the need to view the application site prior to making a decision. The Councillors considered that they had sufficient information at the meeting to make a decision.

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

##### **Principle**

- The Officers were satisfied that they had been given sufficient time to read and digest any additional information received from the applicants since the report was published.
- The principle of the scheme had been established through the Hampshire Structure Plan and the Local Plan Policies.
- The MDA had been agreed in outline and the purpose of the application was to agree the reserved matters detail.
- Details of the adjoining Grainger development was not for consideration at this meeting.
- There was a commitment to provide a play area with safe routes to and from this area. This area was not part of the application so the officers were unable to supply details of the boundary treatments proposed.

##### **Conforming With Design Code.**

- The proposed 7 live to work apartments were an untried commodity. The developers proposed to build more live to work apartments if these proved successful. If the units were unsuccessful, it would be possible to convert the apartments back to residential only.
- The proposed blocks fronting Hambledon Road would be 35 metres away from the parade of shops on the opposite side of the road. Therefore, there would not be a significant loss of light to the existing shops.



- The number of affordable houses conformed with the affordable housing strategy. 15 of these properties would be offered as share equity.

### **Green Infrastructure, Landscaping and Open Space**

- The financial implications of the open spaces were the subject of a Section 106 Agreement which was not the subject of this application.
- Care had been taken when choosing the species of trees to be used on the development to ensure that they would not cause subsidence to properties at a later date and at the same time create an attractive environment.

### **Movement and Legibility**

- Pedestrian and safe cycle routes had been incorporated into the scheme to create a sustainable community.
- The car parking courts had been designed to improve surveillance

### **Built Form, Urban Design and Architecture**

- The built form was in accordance with the approved design code. The Hambledon Road blocks, with stepped frontages and planting, were designed to soften the transition from urban to rural as one travelled along the Hambledon Road and at the same time fulfil their role as landmark buildings.
- The materials and design of the finishes were a significant improvement on Phase 1.

### **Development Mix and Affordable Housing**

- The affordable housing within the phase would be allocated under Hampshire Home Choice and would be available to persons on the housing registers of Havant Borough Council, East Hampshire District Council and Winchester City Council.
- A survey was being undertaken on affordable housing tenants in Phase 1 to identify from which registers the tenants were chosen. Until this information was available, it was not possible to give figures on how the new development met the housing demands for Winchester City Council.
- 70% of the affordable housing units would be socially rental units and the remaining 30% would be shared ownership. This split had been agreed by the housing teams of Winchester City Council and

Havant Borough Council and was in accordance with the Section 106 Agreement which provided for a least 50% of affordable housing to be social rented units.

- The number and location of the parking spaces were considered acceptable. To overcome the problems of on street parking, the parking areas had been designed to be more user friendly than the parking areas in Phase 1.
- The layout of the street network and the design of individual streets had been planned to accord with the Manual for Streets and the Design Code.
- The provision of an electric charging infrastructure would be ideal but had not been required in the Design Code.

### **Waste, Recycling and Sustainability**

- Although some residents might have to move bins to a designated point, such a point would be within 30m of the premises. The conditions relating to waste management would be monitored through Building Control.
- The life expectancy of the houses was 80 years. However, it was anticipated that they would survive for a longer period.
- For Phase 1 the Design Code required the developers to achieve Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and for a minimum of 10% of the energy requirements to be generated by renewable energies. In Phase 2, the applicants wished to move towards a long term solution by placing the emphasis on the reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by improving the fabric of the buildings. The proposals would be more than level 3 but less than level 4. A condition was recommended requiring details of the sustainable measures to be incorporated to be submitted and approved by the Council prior to commencement of the development to ensure that development will be consistent with adopted planning policies, the outline planning permission and the approved design code.
- Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes had been agreed in the Section 106 agreement. Therefore, it was not possible at this stage to require the developers to achieve a higher level of the code.
- Level 3 of the Code did not guarantee the level of carbon emissions proposed by the applicant.

v) **MEMBERS' DEBATE**

The following matters were raised:

- There was some concern about the some improvements were still required to make the design acceptable. Particular concern was raised about the impact of the proposed contemporary design for the Hambledon Road Frontage.
- There was concern that the applicant did not intend generating at least 10% of the energy requirements by renewable energies in accordance with the approved Design Code.

(vi) **CONCLUSIONS**

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

- 1) the Hambledon Road frontage did not fall within the administrative area of Winchester City Council and should not form part of the considerations of Winchester City Council's Planning Development Management Control Committee; and
- 2) The design was in accordance with the approved Design Code and the Masterplan. If the Committee was minded to refuse on design, it would have to indicate what harm would be caused and how the design was inappropriate.

The informal meeting commenced at 9.35 am, adjourned at 11.20 am, re-convened at 11.30 am, and concluded at 1.34 pm.

Chairman