

**SPECIAL PLANNING COMMITTEE –  
NORTH WHITELEY URBAN EXTENSION**

**10 September 2015**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Ruffell (Chairman) (P)

Dibden

Evans

Izard

Jeffs (P)

Johnston (P)

McLean (P)

Scott (P)

Tait (P)

Deputy Members:

Councillor Lipscomb (Standing Deputy for Councillor Dibden)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Achwal

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Read (Portfolio Holder for Built Environment) and Weston (Portfolio Holder for Service Delivery)

---

1. **NORTH WHITELEY URBAN EXTENSION, BOTLEY ROAD, CURBRIDGE**

**OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION (STRATEGIC ACCESS ROADS UNRESERVED) FOR PROVISION OF UP TO 3500 RESIDENTIAL UNITS; INCLUDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING; 2 PRIMARY SCHOOLS AND 1 SECONDARY SCHOOL; UP TO 2000SQM OF FLEXIBLE SPACE FOR A, A2, A3, A5, B1 AND D1, 2 CHILDREN'S NURSERIES; PROVISION OF AN EXTRA CARE FACILITY (WITH SCOPE FOR ALL USES TO REVERT TO RESIDENTIAL IF THERE WERE INSUFFICIENT MARKET DEMAND) IN 2 LOCAL CENTRES; CREATION OF A COMMUNITY BUILDING; SPORTS FACILITY (INCLUDING PAVILION, GRASS PITCHES AND 2 ALL WEATHER PITCHES); ALLOTMENTS; LANDSCAPING; EXTENSIVE RECREATION AND PLAY PROVISION. CREATION OF LINK ROADS BETWEEN WHITELEY AND BOTLEY ROAD, WIDER HIGHWAYS WORK, CYCLEWAY AND FOOTPATH NETWORKS (INCLUDING TWO LOCALISED FOOTPATH DIVERSIONS) BUS PRIORITY MEASURES, CAR PARKING, FLOOD ATTENUATION NETWORK, SERVICE ENHANCEMENTS, DEMOLITION OF A NUMBER OF EXISTING ON SITE STRUCTURES AND ASSOCIATED ENGINEERING WORKS (INCLUDING CHANGES TO LEVELS) (OUTLINE - CONSIDERING ACCESS)**

**Case No: 15/00485/OUT**

(Report PDC1031 and Update Sheet refers)

The decision arising from consideration of the above Report is circulated separately and forms an appendix to the minutes.

The Committee agreed to receive the Update Sheet as an addendum to Report PDC1031.

In summary, the Update Sheet outlined various matters as follows:- Additional and amended conditions recommended by Highways England which were considered acceptable; An update from the Council's Strategic Housing Officer in relation to the affordable housing numbers, mix and tenure; Legal Opinion submitted by Curdridge Parish Council outlining a Preliminary Counsel's Opinion on the Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment (SHRA), together with the Council's Environmental Consultant's response; Hampshire County Council (HCC) Highway's updated comments regarding Whiteley Way Bus Lanes, also setting out changes to recommendations and suggested conditions . Full details contained within the Update Sheet.

In addition, the Update Sheet highlighted corrections to the Report as follows:- (1) In paragraph 10.140 (Page 52) it is stated that Barn Farm is excluded from the site. This is not the case. Barn Farm is included within the red line of the application site; and (2) In paragraph 3.4 (Page 5) of the Report, the figure is stated as being 'up to 3,500 dwellings proposed', this should read 'the limit to 3,500 dwellings'.

At the invitation of the Head of Development Management, the Committee had visited various areas and site locations of the proposal, as outlined in the Report, to assist them in assessing the proposed development in relation to the setting and relationship with the surrounding area. The site visit was attended by all Members present on the Committee.

The Committee gave consideration to the Viability Assessment and Review submitted by the Valuation Office Agency (VOA) as exempt supplementary information, circulated to Members of the Committee prior to the meeting and attached as an exempt addendum to Report PDC 1031.

During public participation, Wendy Backwell and Duncan Murray ( Curbridge Preservation Society) , Roy Roberts, Alison Wilson, Ian Small and Sarah Moorhouse , ( Whiteley Co-Ownership) , Richard Grant (on behalf of on the units on Bury Farm) and Mrs Hatch, together with Councillor Colin Mercer (Botley Parish Council), Councillor Kevan Blundell (Curdridge Parish Council), Councillor Mike Evans (Whiteley Town Council) and Ann Ailes, (Burridge and Swanwick Residents' Association), all spoke in objection to the application and answered Members' questions thereon. Martin Miller (Agent) and Neil Thorn (Agents Office) spoke in support of the application and also answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation Councillor Achwal, spoke on this item as a Ward Member for Whiteley.

In summary, Councillor Achwal stated that, she did not support the application in its current form. She made reference to the promises made to the local community when Whiteley was initially developed approximately 25 years ago, but reported that, to date, this had still not been achieved. In addition, funding in the region of £2 million had been provided many years ago to complete work to Whiteley Way but this was not undertaken. In this respect, residents had lost faith that these works would ever be implemented. Councillor Achwal stated that Whiteley Solent Business Park was full to capacity with approximately 10,000 employees already using the roads to drive in and out of Whiteley on a daily basis and the current highway infrastructure rendering it near on impossible to access or exit Whiteley during peak times. The proposed development would exacerbate an already hazardous traffic position at junctions and make road user levels dangerous for the existing residents of Whiteley. Councillor Achwal made reference to the need for the transport infrastructure prior to the commencement of works on site and also expressed concern regarding the provision of affordable housing on site, with proposed levels of 25% falling significantly below the aspired 40% sought by the Council's policies. In conclusion, Councillor Achwal considered that the proposed plans were not ambitious enough and should seek to include the provision of road infrastructure first, before any development commences on site, together with the assessing the feasibility of a park and ride service, a Whiteley train station (similar to that achieved in Hedge End) and the introduction of bus services at regular intervals.

At the conclusion of public speaking, the Head of Legal and Democratic Services addressed matters relating to Habitat Regulations which affect the Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Area (SPA) (including the Upper Hamble) in response to Counsel's Opinion, as obtained by Curbridge Preservation Society and Curbridge Parish Council. In summary officers consider that Habitats Regulation issues have been fully addressed in the officer's report and in the Shadow HRA which has been assessed by the Council's consultant as being compliant with Habitats Regulation requirements. The Committee were reminded that before making any decision to grant planning permission, the Council as "competent authority" must be satisfied that, having regard to mitigation measures the development is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the SPA. The Committee will be asked to make a formal decision on whether this test is met and to adopt the Shadow HRA as the Council's assessment. This will be included in an amended recommendation .

Members sought clarification from officers on points relating to the phased implementation of the highway infrastructure and the timescales expected for this to support the development of the site.

At the conclusion of the public speaking and the ensuing questions, the Committee debated the application.

In conclusion, the Committee agreed to refuse the officer recommendation outlined in the Report and Update Sheet. (Voting: 7 for refusal; 0 against).

Following discussion of reasons for refusal of the application, Members indicated that the reason why they were minded to reject the officer recommendation to approve the application was because of their concerns over the phasing of provision of highway infrastructure.

Following a short break, the Chairman put forward a motion to the Committee, that the decision of the application be deferred and that this meeting of the Special Planning Committee be adjourned to a date, to be scheduled in due course, pending discussion with the applicant, the North Whiteley Consortium, to fully investigate the transport infrastructure concerns expressed by the Committee, as set out above.

The motion to defer the decision of the application, for the reasons as set out above, was voted on and carried (Voting: 6 for; 1 against).

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Viability Assessment and Review submitted by the VOA, be accepted as an exempt addendum to Report PDC1031; and
2. That the decision taken on application 15/00485/OUT, be deferred and that this meeting of the Special Planning Committee be adjourned to a date, to be scheduled in due course, following the Committee's refusal of the officers recommendation and pending discussions with the North Whiteley Consortium over the phasing of provision of highway infrastructure.

The meeting commenced at 2pm and concluded at 7.05pm.

Chairman