

**WEST OF WATERLOOVILLE FORUM**

**13 September 2011**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Winchester City Council

Cooper (Chairman) (P)

Clear (P)  
Coates (P)  
Evans (P)

Pearson (P)  
Stallard (P)

Havant Borough Council

Farrow (P)  
Hunt (P)

Guest (P)  
Smallcorn (P)

Councillor Shimbart

Hampshire County Council

Allgood (P)

McIntosh (P)

Others in Attendance:

Councillors Beagley, Read and Shimbart

Officers in Attendance

Mr S Tilbury: Corporate Director (Operations), Winchester City Council

Mrs J Potter: Havant Borough Council

Mr N Green: Strategic Planner, Winchester City Council

Mr M Maitland: Community Officer, Winchester City Council

Ms R Goulding: Acceptable Behaviour Co-ordinator, Winchester City Council

1. **CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME**

The meeting was held in the D- Day Memorial Hall, Southwick and the Chairman welcomed approximately 30 members of the public, local residents, representatives of amenity groups, together with District and Parish Councillors.

2. **ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN**

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Guest be elected Vice Chairman for the remainder of the 2011/12 Municipal Year.

3. **MINUTES**  
 ([Report WWF63 refers](#))

Following debate, the Forum agreed to clarify paragraph 6 of page 3 to read: “A Member suggested that any changes to Maurepas Way should be trialled for a period of not less than three months.”

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the above amendment, the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 19 April 2011, be approved and adopted.

4. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON GENERAL MATTERS**

During public participation on general matters, not covered by other items on the agenda, the following issues were raised.

In response to concerns about progress on the new cemetery, Mr Tilbury explained that monitoring work was continuing to assess whether the proposed site was suitable, as it was affected by a high water table. He added that although the much needed new cemetery was proposed to be provided within the new MDA, it was not specifically for the MDA alone and therefore was not something that the Councils could ask the developers to fund in its entirety in another location through the Section 106. Whilst both Councils hoped to make progress on this issue, it was possible that the tests could demonstrate that only part of the proposed site would be suitable and therefore a judgement would need to be made as to whether this would make available sufficient land to ensure the viability of a cemetery over, at least, the medium term. At the conclusion of this debate, the Chairman agreed that the Forum should receive an update report on this matter at its next meeting.

In response to a question regarding the post of the Community Development Officer, Mr Tilbury explained that the current incumbent, Mr Maitland, had been transferred from a similar position within Winchester City Council on a temporary basis. The appointment of a permanent post would be made via the usual selection and advertisement procedures.

In response to concerns regarding the creation of a “rat-run” through the MDA, Mr Tilbury explained that there would be ongoing reviews of traffic issues and that the Section 106 Legal Agreement had made funding available to tackle any unexpected and safety issues that may arise. Mr Tilbury added that the update report for the next meeting would include highways issues.

In response to concerns regarding progress on the development of a new parish council for the MDA, Mr Tilbury apologised for Winchester City Council's delay in responding and the Chairman made an assurance that this response would be sent soon. Mr Tilbury added that there had been a broad acceptance from the parties involved on the principles and outcomes and that the Boundary Commission was currently considering a review of district council boundaries.

5. **PROGRESS REPORT ON THE WEST OF WATERLOOVILLE MDA**  
[\(Report WWF64 refers\)](#)

The Forum noted the progress report and Mr Green added that the Care Home and Nursing Facilities mentioned at the previous meeting, had been granted planning permission in June 2011.

The Forum received a further update from Mr Chris Hancocks (Urban Designer for RPS on behalf of Taylor Wimpey).

In summary, Mr Hancocks explained that Taylor Wimpey's Phase 1 was complete and that the units were now sold. Building work on Phase 2 was likely to take a further 18 months and that the first occupations of Phase 2 (in the Crescent area) were expected by the end of September 2011. The first occupations of the affordable housing schemes were expected in December 2011.

Taylor Wimpey proposed to merge Phases 3 (160 units) and 4 (50 units) to better deal with the peppercotted affordable housing. The Section 106 Agreement had required the development to ensure that the mix of affordable units mirrored the mix of private accommodation. It was anticipated that the planning applications for these merged phased would be submitted by December 2011.

Mr Hancocks stated that the reliance on the design codes would continue to inform Phases 3 and 4 to create a cohesive development through a movement hierarchy (principal, tree lined routes down to shared surfaces), varying densities through the site, distinctive appearance, and landscaping (which included the diversion of a stream).

With regard to the Grainger site, Mr Green explained that consent had been granted and work was progressing on finalising the Section 106 Legal Agreement. In the meantime, the Councils had agreed that Grainger could commence with preparatory, on-site works which were expected to start within the next few weeks.

During debate, Mr Tilbury explained that, under the terms of the policy, the developers were required to provide a maximum of 40% of the site for affordable housing. Concerns were raised by some Members and the audience that this percentage could increase and Mr Tilbury explained that under current conditions, it was unlikely that registered social housing schemes would be financially able to purchase open market housing from the developer. It was also explained that within that 40% there would be a mix of tenure types, including shared equity, and that only half would be social rented.

In response to a question, Mr Maitland explained that there had been limited interest to date in the junior PCSO scheme from the MDA, but that this would be promoted again at a "street brief" meeting, provisionally identified for 25

October 2011. Mr Maitland was also working with others to signpost new residents to existing youth groups in the area.

Concerns were raised regarding anti social behaviour at the MDA and the Forum noted the work that Mr Maitland was developing a Neighbourhood Agreement which would set out a code of acceptable behaviour for residents and the responsibilities organisations such as the Housing Association, the council and Police and others had to help address the issues of concern.

Ms Goulding explained that an analysis of the Police Record Management System for the period August 2010 to September 2011 had revealed that there had been 44 incidents.

There had been a peak of noise incidents in April, which Ms Goulding explained was expected as April was often the first opportunity when the weather allowed gardens to be used more frequently and windows to be opened. This was particularly the case on a new estate, where all the residents had to learn to live with their new neighbours.

Following this debate, the Forum requested to receive a similar update on anti-social behaviour at its next meeting.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Report be noted that the next meeting receive updates on the cemetery, highway issues and anti social behaviour.

**6. HAMPSHIRE WASTE RECYCLING FACILITY REPORT  
(Oral Report)**

Councillor McIntosh explained that he was a member of Hampshire County Council's Regulatory Committee which was expected to determine the planning application for the Waste Recycling Facility and therefore took no part in the debate.

The Forum received a presentation from Mr Chadwick (Hampshire County Council, Development Control Manager) and County Councillor Ward.

From this, the Forum noted that the application for the facility was currently at the consultation stage and it was anticipated that the application would be determined by the Regulatory Committee at its meeting on 28 September 2011. If consent was granted it was hoped that a constructor would be appointed by early 2012, following a tender process; that work would commence on site in March and be open to the public by September 2012.

The new facility would be split level site, similar to other facilities in Hampshire. The internal road network would be designed to avoid delays caused by refuse vehicles servicing the site. In response to a question, Councillor Ward explained that the new facility would not take asbestos waste.

During debate, concerns were raised regarding the nuisance caused to local residents from traffic accessing the site. In response, Mr Tilbury explained that most visitors would eventually use the new commercial road with good signage, but until that the road was completed as part of the Grainger development, traffic would use the existing road network. The majority of this traffic would be private motor cars. Mr Tilbury agreed that this information should be highlighted to residents that were likely to be, albeit temporarily, effected.

RESOLVED:

That the presentation be noted.

7. **DEPLOYMENT OF THE DEVELOPERS' ART CONTRIBUTION**  
(Report WWF62 refers)

Councillor Stallard declared a personal interest only as Winchester City Council's Portfolio Holder for Heritage, Culture and Art.

Mrs Appleby introduced the Report and during debate, several Members commented on the importance that the fund should be used on something worthwhile with a lasting impact.

In response to concerns, Mr Tilbury explained that, for administrative reasons, Winchester City Council would control the fund on behalf of both authorities.

During debate, a Member suggested that street naming, both in the choice of names with a local connection and the unveiling, could form part of the project. A member of the public suggested that the fund could be used to help ensure the success of the new community centre.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet be recommended to approve the deployment and management of the West of Waterlooville Art Contribution, as set out in Section 4 of the Report.

2. That Councillor Stallard (as Winchester Coty Council's representative) and Councillor Smallcorn (as Havant Borough Council's representative) be appointed to the proposed Arts Advisory Panel, described in paragraph 4.1 of the Report.

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 3.50pm.

Chairman