

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (KNOWLE HOSPITAL) SUB-COMMITTEE

6 January 2004

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Bennetts (P)
Clohosey (P)
Davies
Evans (P)

Hatch (P)
Pearson (P)
Read (P)
Sutton (P)

Officers in Attendance:

Mrs S Proudlock (Team Manager Planning)
Ms M Newton (Landscape Architect)

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Davies and de Peyer.

2. **ERECTION OF 41 NO. DWELLINGS COMPRISING OF 5 NO. TWO BEDROOM, 12 NO. FOUR BEDROOM AND 24 NO. THREE BEDROOM DWELLINGS, ASSOCIATED GARAGES AND PARKING, SECTION OF DISTRIBUTION ROAD, PUMPING STATION AND LANDSCAPING AT KNOWLE VILLAGE (DETAILS IN COMPLIANCE WITH OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION W14097/33) PLANNING APPLICATION W14097/34**
(Oral Report)

The Sub-Committee met at the portacabin at Knowle Hospital and the Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately 10 members of the public together with representatives of the applicant, Berkeley Homes.

Mrs Proudlock explained that Phase Nine of the development of Knowle Village comprised of the erection of 41 dwellings, of which 5 were two bedroom, 12 four bedroom and 24 three bedroom dwellings with associated garages and parking. Phase Nine also included the construction of a pumping station, landscaping and part of the distribution road.

Mr Shepherd, on behalf of Berkeley Homes, explained that the character of the development within Phase Nine would be more fragmented and be more rural in nature than the centre of the village. It was proposed that the style of the buildings would be simple and that they would use timber window frames and garage doors, brick, reconstituted stone and that some key buildings would have rendered gables. The application also proposed that the siting of the buildings should be less formal to underline its more organic, rural character.

The siting of the distribution road had been agreed with the County Council in the masterplan. However, in order for this road to be adopted by the County, its gradient would need to be limited by extensive ground levelling. Ms Simes, Berkeley Homes' Landscape Architect, explained that this would be achieved through the creation of an embankment onto Mayles Lane that descended away from the development. At its

extreme the embankment would be 8 metres above Mayles Lane, and it was proposed that this be stepped and landscaped with trees of varying ages on the flat step, the berm (that would have a width of 2 metres), and smaller plants on the one-in-two gradient slopes. This, Ms Simes suggested, would through time replace the existing tree cover that had to be cleared for the construction.

Members commented on the drainage at the embankment and Mr Shepherd stated that this would be dealt with naturally as far as possible and by the pumping station off Mayles Lane. With regard to Members' concerns regarding the stability of the embankment, Mr Shepherd confirmed that Berkley Homes would be advised by the Council's Building Control officers.

Ms Newton explained that she had calculated the gradient to be one-in-one between each berm and that there were significant gaps in the existing vegetation that would make the development very prominent from views along Mayles Lane for some time. In response to a comment from a member of the public, it was agreed that the Sub-Committee should visit this part of the village to assess its likely impact. The Sub-Committee also heard from members of the public who were concerned at the scale of the embankment and from those who stated that the embankment could not be, through its inaccessibility, considered part of the public open space. However, Mr Shepherd commented that the 10 metre verge from Mayles Lane to the start of the embankment would be landscaped and available for public use. He added that across the whole development the provision of open spaces exceeded the area set out in the masterplan.

Berkeley Homes intended the open spaces in the area to be connected through a "green link" that lead down to an ancient woodland, Dean Copse, that was within their area of ownership. Mr Shepherd proposed that this woodland, through minimal disturbance, would be made more accessible to the public by the creation of a footpath accessible from the development and from Mayles Lane.

It was noted that the boundary between Mayles Lane and the development would be marked by the existing wrought iron fence along part of the development and that elsewhere Mr Shepherd stated that the thick vegetation and steep gradient of the bank made any further fencing unnecessary.

The Sub-Committee discussed the parking facilities for the new development and Mr Shepherd explained that the application proposed between one and two spaces per dwelling and was compliant with Government policy. He further explained that these spaces would be as low key as possible and tucked back behind the buildings. He added that the loop roads that served these properties were designed for shared pedestrian/vehicle use with no footpaths and no space for on-street parking. Some general car parking spaces would be provided and retained by the management company and these would be surfaced with rolled chippings to produce a hard wearing grey finish.

A Member expressed concern that the parking facilities were inadequate to serve what was an essentially rural and unsustainable location. This view was echoed by members of the public who also commented on the potential dangers that shared pedestrian/roadways would have for children and the lack of car parking spaces for visitors. In response, Mr Shepherd explained that the shared roadways had been successful at the Poundbury model village in Dorset.

In response to Members' questions, Mr Shepherd explained that this phase of the development contained a higher percentage of affordable housing, but taken as a whole, 64% of Knowle Village came within the definition of affordable housing.

Members expressed a concern for the level of disturbance associated with the construction and Mr Shepherd explained that this would be limited through conditions and that construction traffic would not access Mayles Lane.

It was suggested that the nature of the larger dwellings to be constructed in this phase of the development was likely to attract a number of families as occupants. Members therefore discussed the case to establish a play area within Phase Nine and Mr Shepherd explained that whilst this was not in the application, the siting of play areas would be determined through negotiation with residents.

Members were also concerned by the proximity of some of the dwellings to existing trees and Ms Simes confirmed that the applicant was reviewing this.

Mrs Proudlock reported that the Environment Agency, Southern Water, and the Archaeology Department had not objected to the application. However, the Council were still awaiting comments from the Police, English Heritage, the County Council and Fareham Borough Council.

A representative of the Parish Council addressed the Sub-Committee and stated that no further work should be granted planning permission until the completion of the community centre at the chapel. In response, Mr Shepherd explained that the chapel's flooring had been ordered and would be laid in the near future. Although OFSTED had required additional screening within the chapel for pre-school activities, Mr Shepherd stated that once the flooring was complete, the chapel would meet the specifications of the community centre as set out in the masterplan. He explained that whilst negotiations continued between Berkeley Homes, OFSTED and conservation officers concerning the screens, the chapel would be opened as a community centre following the completion of the flooring. He added that it would be administered by Berkeley Homes until the residents' association was able to take on its operation.

In conclusion, Members thanked the representatives of Berkeley Homes and the public for their contributions to the debate and recommended that officers should further consider the concerns raised. It was also agreed that a site visit should be arranged to evaluate the impact of the embankment onto Mayles Lane.

RECOMMENDED:

1. That further negotiation take place with the applicants particularly in respect of the embankment, the access road, parking issues, and the provision of children's playareas.
2. That further consideration be given to a site visit to assess possible impact of the development from Mayles Lane.

3. **CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPLICATION W08655/13: CONSTRUCTION WORKS TO UPGRADE ACCESS ROAD TO SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS – LAND NORTH OF NORTH PARK FARM, MAYLES LANE, KNOWLE** (Oral Report)

Mrs Proudlock explained that the application sought to upgrade the maintenance access to the sewage treatment works along an informal track. The sewage treatment works were located outside the boundaries of the former Knowle Hospital. She explained that the Council's arboriculturalist had stated that this would result in some, but not a substantial, loss of trees that would require re-planting. Whilst the Environment Agency had not commented on the application, the Highways Agency had expressed its concerns about the access road's egress onto Mayles Lane.

The Sub-Committee heard from Mr Cooper who owned the surrounding land. He stated that the upgrade was unnecessary as the plant had always been accessed by another track leading through North Park Farm which he stated required no upgrade nor loss of trees. In response Mr Shepherd explained that Berkeley Homes had been denied access along this track by one of the owners.

However, Members agreed that the application should be deferred to gather further information about land ownership issues and that a site visit should be arranged to assess the track's egress onto Mayles Lane.

RECOMMENDED:

That application be deferred pending further information and that a site visit be arranged to assess egress onto Mayles Lane.

4. VOTE OF THANKS TO MR NANGREAVE

The Sub-Committee noted that Mr Nangreave, who was unable to attend this meeting, was due to leave the Council and take up a new post at Eastleigh Borough Council. Members wished to express their thanks to Mr Nangreave for his hard work at Winchester City Council and in particular for the expert guidance he had given Members and the leading role he had taken in the Knowle Village development.

The meeting commenced at 7.00pm and concluded at 9.00pm.

Chairman