

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (KNOWLE HOSPITAL) SUB-COMMITTEE

22 March 2004

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Bennetts (P)
Clohosey
Davies
Evans (P)

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

Deputy Members in Attendance:

Councillor Beveridge (Standing Deputy for Councillor Clohosey)
Councillor de Peyer (Standing Deputy for Councillor Davies)

Officers in Attendance:

Mrs S Proudlock (Team Manager Planning)
Mr A Amery (Principal Planning Officer)

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Clohosey and Davies.

2. **MINUTES**

(Report PDC387 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 6 January 2004, be approved and adopted.

3. **THE COMMUNITY BUILDING**

(Oral Report)

The Sub-Committee met at the portacabin at Knowle Hospital and the Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately ten members of the public together with Mr Shepherd, a representative of Berkeley Homes (the applicant).

Members noted that the flooring of the Community Building had been completed and that a number of events had already been held in the de-consecrated chapel. However, Members were concerned that the installation of screens (that would enable the chapel to be used by different groups) was still outstanding and recommended a swift resolution. Mr Shepherd agreed and confirmed that amended plans regarding the screens would be submitted to the Council within the next few days and it was noted that a decision on this matter would normally be delegated to officers.

With regard to disabled access, Members noted that access to the rear and kitchen area was not possible internally because of the steps associated with the stage. It

was explained that use of an existing external door would be difficult to convert to disabled access because of the limitations that arose from the building's listed status. It was therefore agreed that the Conservation Officer be further consulted with a view to remedying this and any other concerns the Portfolio Holder for Community Services had, which prevented the chapel from maximising its potential as a community facility.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted and that the above actions pursued.

4. **CONSIDERATION OF PHASE 9 OF KNOWLE VILLAGE**
(Oral Report)

Mr Amery explained that Phase 9 of the development of Knowle Village had been originally considered at the previous meeting of this Committee on 6 January 2004. In response to comments made at that meeting, and comments made at the public consultations conducted by the developer, Berkeley Homes had submitted amended plans. Mr Amery recommended that the revised plans represented a significant improvement and reported that the Architects' Panel had approved the designs, in principle.

It was noted that Phase 9 proposed 42 dwellings which comprised a mixture of two bedroom flats and three and four bedroom houses across a 4.9 acres site. The embankment onto Mayles Lane had been deleted in the new plan and it was now proposed that the buildings would be stepped to follow the contours of the land.

With regard to concerns about pedestrians' safety, the amended plans proposed a 1.2 metre hard surfaced footpath alongside one side of all the roads, which Mr Shepherd explained would use conservation kerbs to retain the area's rural character. It was noted that the proposed materials, the narrowness and curving nature of the roads would have a similar effect to a home-zone where traffic was encouraged to drive at low speeds.

However, Members noted that all of the amendments to the roadways were subject to comment from the City Council's Engineers.

The amended plans proposed that an equipped play area for younger children be created within the area of Phase 7 of the development and alongside a previously agreed area designated for unequipped play. Timber fencing would enclose the equipped play area.

In response to concerns about a safe crossing to the play area, Mr Shepherd explained that this would be provided by a raised surface along a straight section of the road. Members were also concerned about the visibility of the play area and noted that the nearest houses were at a distance of 15 metres. Mr Shepherd explained that the trees that surrounded the play area were protected, but that their leaf canopies began at approximately three metres above the ground.

In response to a Member's comment, Mr Shepherd confirmed that the location of play areas was highlighted to prospective customers and that Berkeleys anticipated that they be completed in time with other works on Phase 7.

The Sub-Committee discussed the proposals for the pumping station within Phase 9 and noted that the building was likely to be constructed by the utility company and be two metres in height. Although such buildings usually benefited from permitted development rights, Members agreed that landscaping conditions should be imposed

to ensure that the station was enclosed by a 1.8 metres close boarded timber fence. It was also noted that it was not possible to “sink” the level of the station into the ground as it was to be serviced by utility vehicles.

Furthermore, in response to a comment from a member of the public, regarding rights to an existing cesspit within Phase 9, Members recommended that the City Secretary and Solicitor further investigate this issue.

Mr Amery reported that the amended plans proposed a ten metre landscaped strip along Mayles Lane. Some of the dwellings onto Mayles Lane had been re-configured so that their frontages looked out from the village and so that the view from Mayles Lane would not be of a continuous and uniform line of rear garden fences.

In response to questions, Mr Amery explained that there were no affordable housing sites proposed within either Phase 9 or Phase 5 (as set out later in these minutes). It was recommended that officers negotiate with the developer to ensure that the remainder of the required affordable housing was not crammed into one of the four phases yet to be brought forward.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a number of members of the public present commented on the boundary of the development and it was explained that the original masterplan permitted development on the land formerly owned by the hospital, which went beyond the listed boundary wall.

Concerns were also raised regarding the proposed pedestrian linkages to Mayles Lane through the woodland, and whilst it was noted that the walkways would be sensitively landscaped, some members of the public present were concerned that this would encourage car parking on Mayles Lane. In response, the Chairman agreed to seek the advice of the City Council's Engineers on how potentially dangerous parking on this private road could be policed.

A number of the members of the public present were concerned about the lack of parking and, in particular, the lack of visitor parking spaces available. In reply, Mr Amery stated that whilst Government planning guidance recommended an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling, in recognition of the larger properties within this Phase of development, two spaces per dwellings had been proposed. He confirmed that this calculation included spaces provided in garages, driveways and (if any were to be proposed) visitor parking areas.

There was also a concern that the local shops had not yet been occupied and Mr Shepherd explained that the marketing of these units had been transferred from Berkeleys to a specialist company.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted and that the above actions be pursued.

5. **CONSIDERATION OF PHASE 5 OF KNOWLE VILLAGE**
(Oral Report)

Mr Amery outlined to the Sub-Committee the preliminary details of Phase 5 of the development. This comprised 33 dwellings in three blocks that enclosed a central courtyard parking area. One block would be three storeys in height and accommodate 13 flats, the second block was two and a half storeys (with dormer windows to the rear) and comprised eight houses and four further flats, and the third block would be two storey and used for housing. All the flats would be two bedrooms and the houses would be three to four bedrooms. The area of land to be developed

was 1.4 acres and this would include a play area. With regard to car parking, an average of 1.68 spaces per unit was proposed for this Phase and Mr Shepherd explained that it would be surfaced by a gravel based material.

Mr Amery stated that the blocks were similar in scale to others already developed in the village and that they would frame views through the listed building and central courtyard. Members also noted that the boundary treatment and fences to the rear of the properties would be part hidden by the stepped ends of the blocks.

In response to questions, it was confirmed that this Phase of the development included a cycle storage area.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

6. **BUS ROUTES AND ACCESS**
(Oral Report)

Mrs Proudlock explained that a bus route through to the village from Mayles Lane had been agreed as a condition to Phase 7 of the development. To restrict the access to buses only, the County Council had recommended the use of rising bollards to be operated by radar from the buses. The County had advised that this was cheapest maintenance option for the management company to take on, and that the system could also be operated from emergency vehicles. Members also noted that the system would prevent "tail-gating" vehicles.

However, some members of the public present were concerned that the bollards would not stop motorbikes, and it was noted that the County had been reluctant to adopt this access road, which meant that it was not possible to impose traffic orders. No action could therefore be taken against unauthorised use by motorbikes. Following discussion, it was agreed that the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Access should discuss the matter of adoption further with the County Council.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted and the above actions be pursued. The details of the rising bollard system has been accepted in accordance with the requirements of the condition.

7. **UPDATE ON CONSTRUCTION WORKS TO UPGRADE THE ACCESS ROAD TO THE SEWERAGE TREATMENT WORKS AT LAND NORTH OF NORTH PARK FARM, MAYLES LANE, KNOWLE**
(Oral Report)

Mrs Proudlock explained that the developer had negotiated access rights from Mayles Lane to the sewerage plant alongside the cemetery. She reported that the City Council's Engineers had not commented on the access point because it was onto a private road, but that the Arboriculturist Officer had concluded that the scheme would not result in the loss of good quality trees. Members noted that the scheme proposed the felling of trees at the entrance and of five trees along the route of the access road.

In response to comments, Mrs Proudlock agreed to investigate the possibility of restricting access along the road to utility vehicles only and noted Members' concerns about the urbanisation of the entrance point onto Mayles Lane. Members also recommended that a landscaping condition be agreed to replace some of the lost trees.

At the conclusion of the meeting, it was suggested that prior to the next meeting, officers give the Sub-Committee a guided tour of the site to update them on latest issues and developments.

RESOLVED:

That the application for the access road be approved subject to appropriate conditions relating to the matters identified.

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

Chairman