

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 1 December 2005

Item No:	10
Address:	Newtown Garage Church Road Newtown Fareham Hampshire PO17 6LE
Parish/Ward	Soberton
Proposal Description:	Residential redevelopment, comprising 12 no. dwellings (OUTLINE - considering siting, access and landscaping) (RESUBMISSION)
Applicants Name	Mapledean Special Projects Ltd
Case No:	05/02158/OUT
W No:	W19031/01
Case Officer:	Mr Neil Mackintosh
Date Valid:	1 September 2005
Delegated or Committee:	Committee Decision
Reason for Committee:	Parish Council submitted representations contrary to officer recommendation
Reason for Committee:	4 or more representations contrary to the Officer's recommendations have been received
Site Factors:	Development Frontage (part) Countryside (part)

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 1 December 2005

Site Description

- The application site comprises approximately 0.7ha, of which 0.28ha is rough grassland
- The remainder contains a commercial garage/workshop building with a large, redundant forecourt and, to the rear and sides, open storage areas containing cars, vans, timber and tyres.
- The building is approximately 350 sq.m in floor area and has been constructed using brick and cement fibre sheets.
- The commercial part of the site is separated from the agricultural part by a bund surmounted with shrubs.

Relevant Planning History

- W19031 – Demolition of existing garage/workshop and erection of 10 dwellings, associated access road, garages and parking (Outline) – refused September 2004, for three reasons;
- 1. 'it would represent new residential development in the countryside for which no overriding justification has been demonstrated', 2. POS, 3. Affordable housing

Proposal

- As per Proposal Description - Residential redevelopment, comprising 12 no. dwellings (OUTLINE - considering siting, access and landscaping)

Consultations

Strategic Planning:

- Development proposed is contrary to policy and should be refused for the following reasons.
- "The site only contains a small amount of defined development frontage, between Deers Leap and the garage, and therefore this is the only part of the site where housing development should be permitted, only with a frontage to Church Road, and only where it meets the requirements of H2 of the adopted Plan."
- "The remainder of the site is subject to countryside policies and therefore the proposed housing development in that part of the site would be contrary to policy."
- "I note that 50% affordable housing is being offered, which is higher than the normal proportion sought, but there is no justification for setting aside the adopted planning policies."
- "Any proposed affordable housing promoted as an exception scheme, outside the development frontages, if that is the intention, should reflect the frontage character of Newtown, and therefore front Church Road. This is clearly not the case."
- "Any exception scheme should also be promoted and supported by the Parish Council, and be the result of an appraisal of all suitable sites in the Parish. This, again, is clearly not the case, and I am aware that an analysis of all suitable sites in the Parish has commenced without reaching any conclusions to date."

Engineers: Highways:

- No objection, subject to conditions.
- "It is my view that the previous use of the site for business purposes will have generated similar, if not greater, traffic generation than the proposed development."

Housing:

- The Enabling Officer supports this scheme although he suggests that the affordable housing could be better integrated into the site.
- "There is a substantial housing need in Group 6 for affordable rented accommodation with shortfalls of people requiring one, two and three bedroom properties standing at 36, 40 and 34 (Housing Needs Survey 2002)."
- "Although part of the site is behind the existing development frontage I am in full support of this scheme from a Strategic Housing perspective."
- "The developer is proposing to make 50% of the site available for affordable housing, which equates to 2x2 bedroom flats, 2x2 bedroom houses and 2x3 bedroom houses."
- "This is an excellent mix of properties for the area and the developer is also suggesting mixed tenure with two of the properties being available for shared ownership."

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 1 December 2005

Landscape:

- No objections, the use of the paddock for a 'low key' public open space is acceptable and will not detract from the appearance of the countryside.
- A contribution would have to be made to the POS Funding System in respect of Sports, and consideration would have to be given to the provision of play equipment.

Environmental Protection:

- No objections, the previous application concerned me but we have now received a Phase 2 Contaminated Land Report and I am satisfied that, from an environmental health perspective, the site can be remediated satisfactorily for the proposed new use for domestic dwellings.

Environment Agency:

- No objection, in principle, but suggest conditions re: contamination, drainage and piling

Representations:

Soberton Parish Council

- Object – backland development fails to comply with planning policy but development within former H3 frontage is acceptable, in principle
- The character of Newtown, like the remainder of the Parish, is ribbon development and the proposals fail to meet this characteristic.
- There is no need for the proposed additional open space as Newtown is already adequately served by existing local space and play facilities.
- Traffic - the proposals would exacerbate existing highway safety problems at the Lodge Hill junction.
- Sustainability - the village is not served by regular transport and has no shop.
- Affordable housing – A recent survey identifies a small need (4 units) but this is not borne out by the Housing Register. In any case the sustainability issue needs to be addressed.
- In addition, the proposal does not comply with the VDS.

In addition 26 letters of representation have been received, many from Newtown residents and some from slightly further afield.

- The breakdown is as follows; 7 in support, 4 are concerned and 15 object.
- Support – it would;
 - - 'transform an ugly eyesore into an attractive and useful site'
 - - provide much needed affordable housing
 - - provide a good public open space
- Two correspondents support the proposal in principle but say that the number of houses should be reduced to comply with adopted planning policies
- Concerns – traffic generation, precedent, adverse affect on the village, visual impact, beyond the accepted development frontage, no need for the public open space, no support infrastructure such as public transport or local shops.
- Object – over development, scale wholly disproportionate to Church Road, would result in an unrealistic increase in such a small community, traffic generation and parking, highway danger, we no longer have a shop and a bus is a rare occurrence, drainage, should be affordable housing for the younger generation, proposed open space is not necessary.
- One correspondent says 'The Newton postcode of PO17 6LE consists of 37 registered residential properties. This development, if allowed, would increase this number to 49, a rise of 32%. This is totally inappropriate and will have a dramatic and devastating effect on our quiet village.'

Relevant Planning Policy:

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review:

- H5, H9, UB3, C1, C2, T5

Winchester District Local Plan

- H2, H6, EN5, C1, C14, T9

Winchester District Local Plan Review Deposit/Revised Deposit:

- H3, H4, H6, DP3, C1, C17, T2, T3

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

- Achieving a Better Mix in New Housing Developments
- Soberton and Newtown Village Design Statement
- Winchester Housing Needs Survey
- Rural Housing Information Booklet
- Housing Monitoring Report
- Guide to the Open Space Funding System
- Movement, Access, Streets and Spaces
- Parking Standards 2002

National Planning Policy Guidance/Statements:

- PPG 1 General Policy and Principles
- PPG 3 Housing
- PPG 7 The Countryside – Environmental Quality and Economic and Social Development
- PPG 13 Transport

Planning Considerations

The main considerations in respect of this application are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the character of the area/spatial characteristics/street scene
- Residential amenities
- Highways
- Public open space provision
- Affordable housing
- Contamination
- Drainage/flooding
- Comments on representations

Principle of development

- The proposed development falls into two categories:
- That which is within the adopted Development Frontage is acceptable, in principle, subject to 'Better Mix' and normal H2 criteria.
- That which is outside, and therefore in the countryside, may only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and to provide for affordable housing to cater for a proven local need.
- See comments from Strategic Planning above.
- The Soberton and Newtown VDS identifies the view across the site from the adjacent crossroads as a 'glimpse' point ie. a good example of "outlook between buildings which deserve protection from infill" and "preserve the feel of the rural environment".
- In addition, there is an issue regarding the loss of an employment site, although the Committee did not use this as a reason for refusal on the last occasion that this site was considered.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 1 December 2005

Impact on character of area

- Your officers estimate that there are now approximately 54 houses in the 'village' of Newtown
- A development of 12 houses would result in a 22% increase
- The character of the village is linear, with most houses fronting on to Church Road
- There are three examples of 'backland' development and there is a short spur road serving three houses at the north end of the village.
- The proposal would result in a row of 8 houses behind the development frontage, facing towards Hundred Acres Road.
- This would appear to be out of character with the pattern of ribbon development.

Residential amenities

- The proposed layout is such that the buildings should not cause loss of light, overlooking or any other loss of amenity to the immediate neighbours.
- It is possible that they would benefit from the removal of the existing, potentially noisy, use.

Highways

- Although many of the local residents believe that the proposal would generate additional traffic and cause parking and highway safety issues this is not supported by the Highway Engineer.
- He believes that the proposed use could generate less traffic than the existing use.
- He proposes that, if planning permission were to be granted, conditions should be applied to cover arrangements during construction, visibility splays, parking and construction standards.

Public open space provision

- Although the applicant proposes to offer a large area for use as a play area or village green, there is a difference of opinion as to whether this is necessary.
- The Parish Council and some of the local residents say that the Parish is already adequately catered for, whereas your Landscape Officer has no objection to the use of the land for low key recreational purposes.
- Soberton Parish is identified as Scale A(High) in the 2005/6 Open Space Funding Strategy
- Any planning permission would have to be subject to a financial contribution to the Funding System to cater for Sports provision and would have to take into account whether or not the proposed POS should be provided with play equipment.

Affordable housing

- Any planning permission would also have to confirm, by means of a Section 106 Agreement, the terms of affordable housing provision.
- As can be seen from the comments of the Enabling Officer, above, he would have no problem in accepting six dwellings on the terms that are being offered.

Contamination

- The site is within a minor aquifer and previous uses of the site mean that ground disturbance could cause contamination by hydrocarbons.
- However, Environmental Protection and the Environment Agency are content that this can be addressed by planning conditions and that remediation is possible.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 1 December 2005

Drainage/flooding

- There is no mains drainage in Newtown and there are no proposals in this Outline application concerning the means of foul water disposal.
- It is understood that the applicant has applied, in the past, for consent to discharge treated sewage effluent into the Wallington tributary by Ingoldfield Lane
- The Council's Drainage Engineer has raised no objection to this and the EA have not raised this as an issue in their response to the planning application.
- It is probable that part of the Open Space would have to be used for an underground treatment works.
- In addition, the LPA would have to be supplied with details of surface water drainage.

Case Officer's summary

- This application has positive attributes, in that it involves the removal of an unattractive building and a use that has potential to disturb the quiet enjoyment of neighbouring residential properties.
- Twelve additional houses would be provided, of which six would be 'affordable'.
- In addition, an area of land would be dedicated for public use.
- However, much of the development would be in the countryside and contrary to adopted planning policy.
- Your Officers consider that this is not a sustainable site nor appropriate for, in terms of the settlement of Newtown, a major development of this scale and design.
- The potential benefits of the scheme do not outweigh adopted policies.

Recommendation

REFUSE – subject to the following refusal reasons:

Reasons

01 Development as proposed is contrary to H5, H9, UB3, C1 and C2 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review and Policies H2, H6, EN5, C1 and C14 of the Winchester District Local Plan, and would be likely to prejudice Proposals H3, H6, DP3, C1 and C17 of the emerging Winchester District Local Plan Review, in that it;

- a) fails to protect or enhance the countryside,
- b) results in residential development outside the development frontage of the village in a manner that is inappropriate in terms of scale, density and layout and does not reflect the character of the area,
- c) provides for affordable housing in an unsustainable location and where such a need has not been established to the satisfaction of the Parish Council and the Local Planning Authority.

02 The proposal is contrary to Policy R2 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review and Policy RT3 of the Winchester District Local Plan, and would be likely to prejudice Proposal RT3 of the emerging Winchester District Local Plan Review, in that it fails to make adequate provision for public recreational open space to the required standard, and would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the area.

03 The proposed development is contrary to the Policy H8 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review and Policy H5 of the Winchester District Local Plan, and would be likely to prejudice Proposal H6 of the emerging Winchester District Local Plan Review in that it fails to make acceptable provision for affordable housing. The proposal would therefore conflict with the housing strategies of these Plans.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 1 December 2005

Informatives

01. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: H5, H8, H9, UB3, C1, C2, T5

Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: H2, H5, H6, EN5, C1, C14, T9

Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: H3, H4, H6, DP3, C1, C17, T2, T3