

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 12 January 2006

Item No: 08
Address: Hampshire Constabulary Police Headquarters Romsey Road
Winchester Hampshire SO22 5DB

Parish/Ward Winchester Town

Proposal Description: Demolition of all existing buildings; residential re-development
(OUTLINE) (AMENDED SCHEME)

Applicants Name Hampshire Police Authority

Case No: 05/00560/OUT

W No: W04090/19

Case Officer: Mr Dave Dimon

Date Valid: 1 March 2005

Delegated or Committee: Committee Decision

Reason for Committee: At the request of a councillor
Reason for Committee: Parish Council submitted representations contrary to officer
recommendation
Reason for Committee: The Officers consider the application to be controversial or potentially
controversial
Reason for Committee: The application is for a major development
Reason for Committee: 4 or more representations contrary to the Officer's recommendations
have been received
Reason for Committee: The application has been submitted by/or on behalf of a
Member/Officer of the Council which they have notified to the Director
of Development Services

Site Factors:

Introduction

- Members will recall that this application has already been considered at a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Police Headquarters Winchester) Sub-Committee on 9 June this year. Report PDC 554 refers.
- This report does not therefore repeat the information contained in that report, which for the assistance of Members is attached as APPENDIX A to this report, together with the minutes of the sub-committee meeting at APPENDIX B.
- The information that follows is therefore confined to updating the previous report, explaining the changes that have been made to the proposals, the additional supporting information that has been submitted, the further comments that have been received as a result of re-advertising the amended plans and your officer's recommendation on the amended application.
- It should also be noted that since the sub-committee the following events have occurred which are relevant to this application:
 - a. The applicants appeal against the refusal of their earlier application to refurbish and re-clad the existing tower block and erect an additional office building has been dismissed.
 - b. The Inspectors report on the Local Plan Review has been published.

Site Description

- See report PDC554 attached as APPENDIX A to this report.

Relevant Planning History

- See report PDC554 attached as APPENDIX A to this report.

Proposal

- As per Proposal Description
- The proposals have been amended as a result of negotiations subsequent to the sub-committee but this does not alter the description as it is an outline application simply to demolish all existing buildings and redevelop the site for residential purposes. Only the means of access is included for consideration at this stage.
- Further comment on the changes to the proposals is given below in the planning considerations part of the report.

Consultations

The consultation responses previously reported remain unchanged other than for:

Conservation:

- The amended plans and further information provided has not overcome the conservation officers concerns as reported previously to the working party. (See PDC554 Annex A to this report)

HCC Environment Department:

- A contribution of £1000 per unit will be required towards the Winchester Movement and Access Plan.
- Parking provision will be accepted at a level of .95 spaces per unit.

HCC Education

- This is not an area where there is a shortage of school places so a developer's contribution towards education facilities will not be expected in this case.

Forward Plans:

- At the sub-committee meeting it was reported that there was no policy objection to the proposal in terms of loss of existing employment or so far as the proposed housing provision including mix and affordable housing content was concerned. This was of course the situation based on the policy then applying under the provisions of the statutory Winchester District Local Plan 1998.

- Since that time however the Inspectors report on the Local Plan Review has been received.
- This has changed the affordable housing provision percentage required in Winchester to 40%.
- The applicant has submitted a strong representation that the original presumption of a 30% (now 88 units) affordable housing provision should be honoured as that was the applicable policy at the time the application was submitted and all viability projections and negotiations have been progressed on that basis, even though it was known that the Local Plan review proposed to raise the level. Insistence on 40% affordable housing now would, the applicant submits, be seriously prejudicial to the viability of the scheme.
- This is a major policy issue with important consequences for the Council's affordable housing objectives in Winchester, particularly in the light of other emerging significant schemes that will be similarly affected by this policy change.
- Officers have advised the applicant that with the confirmation of the Inspector's report for the application of 40% requirement in Winchester and having regard to the importance that the Council attach to the provision of affordable housing such policy is being applied to all qualifying developments determined after the publication of the Inspector's report.
- Any material considerations as to why such policy should not apply to this application must be resolved by committee.

South East Regional Design Panel:

- Pleased to receive the current outline planning application.
- We feel that whilst there are a number of issues to be resolved to turn this layout and building form into a 'successful place' we absolutely support the general principle.
- We recognise that it is important to view this project 'in the round' and to consider the advantages of the removal of the tower. We also appreciate the advantages of the existing mature landscaping that screen the site on its 'public' edge.
- Having said that, this is an important and potentially prominent site that lies adjacent to a number of buildings and areas of architectural and historic importance. This will demand the appointment of a design team with a proven track record of meeting such demands.
- Frequently we have found that the development industry misunderstands such contexts and responds with a pastiche aesthetic. The need here is to understand the essential vernacular (form, layout, detailing, materials, etc) and creatively respond in contemporary manner.

Southern Water

- In the sub-committee report it was stated that further information was sought on the adequacy of the existing water and waste water system to serve development of this scale.
- Southern Water has subsequently advised that upgrading of the existing main will be required but that this can be covered by a suitable planning condition.

Representations:

City of Winchester Trust:

- Very disappointing that this amended scheme is so little changed from original proposal, and it is considered that the token reduction of six units from the 300 shown then has had no effect on the unsatisfactory rigid layout that was originally proposed, or that the new density would be more acceptable than that proposed in the previous scheme.
- While recognising that the design of the buildings shown is representational, intended only to indicate the number of units and type of residential development that could be accommodated on the site, the Trust considers that the scale and mass of the structures that are still proposed would be inappropriate here and would have more in common with the nearby institutional buildings, the prison and the hospital, than the neighbouring dwellings in West End Terrace and West End Close. It is felt most strongly that the layout and design of any development here should show more consideration of both the topography and the terraced layout of the adjoining Conservation Area.
- While details giving the need for the telecommunications mast are given in the application, it is regretted that nothing was provided about the effect it would have on the street scene, and

this is felt unacceptable for a site in this position.

- The minimal amendments now proposed result in a scheme so similar to the previous one that the Trust has no reason to alter its comments of 24.04.05 made on the original application and therefore continues to STRONGLY OBJECT to the scale, density, layout and style of the proposed development.

Further letters of representation as a result of advertising the amended plans have been received from 15 objectors, most of whom are neighbours. This is in addition to the 33 representations reported in the sub committee report although many of the objectors to the amended plans also objected to the original application. The following concerns have been raised.

- Too many dwellings, overdevelopment of site, loss of existing green area.
- The buildings are too large and too high, design unimaginative & uninspiring. The indications of intent shown do not generate confidence that the proposal would develop into a design worthy of a city of Winchester's quality.
- Will aggravate existing traffic congestion and parking problems in the area. Romsey Road is already overloaded and the inadequate on site parking will cause residents and their visitors to try to park in nearby streets.
- Not in keeping with existing density/style /character of conservation area.
- Will overwhelm existing services, schools etc and not benefit current residents.
- Wish existing Police HQ to stay. Loss of employment will contribute to the dormitory nature of the town.
- Excavation works could destabilise trees in West End Terrace and alter water table. Buildings are too close to trees and insufficient depth of soil is shown for the new tree planting.
- Overlooking /loss of privacy / to West End Terrace residents.
- Block at northern end of site too high at 3 storeys and will overlook existing houses/gardens and reduce light.
- Contextual information and sections still inadequate, gradient of West End Terrace in relation to site levels and silhouette of the roof of the house in the street should be shown. The impact of the trees in full leaf is misleading as in winter the real impact will be much greater.
- Impact on skyline from longer views will be harmful. A solid bank of buildings up to 6 storey height is likely to be just as prominent a silhouette on the skyline as existing tower block.
- Visual impact projections not believable, true topography and tree cover has not been accurately represented. Pedestrian routes through site (West End Terrace/Romsey Road) effectively removed. Derisory provision of open space, too dominated by car provision. Block concept architecture needs more design imagination and incorporation of elements such as shops, restaurants and communal facilities. Site is perfect candidate for a combined heat and power scheme.
- Concerned about visual and health impact of telecommunications mast.
- Not opposed to principle of residential redevelopment but impact on West End Terrace must be better addressed as presently unacceptable, particularly, density, height, trees, parking , open space, telecommunications tower.
- Proposal is a missed opportunity.

Relevant Planning Policy:

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review:

- UB2, UB3, H5, H7, H11, E6, E8, T4, T5, T12

Winchester District Local Plan

- G2, HG6, HG11, EN3, EN4, EN5, EN7, EN8, EN9, H.1, H5, H7, E2, RT3, T8, T9, T11, T12, W1, W5, W10

Winchester District Local Plan Review Deposit and Revised Deposit:

- DP1, DP.3, DP.4, DP5, DP6, DP8, HE2, HE.4, HE.5, HE8, H2, H5, H7, E2, E4, T1, T4, T5, W.1.

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

- Hampshire County Structure Plan (Revision): Implementing Policy H4
- Achieving a Better Mix in New Housing Developments
- Winchester District Landscape Character Assessment
- Winchester District Landscape Assessment
- The Hampshire Landscape: A Strategy for the future
- Winchester Housing Needs Survey 2002.
- Technical Paper: Open Space Provision and Funding
- Guide to the Open Space Funding System
- Assessment of Playing Field Provision in the Winchester Built-Up Area
- Movement, Access, Streets and Spaces
- Parking Standards
- The Future of Winchester Study
- Winchester City and its Setting
- Winchester Conservation Area Project

National Planning Policy Guidance/Statements:

- PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development
- PPG 3 Housing
- PPG 8 Telecommunications
- PPG 13 Transport
- PPG 15 Planning and the Historic Environment

Planning Considerations

Following consideration by the sub-committee on 9 June the principle of redevelopment of the Police Headquarters site for residential development was accepted but officers were instructed to negotiate with the applicants to resolve concerns about the impact of the development and particularly :

- Impact on the character of the area and especially the effect on Winchester's skyline
- Effects on Conservation Area.
- Access and car parking
- Public open space provision
- Affordable housing
- Telecommunications Mast
- Comments on representations

Impact on character of area

- In response to the concerns raised regarding the impact of the development on the character of the area and especially the effect on Winchester's skyline the following amendments have been made to the plans.
- In order to reduce the potential bulk of the new building when viewed from West End Terrace, the number of units has been reduced to 294 and the placing of units within the site has been changed to redistribute some of the accommodation. This has resulted in a building of significantly reduced bulk and lower profile to West End Terrace but an increase in height to Block A (on the prison side of the site) from 4 storey to 5 storey in height.
- The part of the building which can be viewed from the new pedestrian / cycle access (where the frontage is open and glimpsed from West End Terrace) is now only 2½ - 3½ storeys above site level and incorporates a new bridge housing 2 units which provides a better design solution to this important approach and view into the site.
- The corner tower that defines the Romsey Road / West End Terrace corner of the site has been reduced from 6 storeys to 5 storeys, with the fifth storey now in the roof space.
- The parking provision has been reviewed and following the agreement of HCC Director of Environment has been reduced to 0.96 spaces per unit (from 300 to 283). This has allowed

increased landscaped areas within the central courtyard, providing a greener outlook from the surrounding blocks. This also provides the opportunity for more generously scaled footpath routes.

- The applicant has additionally provided photomontages to illustrate the impact of the development from key views around the city both in summer and winter.
- The overall site density is now 126.180 dph.
- Given that the application is only in outline and is not supported by any elevation drawings but only by floor plans to demonstrate the arrangement of accommodation for the purposes of establishing capacity and by some 3 illustrative views, and now a profile elevation as viewed from West End Terrace, the testing of the impact of the development in views from around the city is very important.
- The photomontages have thus attempted to superimpose the profile of the building mass onto the views by a dotted line. This is not as good as superimposing the actual building design but since such details have not been designed that has not been possible.
- The profiles also appear unrealistic because they are overlaid on the photographs in a manner that cannot portray 'depth of field'. That is why one has to recognize that the buildings are in fact set into the site by some distance so the photomontages must be read in conjunction with the layout plan. Officers have been assured that they are accurate and they demonstrate that for the most part the development will be screened by the surrounding tree cover.
- The longer views from St Giles Hill, St Catherines Hill, Orams Arbour and Fulflood School demonstrate that the development will not break the skyline such as to be visually intrusive.
- The close views from Romsey Road, West End Terrace and West End Close similarly show the buildings will be largely hidden by the existing trees and views with and without the existing trees have been provided in order to demonstrate this.

Access and car parking

- Agreement has been reached between the applicant and HCC in regard to the level of car parking which has been reduced to 0.96 spaces per unit (from 300 to 283).
- The serving of the site by means of the existing Romsey Road access has also been accepted with access to West End Terrace being only for pedestrian, cycle and emergency purposes.
- A contribution of £1000 per dwelling is required towards the Winchester Movement and Access Plan.

Effects on the Conservation Area.

- As stated in the consultation section above, the Conservation Officer remains of the view that such a dense urban form of development is inappropriate for this prominent site which relates to the suburb of Orams Arbour which was developed outside the walled city following the arrival of the railway in the 1840s and is distinctly different to that found in the city centre.
- Whilst parts do have an urban character, especially where the 3 storey houses front onto Romsey Road, the terraced houses and villas away from Romsey Road are set back from the street with gardens and railings giving them a more intimate character.
- The proposal is clearly of high density urban form but has the advantage of being contained within a mature enclosure of trees on the most public sides and it is now evident that the development will not be dominant above these trees. There are also several examples of large institutional developments that do not conform to the suburb pattern of development eg, the Hospital, the Prison, West Downs campus, and the redeveloped Peninsular Barracks and St Pauls hospital sites.
- The proposal does also incorporate the opportunity for some new tree planting and it is felt that the impact on the conservation area will not be unduly harmful.

Public Open Space Provision

- The proposal will provide reasonable open space provision in terms of the retained amenity planting around the site and the provision within the scheme whilst contributions to the Open Space Funding scheme will meet the wider requirements for improved provision.

Affordable Housing

- With this being an outline application the details of the affordable housing provision in terms of mix, tenure and number have not been able to be resolved but the Strategic Housing Manager has drawn attention to the Housing Needs Survey requirement for a mix of units comprising one, three and two bedroom units in descending order of need, which should be integrated throughout the development. However, given that the scheme is made up of nearly all smaller units this will be similarly reflected in the affordable housing provision.
- As mentioned above in the policy section, officers believe that following the Local Plan Inspector's report a 40% affordable housing provision should apply. The applicant contests this and will be making representation to committee as to why only 30% affordable housing provision should apply to this application.

Telecommunications Mast

- Much concern has been expressed about the indicative replacement telecommunications tower in the south west corner of the site adjoining the prison.
- Presently the tower block accommodates antenna for Vodafone and Airwave MMO2 which provides the Police and emergency services coverage. These antenna are at a height of 33m.
- In any redevelopment of the site the land owner is legally obliged to make alternative provision for this facility. The present application does not include a replacement mast as part of the proposed development but does identify that such a requirement will have to be addressed by a separate application and that any proposed redevelopment of the site must allow for this. Without alternative provision the tower block could not be demolished as the facility has to be maintained.
- The detailed technical requirement for a replacement mast, including its design, is not at this stage known but the present height advantage does provide optimal coverage which could not be achieved by a single lower mast.
- Various positions on the site have been considered but having regard to the need for servicing access and minimising its visual impact the selected site seems at this stage to be the most discrete available, as well as fulfilling technical requirements.
- Discussions are continuing with the operators, but current information is that if a mast of 30m was provided in the position indicated, that all operators could operate at or below this height. The photomontages show the anticipated impact on the landscape. Antenna would increase this height by about 2m.
- Operators would be asked to share a purpose built building at the foot of the mast to accommodate equipment, which would help to assimilate the structure into the overall design.
- For technical reasons temporary masts may be necessary whilst the tower block is demolished as it will inhibit line of sight from the new mast.
- The possibility of incorporating a mast within one of the new residential buildings has not been ruled out but presents additional technical and legal problems and would need to be negotiated with any developer who takes on the site. As the Police Authority will not be able to provide any certainty in this regard it is incumbent on them to ensure that they safeguard the suggested site to provide for the replacement mast.

Comments on representations

- The concerns expressed about overdevelopment are noted but the site is considered suitable for high density development given its sustainable location and the fact that such development can be designed to integrate satisfactorily with the existing built environment.
- The comments about the design, scale, form and layout of the building are inappropriate to the consideration of this outline application which seeks permission only for the principle of such development and the means of access. Any design details submitted do not form part of the application and serve only to assist an understanding of the principle of the sites development for residential purposes at the density proposed.

- Reference to the impact on local traffic, parking and services is noted but as explained above consultations with HCC have indicated that these matters are satisfactory and do not warrant objection to the application.
- The comment on keeping the existing use is noted but there is no policy requirement to do so and the recent appeal concerning re-cladding of the tower block was dismissed because of its harm to the setting of the city and views from the AONB and failure to preserve either the character or the appearance of the Conservation Area.
- The impact of the development on the setting of Winchester and the Conservation Area has been tested by the photomontages submitted and shown not to be harmful as feared by the objectors.
- The telecommunications mast will be the subject of a separate application at which stage any objections to it will be taken into account. Reference to it so far as this application is concerned is only to identify that there will be a requirement to provide alternative facilities to replace those presently supported by the existing building.
- Comments about the proposal being a 'missed opportunity' and reference to other design aspects are noted but given that this proposal seeks only outline permission with everything other than the means of access being a reserved matter there remains ample scope to secure a high quality design. Indeed this will be a requirement of any developer that acquires the site and the recommendation includes an informative stating as much.

Planning Obligations/Agreements

In seeking the planning obligation(s) and/or financial contributions for off site highways improvement, off site open space provision and on site play area together with affordable housing, the Local Planning Authority has had regard to the tests laid down in Circular 05/2005 which requires the obligations to be necessary; relevant to planning; directly related to the proposed development; fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development and reasonable in all other respects.

Recommendation

APPROVE – subject to a Section 106/Section 278 Agreement for:

- 1. A financial contribution of £294,000 towards highway improvements;**
- 2. The provision of 40% of units (118) as affordable housing, size, tenure and distribution of units to be agreed;**
- 3. A financial contribution of £440,540. towards the provision of public open space through the open space funding system; (NB this is likely to be reduced in recognition of the inclusion of a LAP)**
- 4. The setting up of a management company to undertake the maintenance of the un-adopted common areas comprising the access roads and footpaths, parking areas and the areas of amenity planting;**
- 5. The provision of a public footpath /cycleway through the site from Romsey Road to West End Terrace.**
- 6. The provision of a Local Area for Play including equipment and provision for future maintenance.**

(Note: If the Legal Agreement is not completed within 6 months then the application may be refused without further reference to Committee)

and subject to the following condition(s):

Conditions/Reasons

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 3 Plans and particulars showing the detailed proposals for all the following aspects of the development (hereinafter called "the reserved and other matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development is commenced. The approved details shall be carried out as approved and fully implemented before the building(s) is/are occupied.

Reserved and other Matters:

- (a) The layout including the positions and widths of roads and footpaths.
- (b) Landscape considerations including:
 - (i) an accurate plan showing the position, type and spread of all the trees on the site and a schedule detailing the size and physical condition of each tree and, where appropriate, the steps to be taken to bring each tree to a satisfactory condition; and also details of any proposals for the felling, pruning, trimming or uprooting of any trees;
 - (ii) a landscape scheme showing the planting proposed to be undertaken, the means of forming enclosures, the materials to be used for paved and hard surfaces and the finished levels in relation to existing levels;
 - (iii) the arrangements to be made for the future maintenance of landscaped and other open areas.
- (c) The siting of all buildings and the means of access thereto from an existing or proposed highway, including the layout, construction and sightlines.
- (d) The design of all buildings, [storage sheds and cycle stores](#), plant and tanks, including the colour and texture of external materials to be used together with samples of all external facing and roofing materials.
- (e) The details of materials/treatment to be used for hard surfacing.
- (f) The layout of foul sewers and surface water drains.
- (g) The alignment, height, materials and finished colour of any retaining walls or structures and all boundary treatments including all walls, fences and other means of enclosure.
- (h) Details of the provision to be made for the storage and disposal of all waste material including the siting, design and materials for any bin storage areas or collection points.
- (i) The provision to be made for the parking, turning, loading and unloading of vehicles.
- (j) The finished levels, above ordnance datum, of the ground floor of the proposed building(s), and their relationship to the levels of any existing adjoining buildings [and land adjacent to the perimeter of the site](#)

- (k) Details of the siting, external appearance and materials to be used for any statutory undertakers or service provider's equipment such as electricity substations, gas governors, telecommunication cabinets.
- (l) Details of lighting including any street lighting and lighting for security or other purposes.
- (m) The provision to be made for contractors vehicles parking and plant, storage of building materials and any excavated materials, huts and all working areas.
- (n) The proposed phasing of the development.
- (o) Access facilities for the disabled.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order).

- 4 No development shall take place until details and samples of the materials to be used for the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development presents a satisfactory appearance in the interests of the amenities of the area.

- 5 The alteration to the boundary wall to West End Terrace/Romsey Road shall be undertaken using the original materials or materials to exactly match the original materials and shall match the existing wall exactly in terms of the mortar and bond used.

Reason: In the interests of maintaining the character of the conservation area.

- 6 No development, or site preparation prior to development which has any effect on disturbing or altering the level or composition of the land, shall take place within the site until the applicant (or their agents or successors in title) has secured and implemented a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation to be submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the archaeological interest of the site is properly safeguarded and recorded.

- 7 In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of 5 years from the date of the occupation of the building(s) for its permitted use.

a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998 (Tree Work).

b) If any tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time as may be specified in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

c) The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with details to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any equipment, machinery, or materials are brought onto the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees which are to be retained.

8 The existing trees shown as being retained on the approved plan shall not be lopped, topped, felled or uprooted without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. These trees shall be protected during building operations by the erection of fencing in accordance with Bill Kowalczyk's Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement and Site Layout Tree Protection Plan 1968/2A and in accordance with BS 5837.

9 Reason: To retain and protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the area.

10 A detailed scheme for landscaping, tree and/or shrub planting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The scheme shall specify species, density, planting, size and layout. The scheme approved shall be carried out in the first planting season following the occupation of the building or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. If within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, any trees, shrubs or plants die, are removed or, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or defective, others of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, in the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To improve the appearance of the site in the interests of visual amenity.

11 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Classes A, B, C, D, E, of Parts 1 of Schedule 2 of the Order, shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the locality and to maintain a good quality environment.

12 The car park shall be constructed, surfaced and marked out in accordance with the approved plan before the development hereby permitted is brought into operation. That area shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking, loading, unloading and turning of vehicles.

Reason: To ensure that adequate on-site parking and turning facilities are made available.

- 13 Details of measures to be taken to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site during construction works being deposited on the public highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and fully implemented before development commences. Such measures shall be retained for the duration of the construction period. No lorry shall leave the site unless its wheels have been cleaned sufficiently to prevent mud being carried onto the highway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

- 14 The building(s) shall not be occupied until a means of vehicular access has been constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory road access is provided.

- 15 The [garages / parking spaces](#) hereby approved shall not be used for any other purpose than the parking of cars.

Reason: To ensure the provision and retention of the [garages / parking spaces](#) in the interests of local amenity and highway safety

- 16 Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway all surface water drainage shall be passed through an oil bypass interceptor designed and constructed to have a capacity compatible with the site being drained. Roof water shall not pass through the interceptor.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment.

- 17 The method of demolition and construction for the development shall be carried out in accordance with a scheme to be approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to any development commencing.

Reason: The site is in a very sensitive location with respect to groundwater, and in order to protect the quality of drinking water supplies the working methods will need to be carefully considered.

- 18 Construction of the development shall not commence until details of the proposed means of foul sewerage and surface water disposal have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Southern Water.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory provision of foul and surface water drainage.

- 19 The applicant/developer should enter into a formal agreement with Southern Water to provide the necessary sewerage infrastructure required to service this development. Please contact Southern Water's Network Development Team (Wastewater) based in Otterbourne, Hampshire.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory provision of foul and surface water drainage.

- 20 The provision of one and two bedroomed dwellings for which this outline permission provides shall be retained as separate dwellings and at no time shall works be carried out to combine two or more units to form a larger dwelling nor shall they be used jointly as one dwelling.

Reason: To ensure that the provision of smaller dwellings and the Councils policy on achieving a better housing mix in accordance with development plan housing policy, Supplementary Planning Guidance and PPG3 is not compromised by the formation through amalgamation of larger properties.

INFORMATIVES

1. This permission is granted for the following reasons:
The development is in accordance with the policies and proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.
2. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-
Hampshire County Structure Plan Review UB2, UB3, H5, H11, E6, E8, R2, T4, T5, T12,
Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: G.2, HG.6, HG.7, HG.11, EN.3, EN.4, EN.5, EN.7, EN.8, EN.9, H.1, H.5, H.7, E.2, RT.3, T.8, T.9, T.11, T.12, W.1, W.5, W.10
Emerging Development Plan:-
WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: DP.1, DP.3, DP.4, DP.5, DP.6, DP.8, HE.4, HE.5, HE.8, H.2, H.5, H.7, E.2, E.4, T.1, T.4, T.5, W.1
3. All building works including demolition, construction and machinery or plant operation should only be carried out between the hours of 0800 and 1800hrs Monday to Friday and 0800 and 1300 hrs Saturday and at no time on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Where allegations of noise from such works are substantiated by the Environmental Health and Housing Department, a notice limiting the hours of operation under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 may be served.
4. No materials should be burnt on site. Where allegations of statutory nuisance are substantiated by the Health and Housing Department, an Abatement Notice may be served under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The applicant is reminded that the emission of dark smoke through the burning of materials is a direct offence under the Clean Air Act. 1993.
5. **For the avoidance of doubt this outline permission does not impart or imply any approval for the illustrative floor plans and sketch elevations submitted in support of this application which have been considered only for the purpose of assessing a site capacity not exceeding 294 units of the size suggested by such plans. The Local Planning Authority will require any detailed design to be of the highest quality for this important and prominent site adjoining the conservation area. Applicants are reminded of the need to have regard to the 'Urban Design Compendium' and 'Better Places to Live By Design' in drawing up their detailed proposals.**
6. For the avoidance of doubt the telecommunications mast indicated on the supporting layout drawing number 1968/21 is not hereby approved as part of this outline application for residential development and must be the subject of a separate application.

7. A formal application to requisition water infrastructure is required in order to service this development. Please contact Southern Water's Network Development Team (Water) based in Chatham, Kent.
8. Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 the prior written agreement is required for discharging dewatering water from any excavation or development to controlled waters. The applicant is advised to contact the Hants and IOW Area office (Environment Management Itchen Team) to discuss which type of authorisation will be required.
9. The site lies within groundwater protection zone 1. Potable supplies are therefore at risk from activities at the site and all precautions should be taken to avoid discharges and spillages to the ground both during construction and subsequent operation.

APPENDIX A

POLICE HEADQUARTERS SUB-COMMITTEE 9 JUNE 2005 PDC554

PDC554
FOR DECISION
WARD(S): ST PAUL

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (POLICE HEADQUARTERS, WINCHESTER) SUB-COMMITTEE

9 June 2005

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY POLICE HQ, ROMSEY ROAD, WINCHESTER:

DEMOLITION OF ALL EXISTING BUILDINGS; RESIDENTIAL RE-DEVELOPMENT
(OUTLINE) (W04090/19)

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT

Contact Officer: David Dimon Tel No: 01962 848247

RECENT REFERENCES:

PDC341 - Police HQ Planning Report – 29 September 2003

PDC362 – Sub-Committee Minutes – 29 September 2003

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This planning application is to replace the existing police headquarters buildings on Romsey Road with a high density residential development of 300 dwellings. The development would be arranged in a series of formal squares, with building heights generally of four and five storeys.

A telecommunications mast would be provided adjacent to the Romsey Road close to the prison boundary.

The principle of redevelopment of the site gains support from the policies of the development plan. A high density scheme such as this would achieve a large number of small units and affordable dwellings (approx. 90) in accordance with the development plan housing policies.

There remains considerable concern that the proposal, due to its scale and mass, would not

reflect the character of West End Terrace and would result in harm to the conservation area.

The proposal includes 300 parking spaces which would be well in excess of the maximum standard. This would significantly reduce the potential for a more sustainable development and result in a reduction in the quality of the public spaces within the development.

The application lacks crucial information with regard to the likely impact of the development on longer views across the city and also of the likely impact of the proposed communications mast.

Although a high density proposal may be appropriate on this site it is clear from the submission that 300 units and 300 parking spaces cannot be accommodated without detriment to the character and appearance of the area and the conservation area.

RECOMMENDATION:

To defer for negotiation

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (POLICE HEADQUARTERS,
WINCHESTER) SUB-COMMITTEE

9 JUNE 2005

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY POLICE HQ, ROMSEY ROAD, WINCHESTER:
DEMOLITION OF ALL EXISTING BUILDINGS; RESIDENTIAL RE-DEVELOPMENT (OUTLINE)
(W04090/19)

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT

DETAIL:

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The proposal is in outline with only the means of access to be considered at this stage. However, it represents the development of 300 small residential units made up of 20 studios, 84 one-bed flats, 185 two-bed flats, 2 two-bed houses and 9 three-bed houses.
- 1.2 The site area is 2.44ha. The development of 300 units would therefore equate to 123 dwellings per hectare.
- 1.3 The indicative layout suggests a number of formal blocks of development ranging from six storeys at the corner of West End Terrace and Romsey Road down to two storeys towards the back of the properties in West End Close.
- 1.4 The residential blocks are arranged into a number of formal squares within the development, whilst the boundaries of the site with West End Terrace and Romsey Road retain the wide strip of mature trees which generally screen the site when in leaf.
- 1.5 Access to the site would be via the existing main access onto Romsey Road. The existing two accesses onto West End Terrace would be closed to vehicular use but retained for pedestrian and cycle access. Parking provision is included at one space per unit, much of which is accommodated in a semi-underground car park, a parking area above, and a row of parking spaces adjacent to the existing prison wall.
- 1.6 A telecommunications antenna, which would replace those on the roof of the existing tower, has been included in the corner of the site adjacent to Romsey Road set within the existing woodland. No details of this are provided and would need to be subject of a future application.

2. **RELEVANT HISTORY**

W04090/18	Refurbishment of existing building including recladding of elevations and construction of new office building. Refused 10 February 2005
W04090/17	Resurface existing cycle path and provision of new path and cycle path. Application withdrawn
W04090/16	Reclad existing building and construction of new office building. Refused 27 October 2003
W04090/15	Installation of building for office use. Permitted 24 April 2002.
W04090/14	Temporary building for firearms licensing (RETROSPECTIVE) Permitted 16 April 2002.
W04090/13	Temporary building for use as handyman's workshop Permitted 16 April 2002.

W04090/08	Construction of car park. No objection raised 27 April 1998.
W04090/05	Change of use of houses to offices No objection raised 27 February 1986.
W04090/03	Erection of portacabin to be used as office No objection raised 19 January 1981.
W04090/02	Renewal of temporary permission for existing offices and workshop at Police HQ. No objection raised 24 May 1979.
W04090/01	Erection of single storey extension to provide storage area. No objection raised 24 May 1979.

3 **RELEVANT POLICY**

3.1 Development Plan Policies

HCSP(R)	UB2, UB3, H5, H7, H11, E6, E8, T4, T5, T12
WDLP	G2, HG6, HG11, EN3, EN4, EN5, EN7, EN8, EN9, H.1, H5, H7, E2, RT3, T8, T9, T11, T12, W1, W5, W10.

Other material considerations:-

WDLPR	DP1, DP.3, DP.4, DP5, DP6, DP8, HE2, HE.4, HE.5, HE8, H2, H5, H7, E2, E4, T1, T4, T5, W.1.
PPS1, PPG3, PPG13, PPG15, PPG16	By Design, Winchester Conservation Area Project, Achieving a better mix in new housing developments.

4 **CONSULTATIONS**

4.1 County Surveyor:-

- The main site access onto Romsey Road has substandard visibility but the proposal will not generate a material increase in traffic over and above the current use.
- The junction of West End Terrace with Romsey Road has very poor visibility; restricting access onto West End Terrace would limit the impact on this junction.
- The proposal is not considered to reduce the need to travel, especially by car, which is an objective of PPG13 - Transport. The County Council is proposing several significant transportation improvements in the vicinity in order to reduce the need to travel, especially by car. These improvements will be of significant benefit to this site and therefore a contribution towards the cost of bringing them forward should be required. It is anticipated that the contribution would be in excess of £500,000.

4.2 Forward Planning:-

- The site is within the settlement boundary of Winchester so residential use is acceptable in principle. The edges of the site are within the conservation area so the relevant conservation area policies apply, as do these relating to affordable housing, dwelling mix, transport, etc. The adopted and emerging Local Plans resist the retention of office uses outside the defined commercial core/town centre, so there is no policy objection to the loss of employment provision (E2 is overridden by the office restraint policies in Winchester, where there is any conflict).

4.3 Landscape:-

- Overall the approach works well but there remains a number of concerns including the car parking area and adjacent to the prison wall; and the need for levels information to ensure trees and boundaries are not adversely affected.
- The provision of open space is considered to be satisfactory however the maintenance and management of the green spaces needs to be addressed.

4.4 Arboriculture:-

- The information provided clearly demonstrates which trees are to be removed and an appropriate fencing plan. There is concern about the degree of shading that will be suffered by some properties due to the proximity to the existing trees, however this can be overcome to an extent by careful consideration of the internal layout of dwellings. There are no objections subject to conditions regarding the protection of trees and the need for the submission of a tree management strategy to include necessary pruning works, tree removal with replacement tree planting.

4.5 Urban Design Advice – Matrix Partnership Ltd:-

- Concern with regard to the appearance of the semi basement car park. The landscape bund designed to hide the car park may result in filling over the root spread of important trees which is likely to adversely affect their health.
- The amount of bicycle storage indicated is unlikely to be sufficient in terms of quantity and distribution.
- A car free or an element of car free development could go a long way to improve the scheme generally.
- Concern with regard to the heights of the four and six storey buildings particularly adjacent to West End Terrace which would not reflect the grain and scale of the existing two and three-storey buildings.
- The steeply pitched roofs should be replaced by shallower roof pitches and the concept of accommodation within the roof space should be included throughout the development.
- Accurate photomontages or similar illustrations are essential in understanding the effects of the proposals in the local and wider and City context.
- Pedestrian permeability should be an essential feature of any movement framework and should not be left as a possible option.
- Ground floor access should be maximised to create positive, active frontages with the front doors to ground floor flats on the main building frontages, this would be easier to achieve if the car park was accommodated in a full basement.
- The general layout of buildings works logically with existing trees to define clear well-defined open spaces whilst retaining existing trees and providing a frontage to West End Terrace and Romsey Road. It should be noted that tree number 92 should be retained.

- The height of the buildings around the internal spaces varies between three and five stories, whilst this can in principle be made to work, some unifying device, for example a setback at the common lower storey height would help.
- The internal open spaces are substantially car parks with no sense of focus or identity, spaces should be reduced. This relates to the principle north-south urban square and the parking against the prison wall. More details relating to the planting of trees in the square above the underground car park should be provided to ensure that the proposals are practicable.
- Some concern with regard to relocation of the proposed telecommunications mast.
- The architectural expression is traditional, safe, uninspiring and fails to draw from the Winchester context.

4.6 Sites and Monuments Officer

- It is likely that further archaeological remains may still exist within the site. Given the nature of the development proposals it is likely that any such archaeological remains will be severely impacted. Recommends a condition relating to a programme of archaeological work.

4.7 South East Regional Design Panel:-

Awaited

4.8 Conservation:-

- The Principal Conservation Officer is not satisfied that this is the right location for such a formal high-density urban solution with much of the limited public space given over to parking and considers a more informal medium to high density approach would be more acceptable as it would have less impact on the city skyline and offers opportunities for a contemporary scheme.
- The five and six-storey blocks seem more akin to the largest cities rather than the typical three storey townhouses of Winchester.
- A more thorough analysis of the impact of the proposed development on the city skyline and setting of landmark listed buildings should be required, including photomontage or other graphic techniques.
- The applicant seem to have too readily reached the conclusion that it will not matter if the new development is seen above the skyline and that it takes on a high-density urban form.

4.9 Environmental Protection:

- No adverse comments subject to two informatives relating to hours of construction/demolition and the burning of material on-site.

4.10 Environment Agency:

- No objection in principle subject to the imposition of two conditions.

4.11 Southern Water:

- Considers it likely that development on this scale would overload the existing water and waste water services. A check has been instigated on the existing services and further comments are awaited.
- The adequacy of soak-aways for disposing of surface water should be assessed.

5 **REPRESENTATIONS**

City of Winchester Trust

- A density of 129 dwellings per hectare is considered much too high for development in this location. The buildings will be much too high, particularly the six-storey block close to West End Terrace. This scale relates to the nearby institutions not the houses in the adjoining Conservation Area.
- Concerns with regard to the occupation of the units in terms of the mix of unit sizes, particularly as most of the units are very small which may result in transitory residents who will have little interest in maintaining or contributing to their neighbourhood.
- Underground car parking is welcomed but with the density proposed it tends to result in buildings being too tall for the neighbourhood. There is also concern that this will alter the water table and endanger the survival of the mature trees on the site which are very important to the character of this part of Winchester. It is considered that the standard of architecture shown in the perspectives is not acceptable, being an illiterate mixture of unrelated stylistic references
- The location of the telecommunications mast so close to the road is unacceptable as it would be visually intrusive in the street scene.
- The Trust strongly objects to the scale, density, layout and design of the proposed development and to the telecommunications mast that is proposed in this outline application.

33 letters have been received raising the following concerns:

- The development is out of character with the surrounding residential buildings. The buildings proposed are too high and massive and will overshadow the historic dwellings in West End Terrace and dominate the area visually.
- The proposal is on the edge of the conservation area and it will not conserve or enhance its character or appearance. It will also adversely affect the setting of the listed buildings in West End Terrace.
- The proposal has no architectural design or visual merit and will constitute an eyesore worse than the Police HQ Tower. The architectural features suggested have no relevance to their setting.
- The proposed residential blocks would considerably reduce light to all properties along West End Terrace. In addition noise levels, especially at weekends from residents and visitors will increase enormously.

- A wider range of property types should be included so that the development encourages longer term residents who will contribute to the community.
- Priority should be given to affordable housing.
- There is too little information to be able to satisfactorily assess the proposal. An outline application should not have been accepted and is not in accordance with PPG15.
- The proposal does not accord with the requirements of the Winchester Conservation Area Strategy. However the removal of the tower is only welcomed if it is replaced by a development of considerably greater quality than this proposal.
- This proposal will result in further traffic congestion and parking problems in the adjoining roads. The level of parking provision is far too low.
- The provision of 300 car parking spaces in such a central location is contrary to the Winchester Conservation Area Strategy and the policies of the local plan
- The proposal is not sustainable as it will increase the demand to travel as the occupants will have to travel to work and at the same time a major local employer will be removed.
- The route through the site will be less convenient for pedestrians than existing.
- Concerned that the local schools, hospitals, roads, drainage system, doctors and dentists will not be able to accommodate this new population.
- It is imperative that the trees on the site should be retained and any trees lost should be replaced. It appears that excavations are likely to damage these important trees.
- Concern about the stability of the land particularly around trees and close to the corner of Romsey Road in West End Terrace.
- The provision for open space is inadequate and there is no provision for any community use.
- There has not been an ecological survey to determine the extent of any natural wildlife that could be enhanced in the context of promoting biodiversity.
- Consider it would be better to re-clad the tower than allow the development of this nature.

6 ASSESSMENT AND OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The principle of development

- 6.1 The adopted local plan includes a policy E2 which seeks to retain employment opportunities in the district. However in Winchester, outside the commercial core, the office restraint policies prevents the replacement of office buildings and policy W5 allows for the alteration of office premises to residential use in suitable locations. The intention of the policies is to ensure that existing office sites outside the city core are promoted for reuse, such as for housing.

- 6.2 The proposal offers a large number of units within walking distance of the town centre which would be of significant benefit in meeting the district's housing targets. The units proposed are small units including a substantial number of one-bedroom units which are shown as in short supply in Winchester. The proposal would therefore gain considerable support from the Council's housing policies and supplementary planning guidance.
- 6.3 The proposal would also accommodate a substantial number of affordable houses. The figure of 30% (approx. 90) is proposed which is in accordance with the requirements of the local plan. The proposal would clearly gain considerable support from the Council's policies relating to the provision of affordable housing.
- 6.4 The existence of the Police HQ in the town centre has to be given some consideration. It is clearly a major employer, contributes significantly to the well-being of the city and confirms Winchester's position as the county town. Furthermore it is a highly sustainable location. It is unlikely that the police could relocate to a site that has similar benefits in terms of sustainability. Although the current use of the site has a large number of employees using private vehicles, this reliance on vehicles should be addressed to some extent by the introduction of sustainable transport plans. It is likely therefore, that the relocation of the Police HQ will have a detrimental effect in terms of sustainable transport potential.
- 6.5 The concern with regard to the loss of this sustainable employment location could be balanced by the introduction of a residential development which offered significant benefits in terms of sustainability.

Conclusion on the principle of development

- 6.6 The development plan provides no encouragement for the retention of the office use on this site. There are no other material considerations which suggest that a housing development on this site would not be acceptable in principle, providing the development meets sustainable development objectives.
- 6.7 The proposal seeks to develop the site to its maximum potential and would provide much-needed smaller accommodation and affordable housing. The principle of housing development should therefore be supported on this site provided it can satisfy the other policy concerns particularly with regards to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The effect on the character and appearance of the area

- 6.8 The site lies in a prominent location due to its elevated nature and proximity to the historic core of Winchester. The tree belt adjacent to West End Terrace forms the boundary of the Winchester Conservation Area. Part of the site therefore lies within the conservation area whilst the majority of the proposed built area would lie adjacent to it. Although there are substantial trees within the site it is exposed to views from both short and long distances.
- 6.9 It is essential that any redevelopment respects the character of the surrounding area and does not detract from the longer views across the city into this site. It is essential in terms of development plan and national policy that the development preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 6.10 The application is in outline and therefore the details of the proposal would not be determined at this stage. However the applicant's have specified the number of units that they intend to accommodate in this development and therefore it is necessary to be satisfied that this amount of development can be achieved on the site. As the details that have been provided are the only indication of how such a high density scheme could

be achieved, they need to be given careful consideration. Clearly, at the detailed design stage, if it were considered that the height of buildings needed to be reduced in certain areas then additional development would need to be accommodated elsewhere on the site in order to achieve the number of units proposed.

- 6.11 The development has been carefully designed, with the aid of arboricultural experts, in order to ensure that the proposed development would retain the important trees within the site. To this end the development would be set well back from both Romsey Road and West End Terrace and the existing tree-lined access would also be retained off Romsey Road.
- 6.12 The development has been designed to front on to both West End Terrace and Romsey Road from beyond the tree belt. A six-storey block is located closest to the junction of these two roads, with the height of development then reducing in scale from south to north, but generally being four and five storey. The development is laid out as a series of urban squares with gateway features on the main access to the site and the pedestrian access from West End Terrace.
- 6.13 Concern has been raised with regard to the scale and mass of the proposal particularly as it relates to West End Terrace. The detail of the proposal is extremely limited but it does appear from the cross-section that the scale of the development will be entirely out of keeping with the two and three-storey properties within the conservation area.
- 6.14 It is appreciated that the building blocks are set well into the site, beyond the tree belt and that the top floor accommodation would be partially within the roof slopes, however given that the development will be six-storey and four-storey, on a raised car park level, the details do not provide a convincing case to suggest that the development would enhance the character of the conservation area along West End Terrace.
- 6.15 Although the Design Brief suggests a landmark building is inappropriate on this site, it appears that the six-storey block would appear as a landmark feature. It is not considered that this is an ideal location for such a design intervention. This corner of the site is significantly higher than Romsey Road, when approaching from the town centre and a tower of this size is likely to be extremely prominent. Although this is obviously the function of a landmark feature, in this location it will be partially screened by the extensive tree cover, but where it would be visible it seems likely that it would appear entirely out of context with the scale of the surrounding properties that are within the conservation area.
- 6.16 Aside from the elevation facing West End Terrace, given the setback of the development from Romsey Road and the level of tree cover, the four-storey blocks and the five-storey blocks beyond them are not considered to be unacceptably high. Beyond the five-storey blocks in the centre of the development the heights decrease down to two-storeys on the boundary adjacent to the rear of properties on West End Close.
- 6.17 There remains a concern relating to the appearance of the development from longer views. Unfortunately no analysis of this has been provided. It is clear from many of the long views towards the site that a number of the upper floors of the police HQ Tower are visible above the treeline. The design brief includes a number of such views. It considers that there would be no harm to local character or to medium or long distance views with buildings and roofs visible above the treeline. It goes on to state that it would be important that the bulk and massing of buildings visible on the skyline reflect the urban grain and that this can be achieved through complementary alignment of building blocks, division into blocks of sympathetic scale, appropriate space between buildings, and variation of roof pitch and careful use of materials. It appears from the layout that there will be little space between buildings or variation in heights when viewed from longer distances and it seems likely that the development would be viewed as a single

unrelieved mass. It is considered essential that a greater analysis of the impact from medium and long views is produced so that a proper assessment of the scale of this development can be made.

Conclusion on the effect on the character and appearance of the area

- 6.18 This is a site close to the city centre and it is appropriate that it should accommodate a significant amount of development. However it is considered that the scale and mass of the development facing West End Terrace is inappropriate and would detract from the character of the conservation area.
- 6.19 With regards to the remainder of the site a much more in-depth analysis to demonstrate that the development would not detract from the wider landscaped setting of the city is required.

Design Quality

- 6.20 Although the application is in outline it is essential, given the location of the development, that the design achieves the highest standards. It is unfortunate that it appears that no consideration has been given to sustainability in terms of the building design or layout. Clearly this is not something that can be added as an afterthought at the detailed design stage.
- 6.21 Movement through the site does not appear to have been given significant consideration. The design brief suggests that if the opportunity arises and is not incompatible with the security of new residents, it would be desirable to positively provide a pedestrian route through the site. This has not been achieved. There would be a tortuous route through the two central squares and the secondary route that skirts around the raised car park level. It would seem that this route would be entirely unsatisfactory to the occupants living in the ground floor of these blocks. Pedestrian movement in this location, particularly given the inadequacies of the footpath on Romsey Road and West End Terrace should be a priority.
- 6.22 The main square is entirely given over to car parking. Other surface parking is provided along the entirety of the prison wall, this will need careful landscape provision if it is to become an attractive area within the development. Concern has also been raised with regard to the semi-underground car park, which because of the topography is only partially underground towards the West End Terrace side of the site. This is the area proposed for a children's play area and a sitting area and will be the only amenity area on the site that benefits from not being in shade for large parts of the day.
- 6.23 The lack of uniformity in building heights around the very narrow squares has not been addressed. Greater unity could be achieved by the introduction of offsets at the lowest story level. However this would result in a reduction in the size of accommodation above this level in the higher blocks. Given the already limited size of the units there is likely to be very little flexibility in order to achieve this.
- 6.24 Within the development there is also considerable concern with regards to the amenities of the future residents in terms of the proposed living accommodation. A number of properties have windows which have extremely limited outlook. Although these are shown as kitchen or bedroom windows, some will have an outlook of only 4.5 m towards the gable end of other properties. The studio accommodation in the six storey tower is unlikely to have any privacy from the adjoining bedrooms in the attached blocks. Although these are matters for the detailed design stage, given the lack of flexibility that this level of development provides, these matters remain a significant concern.

- 6.25 With regard to the appearance of the development from the surrounding streets the driveway from Romsey Road provides a significant break in development that will be complemented by the retention of the trees on the site. Unfortunately the West End Terrace elevation does not benefit from any relief in the urban form. The proposed pedestrian access into the main square would be only 5 m wide between two 4-storey blocks. Given that the square is raised above the car park this will not offer an attractive view into the site. The gateway buildings are likely to appear entirely out of scale with this access and are likely to appear exclusive rather than inclusive.

General conclusions on design

- 6.26 The proposal is a very urban form of development due to the high density that has been proposed and the amount of parking included. The bulk and lack of relief in the elevation facing West End Terrace will do nothing to integrate the development into the wider area.
- 6.27 Although amenity areas have been provided it would appear that their function would to a large extent be degraded by their size, lack of space between buildings, aspect, inclusion of parking spaces and the raised underground garage. The likely amenities for some of the occupiers of the units within the scheme are considered to be extremely limited with regards to their living conditions.

Parking provision

- 6.28 Parking provision has been provided at one space per unit. This site is an extremely accessible location being within easy walking distance of both the town centre, the railway station and a major bus route. The Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards sets out the maximum parking provision for new residential development. In accessible locations such as this, standards are 0.5 spaces per one-bedroom unit and one space per two or three-bedroom unit. This proposal is made up of 104 one-bedroom flats/studios; and 196 two or three bed units. This would represent a maximum parking requirement of 248 parking spaces compared to the 300 spaces proposed.
- 6.29 The Transport Assessment provided by the applicants accepts that the site is in close proximity to a wide range of facilities and services in addition to nearby public transport links. It also accepts that the Hampshire car parking standards are in line with national policy. No justification has been provided to demonstrate why parking provision is proposed above the maximum standard. Given the high level of accessibility identified in the Transport Assessment it is considered that Government policy would be to seek considerably less parking than the maximum standards.
- 6.30 A significant reduction in parking standards would assist greatly in the achievement of an acceptable design solution for this site. The loss of surface parking would greatly improve opportunities for improving the urban squares.
- 6.31 Concern has been raised by residents as to the potential for car owners parking their vehicles in the adjoining streets if more parking is not provided, Although such a situation could not be controlled it is considered that the benefits of achieving significant reductions in car usage would offer significantly greater benefits than any potential increased inconvenience for local residents.

Highway Matters

- 6.32 The existing accesses to the site do not meet appropriate highway standards. However this proposal would result in a reduction in vehicle movements on to Romsey Road and as such there would be a benefit to this access. With regards to West End Terrace both accesses would be closed to vehicles, again offering a substantial benefit.

- 6.33 The proposal would continue to generate a higher level of vehicle movement from the site. The County Council are therefore seeking contributions towards schemes which would assist in the reduction of travel by vehicle.

Communications Mast

- 6.34 It is understood that the scheme could not go ahead unless the communications equipment which is situated on the top of the existing tower were to be replaced. The location for the proposed replacement mast is shown adjacent to Romsey Road and the prison. This site does benefit from screening provided by the mature trees both adjacent to it and along the Romsey Road frontage towards West End Terrace. It is not clear what the size or appearance of this mass would be and until this has been established it cannot be properly assessed.

7 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 Redevelopment of this site for a high-density housing scheme has considerable merit in terms of meeting demand for housing; providing housing in a sustainable location; providing small units which are much needed throughout the city; and the provision of a large number of affordable houses.
- 7.2 This proposal fails to respect the character of West End Terrace or the adjacent conservation area. Although the proposal is in outline it is clear that it is unlikely that 300 units can be achieved on this site as the units are already very small; the open spaces are tightly formed; and the quality of amenity achieved by some of the future residents is already likely to be extremely limited. Reducing the scale of the buildings fronting onto West End Terrace would clearly result in a requirement for additional units elsewhere which are unlikely to be accommodated in a satisfactory manner.
- 7.3 For a sustainable location such as this the level of parking appears to be excessive. The parking provision detracts significantly from the overall character of the development. In addition the design does not appear to have taken into account best practice in terms of achieving sustainable built form.
- 7.4 Considerably more information is required with regards to the communication mast and the mass of the development in terms of its impact on wider views across the city.

8 CORPORATE STRATEGY (RELEVANCE TO):

- 8.1 Providing affordable homes in a safe and pleasant environment
- 8.2 Green Agenda – Providing housing in sustainable locations with an opportunity to minimise car parking. Making the best use of Council owned land and using planning policies to secure sufficient land and funding to provide, in partnership, a full range of high quality homes for rental or ownership to meet the needs of residents, is a key priority.

9 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 9.1 None

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Application form, drawings, correspondence, discussions, representations, and any amended plans and drawings included in the appropriate application file.

MINUTES OF POLICE HEADQUARTERS SUB-COMMITTEE
10 JUNE 2005
PDC554

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
(POLICE HEADQUARTERS, WINCHESTER) SUB-COMMITTEE

9 June 2005

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Beveridge (P)
Davies (P)
Evans (P)
Jeffer

Mitchell (P)
Pearson (P)
Read (P)
Sutton (P)

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Bennetts and de Peyer

Officers in attendance:

Mr D Dimon (Acting Planning Team Manager – DC West)
Mr J Hearn – Planning Team Manager (DC East)
Mr H Bone – Assistant City Secretary & Solicitor (Legal)
Mr R MacCullagh – Principal Conservation Officer
Mr N Marsden – Project Officer
Mr G Brady – Urban Design and Architect (Matrix Partnership)
Mr C Gardner – Urban Design and Landscape Architect (Matrix Partnership)
Mr S Jenkins – Hampshire County Council, Highways

-
1. **DEMOLITION OF ALL EXISTING BUILDINGS: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (OUTLINE) (W04090/19) – HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY POLICE HEADQUARTERS, ROMSEY ROAD, WINCHESTER**
(Report PDC.554 refers)

The Sub-Committee met in The Guildhall, Winchester. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting representatives of the applicant (Hampshire Constabulary: Deidre Wells - Redkite Development consultancy), James Bevis (Highway Consultant – WPS): Stojian Kalik (Architect – Andrews Kalik Harris), Jeff Aston (Hampshire Police Estates) and Mr Attenborough - Cox (Chairman of the Hampshire Police Authority). The Chairman also welcomed approximately ten members of the public to the meeting, including

representatives of the City of Winchester Residents' Association and the Winchester Preservation Trust.

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on this application, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as he was a member of the Council of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on this application, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Mr Hearn explained that the application was to replace the existing Police Headquarters buildings on Romsey Road, Winchester, with a residential development of three hundred dwellings. As it was an outline application, only the details of the access to the site from Romsey Road was before Members for approval and all other matters were reserved for the detailed application stage.

The application followed a recent refusal by the Planning Development Control Committee of an application by Hampshire Constabulary for the refurbishment and additional building to the existing Police Headquarters building in Romsey Road, and the appeal for this application would be heard in September 2005.

Mr Hearn continued that the Matrix Partnership had been appointed by the City Council to provide urban design advice on this significant application. The application was in accordance with planning policies, and although the local planning authority would have preferred to have received a full application, it had been agreed after negotiation that an outline application would be acceptable as long as supporting information was provided. Issues to be evaluated included how the built form would sit on the site without harming the Conservation Area or the setting of Winchester and in particular the proposal's visual impact, from a number of vantage points within and outside the city.

Mr Attenborough - Cox, Chairman of the Hampshire Police Authority, introduced the applicant's planning team. Mrs Deidre Wells from Redkite Development Consultancy, who were acting as agents for the applicant, detailed the application to the Sub-Committee.

In summary she stated that the application site on Romsey Road had been in continual ownership by the Police from 1840. The present multi-storey Police Headquarters building dated from 1963/64 and was in need of renovation. There was a mixture of views as to whether the Police should remain on the site or seek a new administrative headquarters building elsewhere in the region.

In order to ensure that the Police continued to have accommodation for its Headquarters staff a twin track approach had been taken, hence the appeal on the refusal to refurbish and extend the existing Police Headquarters building.

The City Council supported residential development on the application site as it accorded with national and local planning policies. The site represented a windfall of three hundred houses which had not been envisaged in the Local Plan process. The Police had continued in a dialogue with the local authority to stay in the local area but this had not been easy. The present building had a useful life of less than three years, and with advancements in technology and modern office requirements the present building was not fit for its purpose. A headquarters building to accommodate approximately six hundred staff was required, but the budgetary constraints imposed on a public service body needed to be recognised.

Mrs Wells continued that it was the intention of the Police to sell the site to a developer once planning permission had been granted. Matters for consideration in the outline application were access and site capacity. A single access to Romsey Road was proposed from the existing access and three hundred units were considered as being the capacity of the site. The applicant had undertaken an appraisal of the site, considering factors such as long views into the site and how it fitted in with the context of the city and the site environment, including impact on the Conservation Area and the adjacent hospital buildings, the prison.

The applicant had assessed the character of the area. This included the Conservation Area at West End Terrace and the more urban character of Romsey Road. There were large institutional buildings in the nearby vicinity, including the hospital and West Downs student accommodation. Tree cover, ground levels, building heights, neighbour relationships, skyline, together with views into the site (both those in the neighbouring locality and long distances including St Giles Hill) had been taken into consideration. The site itself was contained by embankments with retaining walls.

The conclusion was that there was a wide divergence of character around the site. The approach taken, therefore, was that the site could be self-contained but needed to take into account its surrounding environment.

To one side would be the prison wall. From discussions with the Prison Governor a new building could not be built within twenty-five feet of the wall, and there could be no rear gardens or trees above four metres in height that would compromise the security of the prison. The proposal was to utilise lower level landscaping at the base of the prison wall and car parking.

The site was naturally sub-divided into compartments by existing trees. The buildings would be formally grouped into the natural landscape. On the City Council's advice a high density scheme was proposed. This would include a landmark tower on the corner to Romsey Road, the inclusion of play areas and open greens, with the existing vehicular access to West End Terrace being closed and to become a pedestrian and cycle access only.

Sixty percent of the car parking would be underground. Central courtyard areas would contain large box trees and other trees would be retained, although some would require surgery. The units on the site would be largely one and two bedroomed, with ninety of the three hundred units being affordable. This would be particularly useful for the large public service employers within the immediate vicinity.

The proposed units would be four to five storeys in the centre of the development, with three to four storeys facing West End Terrace. A space of approximately thirty metres would be retained from West End Terrace to the first block of development. A design principle had been to link the development at first floor level but with a variation in roof levels and to retain a high degree of light penetration into the development. Although this was an outline application, a more modernistic design had also been sketched.

A requirement of the demolition of the existing Police Headquarters building would be to find a replacement for some of the sensitive telecommunications mast equipment that was presently situated on the roof. Therefore part of the development facing Romsey Road would be retained to provide the option of erecting a replacement mast for the existing operators, which would have a line of sight to Winchester for it to be functionally acceptable.

Mr Bevis from WPS Consultants spoke on the traffic issues arising from the application. In summary he stated that due to the sub-standard visibility and potential problems regarding on-street parking the decision had been taken to close vehicular access to

West End Terrace. Instead, this would remain as a pedestrian and cycle access. The only vehicular access would be from Romsey Road. With respect to car parking, negotiations with Hampshire County had resulted in a proposal to provide one car parking space per dwelling, which was below the County Council standard of 1.5 car parking spaces in accordance with PPG.13. One car parking space per dwelling had been advised because of the sustainability of the site due to its good pedestrian, cycle and public transport links, including accessibility to the railway station. Traffic movements were anticipated as being less than average and perhaps could be limited to weekly shopping trips. Negotiations had also taken place on the level of contribution to improve traffic schemes in the local area. These included improvements to Sparkford Road to improve access to the University College Winchester, surfacing of the High Street, pedestrian schemes on Jewry Street and North Walls, and improved real time information on bus timetables.

Mr Kalik, consultant architect, explained the design principles of the scheme. These were governed by the height of the site in relation to the topography of Winchester and also the slope of the site. There were constraints on the site imposed by existing trees and the requirement to provide a pedestrian access to West End Terrace. The height of the buildings was explained, of which the highest point would be nine to twelve metres tall. The site was well screened and pitched roofs had been included within the design. Open space equated to approximately thirty-three square metres per unit and with the substantial screening the ambience would be one of high density development in a park setting.

Mr Dimon outlined to the Sub-Committee the consultations received to date, which were set out in Report PDC554. He highlighted that it was anticipated that a contribution in excess of £500,000 would be made towards the cost of bringing significant transportation improvements in the vicinity in order to reduce the need to travel, especially by car. A written representation was still to be received from the South-East Regional Design Panel, but a preliminary e-mail had indicated that the design was acceptable in principle, and that the residential content needed further work to knit it into the surroundings. Southern Water was yet to respond on its investigations as to whether the scale of development would overload the existing water and waste water services.

Mr Dimon continued that thirty-seven representations had now been received, four more than set out in Report PDC554. The nature of the representations was as set out on page eight of Report PDC554, with the most frequent representations being that the scale and density and form of development would require careful consideration in terms of its impact on the Town and the Conservation Area.

In terms of assessing the application, the main issues were the principle of development, where forward plans had commented that the site was within the settlements boundary of Winchester, and therefore residential development was acceptable in principle. There was also no policy objection to the loss of employment provision. The development utilised the maximum potential of the site and would provide much needed smaller housing units within Winchester. The development was close to the town centre and therefore car parking provision could be at a lower level, due to the sustainability of the site's location. In assessing design it was noted that this although this was an outline application, the mass facing West End Terrace was inappropriate. However, as an outline application, once planning permission had been granted, the site would be disposed of on the open market to a developer and a new design might be forthcoming. An unknown factor was the height and design of the communications mast that needed to be retained. There was also a concern that parking on the site was excessive and could be reduced. Negotiations were continuing on these points.

Mr Brady from The Matrix Partnership commented on the urban design and architecture. In summary he stated that the trees on the site were very important, as the skyline defined the edge of Winchester. At present this was broken by the cupola on the

adjacent prison, together with the Police Headquarters building. The design also needed to be sensitive to the buildings opposite the site at West End Terrace in the Conservation Area. The layout of the trees on the site led to a logical position for new development. Mr Gardner, Urban Design and Landscape Architect for the Matrix Partnership, added that the information provided so far made it uncertain what the effect on inward views to the development would be. The proposed development would present a significant mass and would be broad in its width. There was also uncertainty over the size of the communications mast. Precise measurements would be required. He also explained that there would be some loss of trees, including one significant copper beech tree.

Mr Jenkins, Hampshire County Council Highways, explained that he broadly agreed with the applicant's transport assessment. There would be an impact, but this would be based on residential vehicular trips rather than those associated with the present business use. There were eight buses per hour on Romsey Road and through calculations a minimum standard for provision of spaces on site would equate to 248. There was, therefore, flexibility if there was a requirement to reduce the car parking space provision within the development, but the position on appeal would be awkward and the negotiation leading to 300 space provision was acceptable to the County Council.

Mr MacCullagh, Principal Conservation Officer, commented that the site provided a background to a number of significant listed buildings in the town, including the Cathedral and The Guildhall, which were key landmark buildings. There were also views from St James's Cemetery, and the proposals required much more assessment from views around the town.

Mr Marsden, Communities Project Officer, stated that the housing mix proposed was acceptable and that thirty per cent of the units (ninety in total) would be for affordable provision. At the time of a detailed application the scheme would need to reflect the housing need within the town. At present there was a reduced requirement for one bed units but an increase in demand for three bedroom family and two bedroom units. Also at the detailed application stage the affordable housing would need to be well integrated within the scheme and, if at all possible, to be pepper-potted throughout.

Mr Hearn stated that following consultation with the Council's Arboriculturalist it was confirmed that there would be a loss of a copper beech tree and that tree protection measures needed to be adequate. Due to the closeness of some of the buildings there could be future pressure to cut back trees where they resulted in darkened rooms. Careful consideration also needed to be given on the effect of available ground water if significant underground parking was constructed beneath the site.

In the public participation part of the meeting the following points were made:

Mrs Meeson, of 1 Step Terrace, stated that she would be living opposite the proposed pedestrian access. She had concerns over the proposed height of the buildings and their impact on the Conservation Area; the implications for parking within Zone J and whether sufficient provision would be made for visitor parking within the site.

Mr B Taylor stated that he supported the refurbishment of the existing Police Headquarters tower. He stated that the tower was elegant and well proportioned and was a good example of a modern movement of architecture. The sketched proposals before the Sub-Committee were not dynamic or of sufficient quality.

Mr Weeks, representing the City of Winchester Residents' Association, stated that there was support for the demolition and redevelopment of the site. The site capacity was an issue. Three hundred units in four to five storey blocks would have an effect on views.

269 units to be one and two bedroom flats was inappropriate to housing need as there was a greater need for family homes within the area. A play area had been provided for children but there was no community use and the predominance of one and two bedroom flats could result in a lack of children on the site to utilise the play equipment. There were no garden areas and no natural life retained that could be enhanced. The site would be crammed and a less dense development would be welcomed. He also questioned whether the demolition and relocation of Police Headquarters would be more financially beneficial to the Police Authority over the costs associated with the refurbishment of the present Police Headquarters building.

Mrs K Mackintosh, a resident of West End Terrace, commented on the point taken to assess height for the proposed development. She also encouraged the control on limitation of cars on the site and suggested that a car pool scheme could be utilised within the development. She commented on the public open space created by the blocks of development which had not been treated with sensitivity or regard. In many cases the open spaces would be filled with car parking. The communications mast would be also very prominent and she asked if there a possibility to absorb it within the tallest part of the new development.

Mr N Meeson, of 1 Step Terrace, spoke in favour of retaining the existing Police Headquarters building and having it re-clad. He was in favour of the Police being accommodated within the present site rather than having to relocate. The site presented a major local employment opportunity and it would be a loss to the town if the Police moved out. He also expressed concerns at the height of the proposed buildings and car parking issues. Although supporting the single access to Romsey Road, he concluded that in terms of site capacity the scheme represented over-development and was out of proportion to the surrounding character of the area.

In response to the points raised, Mrs Wells stated that in terms of height, although the block opposite West End Terrace would be elevated, it would be set thirty metres back from the present development. With regard to costs, the expense of finding a new headquarters for the Police within Hampshire was significant. The proposals for relocation were intended to be cost neutral, whereas the cost of refurbishing the existing building would be at additional cost to the Police Authority, including an estimate £3-4m to decant existing staff while a refurbishment took place.

Mrs Wells continued that with regard to the communications mast, its relocation on top of the highest building within the new development would be a sensible approach. However, for the development to proceed, it was for the Police to guarantee that alternative provision could be made, and this could not be achieved unless a separate parcel of land was retained on which a communications mast could be erected. However, if a successful scheme was achieved then a developer could be encouraged to take this approach.

The point on the relocation of employment was noted but the Council's Local Plan policies encouraged residential development of this site together with high density development. In terms of parking the calculation on provision took into consideration visitor car parking, therefore effectively provision was below one per dwelling. It was envisaged that for example in the affordable housing element, uptake on car parking provision would be below one per unit. If the site was not sustainable then five hundred car parking spaces would need to be provided.

The applicant had negotiated with the City Council the removal of one copper beech tree which was in a healthy condition. In the overall context of the development of the scheme this had been acceptable.

Mr Hearn added that negotiations with the applicant would continue and there would be an opportunity for further public participation as the scheme progressed. The detailed scheme, when submitted, would also need to come to Committee, and there would be a requirement for details in compliance at the outline stage.

In answer to Members' questions, Mr Hearn stated that the matters for determination by the Sub-Committee were the capacity of the site, that is whether three hundred units was appropriate, and the principle of a single access from Romsey Road. It was acknowledged that there were problems in the relationship of the proposals with West End Terrace, but a proper assessment could not be made as only sections had been submitted at present. Further detail was also required on crucial issues, for example to assess the development's setting with respect to viewpoints around Winchester and to assess relationships with surrounding development.

Mr Hearn explained that the Council had refused the application for re-cladding of the existing Police Headquarters building and this was subject to appeal. Subsequently, the City Council had assisted the applicant in trying to find a solution, and this included encouragement towards a higher density residential development on the site. Consideration needed to take place on the urban grain of development around the site, including Step Terrace and West End Terrace. This had led to a hard urban development of a high density, with streets and enclosures, which had been supported in its approach by the Council's urban design consultants, The Matrix Partnership.

Mr Brady from the Matrix Partnership added that the applicant had been encouraged to look at similar schemes within the town where five and six storey development had taken place, such as Northgate House at Staple Gardens and St Paul's. However, it was for the developer to show that the height of the block and the density of development would work.

Mr Dimon explained that the area of the site was actually 2.33 hectares and not 2.44 hectares as stated in the report. This resulted in a density of 129 units per hectare and not 123 as stated. The height of the communications mast was yet to be assessed. Mr Jenkins added that the local planning authority could not insist that the applicant run a car club with pool cars on the site. However, if the applicant was willing to negotiate on this point then the County Council could provide advice.

It was also noted that other issues on the site such as layout in relation to existing landscaping including the trees and the positioning of affordable housing within the site were all subject to further negotiation.

During debate, Members commented that further detail was required before a decision on a suitable capacity for the site and acceptance of a single access from Romsey Road could be properly assessed. The detail of the scheme was vitally important and could be a lot different if the scheme was sold by the Police to a third party developer, as was intended. There were positives in the scheme, such as the provision of affordable housing close to the town, but questions such as the relationship of development with trees on the site and the effect on Winchester's skyline, space between development and the ratio of car parking provision for the number of units proposed, together with effects on the Conservation Area all required further detail.

In conclusion, the Sub-Committee was appreciative of the difficulties that development of the site and options for the future location of a Police Headquarters presented to the applicant. It was an important decision for Winchester as a whole, both in terms of employment and residential provision. Members encouraged continuing dialogue between the applicant and its officers in order that the opportunity that the proposals presented could be fully embraced. The objective was to provide a development of which all parties could be proud and this would require careful consideration due to the

sensitivity of the site. Therefore, after debate, the recommendation to defer for further negotiation was supported by the Sub-Committee.

RECOMMENDED:

That the application to demolish all existing buildings and provide residential redevelopment (outline) (W04090/19) be deferred for further negotiation.

The meeting commenced at 2.30 pm and concluded at 5.25 pm.

Chairman