

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**13 June 2011**

Attendance

Councillors:

Jefferies (Chairman) (P)

Berry  
Evans  
Clear  
Izard (P)  
Johnston (P)  
Laming (P)

McLean  
Pearce (P)  
Read (P)  
Ruffell (P)  
Tait (P)

Deputy Members

Councillor Love (Standing Deputy for Councillor Clear)  
Councillor Scott (Standing Deputy for Councillor McLean)  
Councillor Mitchell (Standing Deputy for Councillor Evans)

---

1. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Read declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in planning applications 10/03252/OUT and 10/03253/OUT as he was a member of Denmead Parish Council. He remained in the meeting and took part in the debates and votes.

2. **PLANNING APPLICATION 10/03252/OUT (WCC – W19499/14) – Phase 2(M2)  
Land at Oak Park Farm Wimpey Site Part of West of Waterlooville MDA  
Hambledon Road, Denmead, Hampshire  
(Report PDC902 refers)**

**Proposal:** Erection of a nursing care home with approx 82 beds (outline with all matters reserved)

**(The meeting adjourned at 1.05 pm for informal discussions to take place.**

**The meeting resumed at 2.11 pm)**

The Committee considered:

- (A) the written report and recommendations of the Corporate Director (Operations) at Winchester City Council;
- (B) the following issues and matters raised whilst the meeting was adjourned:

- (1) the officers' presentation;
- (2) additional information circulated in an addendum prior to the meeting;
- (3) Deputations from J Knight (Denmead Parish Council), Councillor Stallard (Winchester City Council) and Councillor Cooper (Winchester City Council), Mr Cramond (Dc Planning Ltd) and Mr Simpson (Lionel Gregory);
- (4) questions raised by members of this Committee and members of Havant Borough Council's Development Management Committee in relation to this application as set out in the appendix to these minutes;
- (5) the matters raised during a debate involving members of this Committee relating to this application as set out in the appendix to these minutes;
- (6) The following amendments to the recommendation set out in the report;
  - (a) The deletion of condition 11; and
  - (b) The completion of a legal agreement to the satisfaction of the Head of Legal Services under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and other relevant legislation binding this application in with the terms of the Section 106 agreement completed for the original Taylor Wimpey outline application reference 05/00500/OUT , W19499..

RESOLVED:

That the Head of Planning Management be authorised to grant permission for application 10/03252/OUT subject to:

- (A) the completion of legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other relevant legislation, binding this application with the legal agreement entered into in respect of planning application 05/00500/OUT, W19499 (subject to such changes as the Head of Planning Management may determine), such agreement to be to the satisfaction of the Head of Legal Services;
- (B) the following conditions:

- (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 (as amended).

- (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 (as amended).

- (3) Approval of the details of the appearance, layout and scale, the means of access thereto and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the local planning authority in writing before any development is commenced.

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

- (4) Plans and particulars of the reserved matters referred to in condition 3 above relating to the siting, design and external appearance of any buildings to be erected, the means of access to the site and the landscaping of the site, shall be submitted in writing to the local planning authority and shall be carried out as approved.

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

- (5) No development shall begin until details which demonstrate the feasibility of a strategic surface water regulation system for the whole of the application site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Further to this approval, no development on individual plots/phases shall begin until the design of the surface water drainage system for that plot/ phase supported by detailed calculations and implementation program has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. That plot/phase must not be built other than in accordance with the approved details and the strategic water regulation system must be implemented to a point whereby that particular plot/phase can be serviced. The strategic

surface water regulation system for the whole site must ensure that the runoff is controlled through the use of sustainable drainage systems and that for the range of annual flow rate probabilities, up to and including the 1% annual probability storm, the developed rate of runoff is no greater than the greenfield rate of runoff for the same event. The drainage arrangement should also be such that the volumes of surface water leaving the site are no greater than pre-development. The scheme shall include a maintenance program and establish future management responsibility for the system.

NB If a phased approach is adopted, the downstream system must be completed in order to minimise the risk of flooding. No plots/phases shall be allowed to discharge runoff un-attenuated and untreated into receiving water courses dependant on future phasing downstream.

**Reason:** In order to reduce the risk of flooding.

- (6) Details of a scheme for protecting the proposed development from noise from the road traffic shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing before development commences. Any works which form part of the approved scheme shall be completed before the building is occupied unless an alternative period is agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Such noise protection measures shall thereafter be maintained and operated in accordance with the approved scheme.

**Reason:** To ensure that acceptable noise levels within the dwellings and the curtilage of the dwellings are not exceeded.

- (7) Details of the means of extraction of fumes from the premises shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced, and thereafter maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details.

**Reason:** In the interests of the amenities of the adjoining properties.

- (8) Before air conditioning / refrigeration equipment is installed and operated on the premises, a full acoustic report shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The equipment shall be installed and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

**Reason:** To protect the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties.

- (9) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted (or within such extended period as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority), a scheme to deal with contamination shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme shall conform to current guidance and best practice as set out in BS10175:2001 Investigation of potentially contaminated sites - code of practice and Contaminated Land Reports 7 to 11, or other supplementary guidance and include the following phases, unless identified as unnecessary by the preceding stage and agreed in writing by the LPA:

- (a) A desk top study and conceptual model documenting all the previous and existing land uses of the site and adjacent land;
- (b) A site investigation report documenting the ground conditions of the site and incorporating chemical and gas analysis identified as appropriate by the desk top study;
- (c) A remedial strategy detailing the measures to be undertaken to avoid risk from contaminants and/or gases when the site is developed and proposals for future maintenance and monitoring. Such scheme shall include nomination of a suitably qualified person to oversee the implementation of the works.

**Reason:** In order to secure satisfactory development and in the interests of the safety and amenity of future occupants.

- (10) Development shall cease on site if, during any stage of the works, potential contamination is encountered which has not been previously identified, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Works shall not recommence before an assessment of the potential contamination has been undertaken and details of the findings along with details of any remedial action required (including timing provision for implementation), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be completed other than in accordance with the approved details.

**Reason:** In order to secure satisfactory development and in the interests of the safety and amenity of future occupants.

- (11) No works on the development hereby permitted shall commence until a BREEAM 2008 pre-assessment for that element of the scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This submission shall demonstrate how the development will achieve a minimum rating of 'very good' under the BREEAM 2008 method of assessment. Thereafter, the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved assessment, or any subsequent revision approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which shall achieve a minimum rating of BREEAM 'very good' or other such rating as may be agreed by the Local Planning Authority. No building shall be occupied until such time as it has achieved a minimum rating of BREEAM 2008 'very good'.

**Reason:** In order to ensure a sustainable form of development consistent with the objectives of PPS1 – delivering sustainable development and Climate Change and the objectives of the Local Planning Authorities Interim Policy Aspirations.

**Informatives:**

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.

3. **PLANNING APPLICATION 10/03253/OUT (WCC – W19499/15) – LAND AT JUNCTION OF MAIN AVENUE AND HABLEDON ROAD, DUKES MEADOW DEVELOPMENT SITE, WATERLOOVILLE**  
**(Report PDC901 refers)**

**Proposal:** Outline application for erection of extra care accommodation with approx 37No. units.

**(The meeting adjourned at 2.15pm for informal discussions to take place.**

**The meeting resumed at 3.45pm)**

The Committee considered:

- (A) the written report and recommendations of the Corporate Director (Operations) at Winchester City Council and the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment (Havant Borough Council);
- (B) the following issues and matters raised whilst the meeting was adjourned:
  - (1) the officers' presentation;
  - (2) additional information circulated in an addendum prior to the meeting;
  - (3) Deputations from J Knight (Denmead Parish Council) and Councillor Stallard (Winchester City Council), Mr Cramond (Dc Planning Ltd) and Mr Simpson (Lionel Gregory);
  - (4) Questions raised by members of this Committee and members of Havant Borough Council's Development Management Committee in relation to this application and application APP/11/00015 (Havant Borough Council) as set out in the appendix to these minutes;
  - (5) the matters raised during a debate involving members of this Committee and members of Havant Borough Council's Development Management Committee in relation to this application and application APP/11/00015 (Havant Borough Council) as set out in the appendix to these minutes;
  - (6) The following amendments to the recommendation set out in the report;
    - (a) Condition 5 being amended to read:  
The building shall be used only for extra care accommodation and for no other purpose whatsoever including any purpose in Class C3 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order.  
  
**Reason:** In order to control the use in view of the special circumstances relating to its operation.
    - (b) The recommended legal agreement to include terms binding this application in with the terms of the Section 106 agreement completed for application 10/02862/OUT/W19499/01.

- (c) an additional condition requiring the submission of details of the proposed surface water drainage system

RESOLVED:

That the Head of Planning Management be authorised to grant permission for application 10/03253/OUT subject to:

- (A) the completion of legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other relevant legislation, incorporating the terms set out above in para 8.2 of the report and binding this application with the legal agreement entered into in respect of planning application 05/00500/OUT (subject to such changes as the Head of Planning Management may determine), such agreement to be to the satisfaction of the Head of Legal Services, Winchester City Council and the Solicitor to the Council, (Havant Borough Council).

- (B) the following conditions:

- (1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 2 years from the date of the approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

**Reason:** To comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- (2) Application for approval of reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of 3 years from the date of the grant of this planning permission.

**Reason:** To comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- (3) Approval of the details of the scale, layout and appearance of the proposed development, the means of access thereto and the landscaping of the site hereinafter called "reserved matters" shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.

**Reason:** In order to secure a satisfactory development.

- (4) No development hereby permitted nor any related site clearance shall commence until plans and particulars specifying the detailed proposals for all of the following



aspects of the same have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- (a) Access facilities for the disabled;
- (b) The measures to be taken to protect adjacent areas from excessive noise;
- (c) The manner of treatment of existing water courses and ditches;
- (d) The alignment, height and materials of all walls and fences and other means of enclosure;
- (e) Hardsurfacing proposals including surfacing materials;
- (f) The provision to be made for the parking, turning, loading and unloading of vehicles;
- (g) The provision to be made for the storage and removal of refuse from the premises;
- (h) The provision to be made for external lighting;
- (i) The areas to be used for contractors' vehicle parking and materials storage during (site clearance and) construction of the development;
- (j) The provision to be made for the parking of cycles.

**Reason:** To secure orderly development.

- (5) The building shall be used only for extra care accommodation and for no other purpose whatsoever including any purpose in Class C3 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order.

**Reason:** In order to control the use in view of the special circumstances relating to its operation.

- (6) No externally visible or audible plant, machinery or structures required for ventilation or filtration purposes shall be installed at the premises until and unless details of the external appearance and acoustic performance of the same have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To safeguard the amenities of the locality and/or occupiers of neighbouring property.

- (7) No development hereby permitted shall commence until a scheme for protecting the proposed extra care units from noise from the adjacent highways has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Those dwellings shall not be brought into use until the implementation of all works forming part of such approved noise protection scheme has been completed in full accordance with all detailed components of such scheme.

**Reason:** To safeguard the amenities of occupiers of those dwellings.

- 8 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted (or within such extended period as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority), a scheme to deal with contamination shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall conform to current guidance and best practice as set out in BS10175:2001 Investigation of potentially contaminated sites - codes of practice and Contaminated Land Reports 7 to 11 or other supplementary guidance and include the following phases, unless identified as unnecessary by the preceding stage and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- a) A site investigation report documenting the ground conditions of the site and incorporating chemical and gas analysis identified as appropriate by the desk top study;
- b) A remedial strategy detailing the measures to be undertaken to avoid risk from contaminants and/or gases when the site is developed and proposals for future maintenance and monitoring. Such scheme shall include nomination of a suitably qualified person to oversee the implementation of the works.

**Reason:** In order to secure satisfactory development and in the interests of the safety and amenity of future occupants.

**Reason:** In order to secure satisfactory development and in the Interests of the safety and amenity of future occupants.

- (9) Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, written verification produced by the suitably qualified person approved under the provision of condition 8 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report must demonstrate that the remedial strategy approved under the provisions of conditions 8 has been implemented fully, unless varied with the written agreement of the Local Planning Authority in advance.

**Reason:** In order to secure satisfactory development and in the interests of the safety and amenity of future occupants.

- (10) Development shall cease on site if, during any stage of the works, potential contamination is encountered which has not been previously identified, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Works shall not recommence before an assessment of the potential contamination has been undertaken and details of the findings along with details of any remedial action required (including timing provision for implementation), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be completed other than in accordance with the approved details.

**Reason:** In order to secure satisfactory development and in the interests of the safety and amenity of future occupants.

- (11) The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until an Interim Certificate of Compliance with the Code for Sustainable Homes has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Certificate shall demonstrate that the development will attain a minimum standard of Level 3 in accordance with the Code. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the details the subject of the Certificate.

**Reason:** To ensure the development meets an appropriate level of sustainability measures.

- (12) Condition requiring the submission of details of the proposed surface water drainage system
- (13) Condition detailing the plans approved by the Committee.

**(The meeting commenced at 1pm and concluded at 3.48pm)**

**APPENDIX**

**HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL EXTRAORDINARY DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT  
COMMITTEE**

**AND**

**WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**13 June 2011**

**INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS**

**Councillors' Attendance**

**Winchester City Council**

**Councillors:**

Jefferies (Chairman) (P)

Berry  
Evans  
Clear  
Izard (P)  
Johnston (P)  
Laming (P)

McLean  
Pearce (P)  
Read (P)  
Ruffell (P)  
Tait (P)

**Deputy Members**

Councillor Love (Standing Deputy for Councillor Clear)  
Councillor Scott (Standing Deputy for Councillor McLean)  
Councillor Mitchell (Standing Deputy for Councillor Evans)

**Havant Borough Council**

**Councillors:**

Buckley (Chairman)

Gibb - Gray (P)  
Johnson (P)  
J Smith (P)

Mrs Shimbart (P)  
Turner (P)  
Wilson

**Deputy Members**

Councillor Cheshire (Standing Deputy for Councillor Buckley)

**Officers' Attendance:****Winchester City Council**

Steve Tilbury – Corporate Director (Operations)  
 Howard Bone – Head of Legal Services  
 Jill Lee – Principal Planning Officer  
 Nigel Green – Major Development Project Leader  
 Stuart Dunbar-Dempsey - Landscape Officer

**Havant Borough Council**

Steve Weaver – Interim Development Services Manager  
 Sally Smith – Senior Planner  
 Shirley Shaw – Deputy to the Solicitor to the Council  
 Julie Boschi – Senior Landscape Architect  
 Mark Gregory – Democratic Services Officer

4. **PLANNING APPLICATION 10/03252/OUT (WCC – W19499/014) – Phase 2(M2)**  
**Land at Oak Park Farm Wimpey Site Part of West of Waterlooville MDA**  
**Hambledon Road, Denmead, Hampshire**  
**(Report PDC902 refers)**

**Proposal:** Erection of a nursing care home with approx 82 beds (outline with all matters reserved)

i) **INTRODUCTION**

The Chairman outlined the format of the informal discussion. He advised members of Havant Borough Council's Development Management Committee that as this application fell entirely within the boundary of Winchester City Council, they were welcomed to ask questions but could not take part during the ensuing debate.

ii) **OFFICERS' PRESENTATION**

The main aspects of the application were explained to the Committee by referring to the appendices to the report and a PowerPoint presentation.

Taylor Wimpey had submitted an outline planning application for that part of the Taylor Wimpey section of the West of Waterlooville major development area known as M2. This application was linked with another application submitted on site E1 (application 10/03253/OUT) and was intended to operate as one business.

Members were shown the relationship of the proposal with the residential areas and the overhead electricity power lines. Members were also shown indicative plans and elevations.

In response to concerns raised by Denmead Parish Council, the access road on the southern end of the development had been redesigned to ensure that the road did not encroach into the Denmead Gap and to restrict access to the Denmead Gap.

It was explained that the application had been advertised in local newspapers and residents informed appropriately and that no objections had been received. Denmead Parish Council and the North Waterlooville Community Board had been consulted. Members' attention was drawn to the representations from consultees as summarised in the report.

Members attention was drawn to the updates circulated prior to the meeting.

## ii) **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr Knight, representing Denmead Parish Council addressed the Committee and advised that although the Parish Council had no objection in principle to the development it had the following concerns:

- (a) the nursing care home would be located close to the main avenue which in addition to being the main access road to the development was also the dedicated route to the household waste amenity site. Therefore the residents would be disturbed by noise emanating from general traffic and the noise generated by heavy vehicles travelling to and from this facility;
- (b) the view to be provided for the care home residents was inappropriate for residents of a care home;
- (c) the number of parking spaces was inadequate for the use proposed; and
- (d) although the style and design of the building was in accordance with the approved Design Code, it was considered unattractive and unpopular with local residents.

Mr Knight was pleased to note that the design to the proposed southern access route had been amended so as to ensure that it did not encroach into the Denmead Gap.

Councillor Stallard (Winchester City Council) addressed the Committee and whilst she acknowledged that there was an increasing demand for housing for the an aging population, she raised the following concerns:

- The nursing care home would be in close proximity to a main access route to the development and the household waste facility. Therefore, the residents would be subjected to unacceptable levels of noise and fumes. The proposal could be sited in a more suitable location within the development away from a main access road.
- The application was unclear on how many car parking spaces would be available for residents and visitors.

- The boundary treatment should be extended to the boundary with the Denmead Gap.
- It was important that the proposed southern access road did not encroach upon the Denmead Gap: a hammerhead should be constructed at the end of the road.
- There was local concern about the proposed design of this landmark building. Local residents considered that the design should be more attractive.

Councillor Cooper (Winchester City Council) in his capacity as Deputy Leader of Winchester City Council and Portfolio Holder for Communities, Safety and Public Health, supported the application on the following grounds:

- Experience of similar nursing homes showed that a nursing home was appropriate for this development and the location was suitable.
- The nursing home would act as a catalyst for community and voluntary work.
- The nursing home would generate much needed employment opportunities, particularly for working mothers and school leavers.
- The nursing home would make a significant contribution to the local economy.
- There was a need for purpose built nursing homes: the facilities provided by converted nursing homes were restricted by the size and design of the buildings.
- There was a shortage of the type of nursing home proposed with only 1 similar home being available in the area.
- The residents would be adequately protected against noise and fumes likely to be generated by traffic using the adjoining road.
- The car parking spaces were inadequate and should be increased when the detailed application was submitted.

During his deputation Councillor Cooper declared a personal and prejudicial interest because of his and his relatives' involvement in the residential care home business. However, he stressed that neither he nor his relatives had any links with this proposal.

iii) **APPLICANT**

Mr Cramond (DC Planning Ltd), the applicant's agent, in support of the recommendations set out in the report made the following points:

- The proposal would meet the growing demand for residential care homes.
- The nursing home would provide much needed employment opportunities for local people.
- The Environmental Health departments of Havant Borough Council and Winchester City Council had not raised objections relating to noise impact subject to appropriate conditions.
- The proximity of the powers lines to the development was within government guidelines.
- The southern access road would not encroach into the Denmead Gap.
- The proposal did not conflict with the planning policies or the approved design codes.
- There were no proposals by Taylor Wimpey to develop the Denmead Gap.
- The submitted Illustrative drawings demonstrated that a nursing home could be provided on the site

Mr Simpson (Lionel Gregory Architects) advised that:

- The illustrative drawings were in accordance with the approved design principles and appropriate for a landmark building. The design would be architecturally pleasing and in keeping with the character of the surrounding development.
- The illustrative design incorporated appropriate levels of fenestration and open space.
- Landscaping would provide adequate protection from detrimental noise impact from the adjoining access route.

The Chairman prevented Mr Simpson from completing his deputation because he had exceeded the maximum time allowed for deputations.

#### iv) **OFFICER'S RESPONSE TO PUBLIC PARTICPATION**

In response to matters raised during public participation, the officers advised that:

- The use of the site was in accordance with development plan policies and the approved masterplan and design codes.
- The Committee was required to determine the application as submitted to the Council.



- The amenity space for the home would be provided on the side of the proposed building away from the main access road.
- Car parking provision would be determined at the reserved matters stage: the details submitted with the application were an illustration of what could be achieved.
- The approved masterplan and design code indicated that this site would contain a landmark building. The submitted illustrative drawings showed how such a building could be achieved on this site.
- Adequate measures would be taken to protect the residents against noise generated by the adjoining roads.

v) **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

In response to questions raised by members, the officers advised that:

**Principle**

- The design of a landmark building was open to interpretation
- The illustrative plans were submitted to show that a level of development could be provided in a satisfactory manner: the reserved matters application could contain a different design. However, the approved design would have to conform with the approved masterplan and design codes.
- The layout and size of individual rooms would be determined at the reserved matters stage.
- The proposed distance between the overhead power lines and the nursing home was acceptable.
- The nursing homes was set back from the footway and there would be substantial planting between the footway and the building

**Other Matters**

- Winchester's Interim Policy Aspirations required non-residential development to be "very good". At this stage it was difficult to ensure that these aspirations could be achieved and a lower rating would be agreed, if there were compelling reasons.
- In accordance with the approved policies the proposed building had to meet Level 3 of the sustainable code.
- Details of the building would be decided at the Reserved Matters stage.

vi) **MEMBERS' DEBATE**

There was a general support for the application during the debate with an acknowledgement that the proposed use would meet the growing need for nursing care homes and would make a contribution to the local economy. However, there was some concern that the details of the design submitted at the reserved matters would not match the submitted illustrative drawings.

(the meeting adjourned at 2.11 pm and resumed at 2.18 pm)

5. **PLANNING APPLICATION APP/11/00015 (HBC) AND 10/03253/OUT (WCC – W19499/014) – LAND AT JUNCTION OF MAIN AVENUE AND HAMBLEDON ROAD, DUKES MEADOW DEVELOPMENT SITE, WATERLOOVILLE (Report PDC901 refers)**

**Proposal:** Outline application for erection of extra care accommodation with approx 37No. units.

1) **OFFICERS' PRESENTATION**

The site of the proposed development was partly in Winchester City Council's area and partly in Havant Borough Council's area. In such a situation, legislation required the applicant to submit a separate application to each Local Planning Authority for that part of the site which fell within that administrative area. The applicant had therefore submitted two identical applications, one to each Council. Each application showed the whole development site for clarity rather than just the land within that Council's area. It was noted however that each Council could only determine the application which fell within its own administrative area.

The main aspects of the application were explained to the Committee by referring to the appendices to the report and a PowerPoint presentation.

The site was shown as an employment area in the Taylor Wimpey Masterplan, subject to the outline permissions for the Old Park Farm area of the West of Waterlooville MDA. A different use of the site had been investigated since a marketing of the site revealed a lack of interest in developing the site for an employment use. It was considered that there were compelling reasons, as set out in the submitted report, to accept an alternative use of the site and the use proposed was supported. An outline application had been submitted as the extra care accommodation proposal was not considered to be 'employment' as defined in that permission.

Submitted illustrative drawings were displayed at the meeting, showing possible layout and elevations. The members were reminded that this application was linked to an application submitted on site M2 (Minute 1 above) and intended to operate as one business.

It was explained that the application had been advertised in local newspapers and residents informed appropriately and 1 objection had been received.

Denmead Parish Council and the North Waterlooville Community Boards had been consulted. Members' attention was drawn to the representations from consultees as summarised in the report.

Members attention was drawn to the updates circulated prior to the meeting.

## ii) **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr Knight, representing Denmead Parish Council addressed the Committee and advised that although the Parish Council had no objection in principle to the development it had the following concerns:

- (a) the proposal would be located close to the busy B2150. Therefore the residents would be subjected to noise emanating from traffic using this road. It was considered that the proposal should be repositioned to protect against the noise pollution;
- (b) the proposed number of staff did not appear to be adequate for the number of residents to be accommodated on the site.
- (c) It was important that there should be interaction between the proposal and the Health Authority. However, details of the responses of the relevant Health Authority had not been set out in the report.
- (d) the number of parking spaces was inadequate for the use proposed;
- (e) although the style and design of the building was in accordance with the approved Design Code, it was considered unattractive and unpopular with local residents.

Councillor Stallard (Winchester City Council) addressed the Committee and whilst she acknowledged that there was an increasing demand for this form of housing, she raised the following concerns:

- The extra care home would be in close proximity to the Main Avenue and B2150 which generated a high level of noise throughout the day. Therefore, the residents would be subjected to unacceptable levels of noise and fumes for 24 hours a day.
- The proposed number of staff did not appear to be adequate for the number of residents to be accommodated on the site. Inadequate details had been submitted on duties of this staff and on how they interlinked with the nursing home.
- Although there would be a call system between the proposed use and the nearby nursing home, the nursing home would not be able to immediately react to a request for aid.

- The number of parking spaces did not appear adequate for the proposed use, bearing in mind that a number of the residents would be likely to own cars.
- The amenity space would be denied direct sunlight due to its orientation.
- although the style and design of the building was in accordance with the approved Design Code, it was considered unattractive and unpopular with local residents.

iii) **APPLICANT**

Mr Cramond (DC Planning Ltd), the applicant's agent, in support of the recommendations set out in the report, made the following points:

- The proposal would meet the demand for this form of housing, which filled the gap between residential care homes and sheltered housing.
- The homes would be linked to the approved nursing home and many of the facilities available in the home would be available to residents of the proposed dwellings.
- An active marketing exercise had been undertaken but no interest had been expressed for the development of this site for employment use. The designation of Dunsbury Hill Farm as a strategic site in Havant's Core Strategy had down graded the importance of the MDA for wider employment needs.
- This development with the approved nursing home would provide employment for between 80 to 120 staff.
- The homes would be screened from noise from the nearby roads by a landscape buffer zone.
- The parking provision would be adequate and was in accordance with the adopted parking policies.
- Deliveries to and from the waste collection centre would be minimal.

Mr Simpson (Lionel Gregory Architects) advised that:

- The illustrative drawings complied with the approved design principles and were appropriate for a landmark building. The design would be architecturally pleasing and in keeping with the character of the surrounding development.
- The illustrative design incorporated appropriate levels of fenestration and open space.

- Landscaping would provide adequate protection from detrimental noise impact from the adjoining access route.
- Although the design included north facing balconies, the scheme included areas where the residents could sit in direct sunlight.
- The design would be wheelchair accessible.

iv) **OFFICER'S RESPONSE TO PUBLIC PARTICPATION**

In response to questions raised by Members, the officers advised that:

- The landscape buffer to be provided at the front of the development would reduce the impact of noise from the use of the adjoining roads.
- The development was situated close to the main signalised junction into the site, so the impact speed and noise from vehicles passing the proposed development would be modest.
- The balconies would be facing north east so the residents would get a degree of direct sunlight.
- The anticipated movements of heavy lorries to and from the Household Waste Amenity Site would not have a significant impact on the residents of the proposed units: such traffic movement would cease upon the construction of the designated route via the ASDA roundabout junction into the Grainger Site.
- The parking provision was considered adequate for this type of accommodation and no objections had been lodged by the highway engineers of Havant Borough Council and Winchester City Council.
- Adequate measures would be taken to protect the residents against noise generated by the adjoining roads.

v) **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

During Members' questions, in summary, the following matters were discussed:

**Principle**

- No responses had been received from the NHS or the Primary Care Trust.
- It was considered that the principle of the proposal on a site previously intended employment site in this area of the MDA was acceptable. This use together with the nursing care home, would create the correct balance for a mixed community in the MDA and provide employment for the locality.

- Details on how the proposed development and the nursing care home would be linked together and the level of care to be provided would be finalised in the proposed Section 106 Agreement.
- The proposal was required to meet the sustainability requirements of the Building Regulations and Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes upon completion.
- The parking provision was considered adequate and the details would be finalised at the reserved matters stage.

### **Design and Layout**

- This form of accommodation could be a landmark building provided the design met the design code principles.
- The landscaping to be provided would reduce the impact of traffic noise.
- The level of staffing and the quality of care to be provided was not a planning consideration.
- Details of the scale, layout and appearance of the proposed development, the means of access and the landscaping (“the reserved matters”) would be submitted for approval by the Committees at a later date.
- A significant change to the proposal would require a new application.

### vi) **MEMBERS’ DEBATE**

There was a general support for the application during the debate with an acknowledgement. However, the following concerns were raised:

- (a) there were no details on how the scheme would interact with the health service as neither the Primary Care Trust nor the NHS had responded to the application;
- (b) there were inadequate details on how the proposal would be linked to the approved nursing home and it could be argued that this proposal was just another residential scheme; and
- (c) that the details of the design submitted at the reserved matters would not match the submitted illustrative drawings.

The informal meeting commenced at 1.06 pm, adjourned at 2.11 pm, reconvened at 2.18 pm, and concluded at 3.45 pm.