

WEST OF WATERLOOVILLE FORUM

20 October 2016

Attendance:

Councillors:

Winchester City Council

Read (Chairman) (P)

Brook (P)
Clear (P)

Cutler (P)

Havant Borough Council

Blackett (P)
Hughes (P)

G Shimbart
Wade (P)

Hampshire County Council

McIntosh (P)

Stallard (P)

Denmead Parish Council

Lander-Brinkley (P)

Southwick and Widely Parish Council

Watson (P)

Officers in Attendance

Mr A Biltcliffe - Head of Planning, Havant Borough Council.

Mr N Green - Strategic Planner, Winchester City Council.

Mrs J Lee - Principal Planning Officer, Winchester City Council.

Mrs K Stickland - West of Waterlooville Implementation Officer, Winchester City Council and Havant Borough Council.

Mr S Lincoln - Community Planning Manager, Winchester City Council.

Mrs J Bridges - Community Officer, Havant Borough Council.

Apologies:

Apologies were received from the following:

Hampshire County Councillor Briggs (Deputy Member) and Havant Borough Councillor G Shimbart.

1. **CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME**

The meeting was held at the Deverell Hall, Purbrook. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately 8 members of the public, local residents, representatives of amenity groups, together with District, County and Parish Councillors and also John Beresford and Lisa Turley representing Grainger.

2. **MINUTES**

(Report WWF91 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 8 September 2016, be approved and adopted.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

During public participation, the following members of the public raised the following points and the officers' responses are set out below:

(i) Mr Field.

Mr Field commented that the new properties built adjacent to the road leading to the recycling centre appeared to be constructed very close to the highway and without space for car parking.

In reply, Mr Green stated that the Highway Authority, required all new houses to be set back so that no doors and windows open out onto the highway. Without knowing the exact properties referred to, it could be possible that court parking was provided to the rear of the property in question. The Chairman added that this was Phase 5 development, which was originally intended to be industrial but was now residential. Mr Crichton (member of the public) stated that the car parking for residential properties was not provided on the access road to the recycling centre

(ii) David Crichton

Mr Crichton commented that if a nursery/ pre-school facility was to be provided within the proposed Town Park community/sports facilities, then it would require its own separate space.

Mrs Turley replied that this use could be combined within a community space in a single building but it was currently proposed that a nursery would be provided in a separate facility.

(iii) Mrs Julie Clementson.

Mrs Clementson stated that she was the Treasurer of Waterlooville Area Community Association (WACA). In summary, she stated that the proposed Town Park Community Centre would be satisfactory for sports but the inclusion of community facilities would provide a competitive challenge to the WACA run facility at the Waterlooville Community Centre. The Community Centre had run into problems in 2007, under previous management, due to under-use and a shortage of finance. This had led at that time to discussion with Grainger. However, further discussions had not taken place since that time, despite requests to Grainger, Winchester City Council and Havant Borough Council. WACA now had an active Board and was financially sustainable, with the income being approximately £120,000 and expenditure £100,000. The new proposed facility raised concerns as it would provide competition for weddings and other community events. The proposed facility was not required as it would have to be funded by public finance and the existing Waterlooville Community Centre was in very close proximity. The Forum was asked to give consideration to the size of the new facility as it might challenge the future operation of the Waterlooville Community Centre.

In reply, Mr Beresford stated that Grainger wanted the Town Park facility to be successful and that it would be built to the latest BREEM standards minimising the maintenance costs, which was not the case at the older Waterlooville Community Centre.

Mr Biltcliffe added that the Waterlooville Community Centre was owned by Havant Borough Council and that it was sited in the car park that was on a 70 year lease to ASDA. The Town Park proposals provided the opportunity to review the future of the WACA facility as the new facility could now provide for a wider area, but the WACA site had a better locational relationship with Waterlooville. The Section 106 Agreement had a requirement for Grainger and Taylor Wimpey to provide the new facility. It was suggested that a meeting be arranged between Grainger, Havant Borough Council, Winchester City Council and WACA to explore the issue and to discuss what could be done in the area.

Mr Green added that there was a S106 requirement for both the sports and community facilities to be provided, however any discussion that took place between the parties on how the new facilities would operate would need to consider the issue of competition. However, they should be capable of operating separately, as for example, the Waterlooville Community Centre had an excellent dance floor which would not be part of the proposed facility at Town Park.

In conclusion, Mrs Clementson welcomed the proposal for a meeting and added that WACA could offer to run any temporary facility. It was additionally stated that the access and parking to the Town Park Centre should include provision for mobility scooters.

(iv) John Briggs

Mr Briggs stated that he was a trustee of Deverell Hall, which was an independent charity. He asked why badminton would be provided in the Town Park facility as this would require a high ceiling and whether it would also contain a pre-school.

In reply, Mr Beresford stated that the provision of badminton was a requirement of Sport England and that a separate pre-school would be provided at the local centre.

Mr Lincoln added that there was ongoing discussion as to the range of facilities to be provided as the proposals were indicative at this stage.

4. **PRESENTATION FROM GRAINGER – PROPOSED CHANGES TO TOWN PARK.**

Presentation from local authorities giving an overview to date.

Mrs Stickland provided a presentation on the Proposed Deed of Variation for Berewood, Waterlooville. In order to create a masterplan for the development, area market research and viability testing had been carried out by the developers. This included consultation with Sport England, who supported the provision of outdoor and indoor facilities on the MDA as well as a contribution for funding existing sport facilities in the locality. The Open Space Strategies for Havant and Winchester, referenced in the Masterplan had also identified the need for allotments and areas for play and sports.

The developer was seeking a Deed of Variation to vary the Section 106 Agreement. The development was nearing the occupation of 250 dwellings, expected by the end of 2016, which triggered elements of the Section 106 Agreement relating to the local centre. The developer was now proposing a plan to provide community facilities in two areas, the local centre and Town Park.

This process would require the developer to submit a draft proposal, and consult with key stakeholders. In response, the local authorities would need to seek specialist advice, consider the views of stakeholders and submit recommendations to the Joint West of Waterlooville Major Development Area Planning Committee.

Grainger on proposed changes to community centre facilities and Town Park (Berewood Park).

Mr Beresford and Mrs Turley from Grainger provided an outline of Grainger's proposals to seek a Deed of Variation in the Section 106 Agreement on the Berewood site.

In summary, it was stated that the trigger of occupations within the Section 106 Agreement had led Grainger to take a fresh look at the provision of community facilities, as the original proposals dated back to 2006.

Grainger wanted the community facilities to be sustainable and to not replicate the two facilities. The proposal was to create community facilities to include sufficient space for meeting rooms and offices, for example to accommodate a new parish council, a cafe and upstairs accommodation in the local centre with separated facilities for shops and businesses. Wider facilities would possibly include an extra care facility and the layout would be similar to a town square with shops around a central space.

In the Town Park community facilities there would be a bar and social area which would be able to cater for weddings. Sport and leisure would be provided for through the provision of a cricket ground and tennis courts. There would also be the provision of a youth shelter, kick about area and skateboard park.

In the middle of the park would be a central facility comprised of a cricket pavilion and community building. The ceiling of the community building would be high enough to allow the playing of badminton. The concept was of a shared facility which would provide changing facilities for cricket and tennis and a social area that could accommodate weddings.

Two additional tennis courts would be provided (to make six in total) in order that the tennis club could be registered with the Lawn Tennis Association to play matches in the Hampshire League.

The central facility was envisaged to resemble a Hampshire barn with a balcony for viewing outdoor sports provided by means of a double height public space. It would comply with Sport England advice and would provide a space for basketball and volleyball. It would also remain a manageable entity and would be at the correct scale within the topography.

The Deed of Variation would be to provide a large sports and social community facility in the Town Park and community space in the local centre, which would be no less than 720 square metres internal area provided across the two locations.

In reply to questions from members of the Forum, Grainger's representatives stated that:

- The Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) would be located away from residential areas to try to reduce conflict with other users, such as through the use of floodlights and the generation of noise; in this way potential conflicts could be limited at the design stage.
- The topography would be levelled utilising the ground cut from the housing developments.
- The facilities to be provided in the local centre would reflect the views of residents following consultation.

- The cricket pitch would be of a good standard with consideration being given to using the outfield for junior football during the winter, with an early finish in the season to allow the cricket pitch be prepared in April.
- The management of the sports centre could either be retained by Grainger (as it would have 1,300 homes on the site), or could be passed to an external party, as a commuted sum would be provided for this purpose. Mr. Green added that there were a range of options for the future management of the sport facility and details would need to be approved by the Councils including the potential payment of subscriptions etc.
- The provision of facilities for older persons, including the provision of an all weather outdoor gym, could also be considered at design stage.
- Car parking would be provided at the centre and also along the distributor road.
- The bottle bank could be located on the distributor road for the local centre. It was recommended that this be away from residential dwellings.

In reply to questions from members of the public, Grainger's representatives stated that:

- The children's play area would be separated from the distributor road to the west of Town Park by means of a ditch and hedge.
- The security of the buildings and management were a consideration.

Some members of the Forum commented that the proposals would provide the sports and community facilities for a new parish council for the area, which would complement the area rather than provide duplication and a threat. There was a lack of meeting rooms in the area and the proposals provided a mechanism for further provision.

In conclusion, members of the Forum were supportive of the proposals which would be submitted to the Joint Committee early in 2017.

Arising from further debate, Mrs Lee stated that she would give further consideration to the Section 106 Agreement and its triggers to see if more could be done to seek the completion of the connecting bridge between the Grainger and Taylor Wimpey developments. Members of the Forum would be updated on progress. It was further agreed that Taylor Wimpey be formally invited to the next meeting of the Forum to provide an update on their intentions for the "E2" employment area.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Forum supports the proposals to provide community facilities in two areas, which would be submitted to the Joint Committee early in 2017.
2. That members of the Forum be updated on the progress of the connecting bridge between the Grainger and Taylor Wimpey developments.

3. That Taylor Wimpey be formally invited to the next meeting of the Forum to provide an update on their intentions for the "E2" employment area.

5. **DATES OF 2016 - 2017 MEETINGS**

It was noted that the date of the next meeting of the Forum was Thursday 23 March 2017 at 10:00am, D Day Memorial Hall, Southwick.

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 3.25pm

Chairman