

NORTH WHITELEY DEVELOPMENT FORUM

13 November 2017

Attendance:

Councillors:

Winchester City Council

Ruffell (Chairman) (P)

Achwal (P)
Bentote (P)

Huxstep (P)
Pearson (P)

Eastleigh Borough Council

Clarke (P)

Fareham Borough Council

Butts (P)

Hampshire County Council

Woodward
Stallard

Whiteley Town Council

Evans (P)

Curdridge Parish Council

Bundell (P)

Botley Parish Council

Mercer (P)

Officers in Attendance:

Mr S Tilbury – Strategic Director, Winchester City Council

Others in attendance:

Mr N Thorne - Peter Brett Associates

Mr B Clifton – Hampshire County Council Highways

Mr R Vaughan - Hampshire County Council Children's Services

1. **CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME**

The meeting was held at the Solent Hotel, Whiteley and the Chairman welcomed approximately 40 local residents and representatives of amenity groups, the development consortium and businesses.

2. **APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR THE 2017/18 MUNICIPAL YEAR**

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Huxstep be appointed Vice-Chairman for the remainder of the 2017/18 Municipal Year.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Chairman invited members of the public (including local interest groups and stakeholders) to raise any general matters of interest and/or matters relating to the work of the Forum following the presentation and discussion of agenda item 5 - North Whiteley Development Forum Progress Report and Update (Report NWDF5 refers).

4. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held 3 July 2014 be agreed as a correct record.

5. **NORTH WHITELEY DEVELOPMENT FORUM PROGRESS REPORT AND UPDATE**

(Report NWDF5 refers)

Mr Tilbury gave a presentation to the Forum, a copy of which has been made available on the [Council's website](#).

In summary, Mr Tilbury reminded the Forum that North Whiteley was one of three Major Development Areas (MDAs) in the current Winchester District Local Plan. The other two are located at Barton Farm (King's Barton) and at West of Waterlooville – both of which were currently in varying stages of being built out. It was explained that planning permission for North Whiteley was resolved to be granted by Winchester City Council in October 2015, subject to a Section 106 (S106) agreement being prepared and signed. This was a legal agreement with regard to various important phased infrastructure being in place at specific stages of the development, notably highway improvements. Planning consent was now shortly to be issued as the S106 was now ready to be signed after delays caused largely by uncertainty over infrastructure funding. Mr Tilbury drew the Forum's attention to the appendix to the Report which set out the schedule of obligations within the S106 agreement.

It was explained that a S106 would ensure that all necessary additional infrastructure was provided for by the developer. This would ensure that the 'burden' of the new development did not fall upon existing residents.

Mr Tilbury highlighted those involved in the decision making, the in particular the local authorities, the developer consortium as well as statutory consultees and also key stakeholders. The latter included Whiteley Town Council, Curdridge Parish Council and neighbouring authorities and were represented on the Forum.

The development area was extensive and within the 'red line' boundary of the planning application a considerable proportion of land would not be developed. This was generally because these were areas of particularly sensitive natural environment. Mr Tilbury showed the broad form of the development, and its three distinct areas. An area close to the existing Whiteley would contain a new primary school. A 'middle' area would include a new secondary school and the third area to the northern end of the MDA was to be of a different character and was to include the second primary school, playing fields and community buildings.

There would be no employment or large scale retail within the development as this already existed in Whiteley.

Mr Thorne, Peter Brett Associates detailed the significant on-site and off-site highway infrastructure improvements and the three primary routes through the development – Bluebell Way extension, Whiteley Way extension and Curbridge Way. There was also to be a significant sustainable transport strategy. Off site high way works included at parkway south roundabout ('R1') and also at M27 J9. All improvements were to be expedited due to securing £14m Solent LEP funding. Mr Thorne explained each of the three highway 'packages' as highlighted in the presentation, including their various triggers around house occupations. The Blue Bell Way extension (package 1) was to provide access to the new primary school and was to be approximately 1.3 kilometres long and was expected to be delivered by 2019. Package 2 included improvements to R1 and also the M27 J9. The latter, especially, was complex and required careful traffic management and liaison with Highways England - although it was an objective for these works to be completed asap. Package 3 included improvements to the Tesco Roundabout, access to the town centre shops, Marjoram Way and also Parkway north roundabout. These proposals required careful sequencing so to avoid disrupting the movement of shoppers and business excessively.

Mr Tilbury reported on the £42m total contributions within the S106 with regard to education and the 'triggers' for their completion. The new secondary school (up to eight form entry) would be the first to have built in Hampshire for many years and would support community facilities. The target opening date for the first new primary school in the southern area was September 2020 at which point the existing Cornerstone school would be relocated.

Mr Tilbury also explained that there was to be provision of 15% affordable housing on site, and a further financial contribution for off site provision equivalent to a further 10% on site. The Forum's attention was also drawn to

an indicative timetable in his presentation which set out site clearance by February 2018, first occupations by spring 2019 and continued delivery 5-10 years after delivery of the first primary school at September 2020. The Forum was reminded that there were factors outside the control of the consortium and the Council which may impact upon the timetable.

Finally, Mr Tilbury reiterated the important role of the Forum going forward. It would provide feedback on planning issues etc and oversee community development activities etc. The Forum's achievements to date had included helping shape the masterplan for the MDA, the design codes and community infrastructure requirements.

Members of the Forum asked a number of questions which were discussed and responded to as summarised below:

Medical Centre

The existing Whiteley Surgery had been consulted on the development and it had been agreed with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) as having the ability to expand to meet the medical needs of the residents of the development at North Whiteley and therefore no new premises for primary health care were proposed. However, the car park at the surgery is inadequate and the S106 agreement therefore provides funding for an extension by the owners of the property. This would require planning consent from Fareham Borough Council as local planning authority. A member of the Forum asked what would happen if Fareham Borough Council did not grant planning permission and it was confirmed that in that circumstance, an alternative form of car parking would be required.

Highways improvements

It was explained that the Consortium and the County Council were both aware that there must be flexibility and agility to deliver the highways works promptly and phased appropriately to tie in with specific elements of the development as this was progressed. For example, those to be undertaken at Junction 9 M27 should ideally be undertaken ahead of those at R1 roundabout. There was a clear willingness to deliver and recognition to be flexible so as to ensure the least impact as possible on existing residents and business. Further detail would be brought forward in due course of the detailed planning and scheduling of the highway works. Information of the County Council's delivery of the highway improvements linked to the development should be tied into the work to complete a village plan for Botley as well as having regard to the decision soon to be made regarding the Botley bypass.

Education

It was explained that the initial assessment undertaken in 2013 had concluded that there should be provision for two primary schools each of three forms of entry built as part of the development. The County Council now anticipated fewer pupils from the existing Whiteley area and so the two new primary schools will be configured as one with three forms of entry and one with two forms of entry.

Woodland SINCs

The North Whiteley development was to retain a significant area as countryside. However, not all of this land would be accessible to the public due to its sensitivity and it would be managed accordingly.

The Chairman invited members of the public (including local interest groups, and stakeholders) to raise any general matters of interest and/or matters relating to the work of the Forum.

Councillor Hazel-Croft (Whiteley Town Council) addressed the Forum with regard to provision for wildlife and the natural environment as part of the development.

The consortium was urged to consider how to enhance biodiversity within house building and design. All new buildings must ideally be constructed to be 'wildlife friendly' and there was good practice set out in the RIBA Guide 'Designing for Biodiversity' which was the outcome of much detailed work with relevant groups and experts. A housing development at 'Kingsbrook' Aylesbury was referred to as good practice, which was a site not dissimilar to North Whiteley. The developer here had incorporated wildlife corridors, bat roosts etc. The Town Council was already discussing how to incorporate such initiatives into the existing Whiteley by enhancing areas for wildlife.

In response, Mr Tilbury recognised that this was an important area and explained that this could be looked into as part of the future reserved matters planning applications for the development.

A local resident asked whether the volume of traffic in Leafy Lane would further increase during development as was already difficult due to business traffic.

In response, Mr Clifton referred to proposed improvement works to Whiteley Way and opportunities to look at the interaction of the existing business park traffic with Leafy Lane. Study work being undertaken could include this.

A local resident was concerned at an apparent lack of priority to consider the urgent expansion of the existing health centre, which was already at capacity.

In response, Mr Tilbury clarified that the NHS had made clear, as it had at other neighbouring development, that it did not want any additional buildings to be provided and that healthcare for residents could continue to be delivered effectively with new services provided at existing facilities. Additional GPs would be provided by the NHS and could not be sought through the planning process. It was also noted that in Botley, other community buildings had been successfully fitted out for suitably equipped 'nurse led' health care facilities.

A representative of Whiteley Town Council referred to existing issues of traffic being halted at the Marjoram Way Roundabout at the pedestrian crossings by workers travelling between the business parks. It was queried whether there may be consideration of a footbridge to assist with traffic flow.

Mr Clifton explained that although there were no plans for footbridge as part of the highway works the frequency of the crossings had featured in traffic assessment works. The existing breadth of the works here were to increase the capacity of the roundabout and along Whiteley Way as well as there being additional crossing points along Whiteley Way.

A local resident queried when the new secondary school was to be provided?

Mr Tilbury reported that the school was scheduled to be provided by 2025 and also that within the S106 there was to be financial contributions to fund transport to take pupils off site until this was open.

A local resident queried whether Yew Tree Drive was to remain open and if Rookery Avenue was eventually also to be a new route out of Whiteley?

Mr Clifton responded that the area transport assessment assumed that Yew Tree Drive would as remain open and there were no plans to complete Rookery Avenue. Councillor Bundell (Curdrige Parish Council) raised the issue of the proposed cycle way along part of the A3051 and being lit by 5 metre high lamp-posts. This would create an effect of urbanisation of the area and he requested that the Forum support the Parish Council's request that Hampshire County Council further consider options available.

In response, Mr Clifton explained that the footway/cycleway was an important facility and that the design of lighting would be carefully looked at. The County Council were likely to agree the minimal specification for the lighting, having been mindful of the character of the area. These were likely to be LED lights, which will not be over lit, with no 'overspill'. This specification met the dark sky policies of the national parks. There could be other options available, such as lit bollards, but these could not be adopted by the County Council. The various options available could be made available for discussion at a future meeting of the Forum.

RESOLVED:

1. That the content of the report be noted.
2. That the Hampshire County Council provide further options for discussion to a future Forum meeting before any final decision is made with regard to its current position on the provision of lighting of the A3051 footway/cycleway.

The Chairman thanked those attending this meeting of the Forum.

The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and concluded at 8.15pm.

Chairman