

Planning Committee

Update Sheet

12th December 2023

The information set out in this Update Sheet includes details relating to public speaking and any change in circumstances and/or additional information received after the agenda was published.

| Item No | Ref No | Address | Recommendation |
|---------|--------------|--|----------------|
| 6 | 21/02439/FUL | Land At Solomons Lane Solomons Lane Waltham Chase Hampshire | Permit |

Officer Presenting: Rose Chapman

Speaking

Objector: David Ogden

Parish Council representative: Mr Ian Donohue and Cllr Margaret Jones

Ward Councillor: Cllr Malcolm Wallace

Supporter: Simon Packer

Update

Amendments to plans negotiated section

Updated viability reports were submitted. This was readvertised 06.11.2023 for 21 days.

Additional objections submitted though these are from households that have already commented.

The issues raised include:

- Foot paths being closed and changes to the routes to school
- Use of the 'Land to the East' is not within the applicant control
- Proposed development is poor

A comment from Councillor Lumby has been submitted in regard to:

- Loss of employment
- Loss of local amenities
- Over development of the village
- Contrary to policy
- Master plan required to cover whole of WC1 area
- 250 allocated dwellings within Waltham Chase has already been met
- Lack of open space
- Lack of affordable housing
- Pavement width along Winchester Road is narrow
- Poor layout fronting Winchester Road
- Insufficient employment space
- Proposal is too dense
- Insufficient POS of the right type
- Poor design of dwellings

Further clarification has been sought on a number of issues, each are addressed below:

- External lighting has been conditioned (condition 6)
- As of 11/12/2023 there were approximately 10-25 people working on site. Of these approximately 12-15 are moving premises at the end of December. The proposal would generate approximately 40 jobs within the

employment buildings.

- The management of the public open space is proposed to be secured via the S106.
-

Sustainable Travel section addition:

Concerns have been raised regarding the Routes to School. The routes to school frameworks are managed by Hampshire County Council. The proposal includes a footpath from Winchester Road that connects to the existing footpath with school property. The existing foot path is owned by a 3rd party and is not subject to this application. Neither is it within the applicant's ability to secure continued use of footpaths outside of the red line plan. As such the proposed foot path that would run within the proposed POS would be additional to the existing routes to school framework.

The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy CP10 and DM18.

Page 49 – Additional Heads of Term for a Bond to pay upfront to ensure laying out of open space.

Public Health

Further representation received from NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB – 8th December 13:57

Representation received from the Head of LPA Engagement on behalf of HIOW ICB. The representation received objects to the statements made in the Officer's report relating to the ICB's request for funding to increase the clinical infrastructure at the 2 GP surgeries that serve the catchment area of the proposed development.

The representative objects on the basis that the statements are wholly incorrect. The ICB submit that the basis for the Officer's refusal of the contribution request appears to have been based on two High Court cases where the rulings were related to 'revenue gap funding'. The representative maintains that the request in the instant case is directly related to 'Capital Funding' for 'Health Infrastructure'.

1. It is submitted again that the request for £44,851 directly relates to infrastructure and not services. At numerous occasions in the representation the ICB object to the analysis based on comments made relating to provision of services and a one year funding gap;
2. The ICB seeks to clarify that the requested contribution relates to capital funding (infrastructure) and it is incorrect to refer to revenue (services) within the report;
3. The ICB maintains that it has clearly described how the contribution will be used towards infrastructure projects and states: "In this instance the ICB is requesting a S106 contribution to increase infrastructure capacity at either the Wickham surgery or Bishops Waltham surgery. The amount requested is commensurate with the additional space that the new residents of this proposed development will create."
4. The ICB highlight that it is arguable to state that there is sufficient funding from taxation to provide all the services. It comments that the Treasury allocates funding based upon the amount of taxation collected and then distributed in terms of affordability and not necessarily on the amount

required to deliver the service “or to create sufficient infrastructure capacity”;

5. The ICB in its response state that all patients have a right to choose which GP surgery they register with, as long as they reside within the surgery catchment area. The ICB then provides a tabulated identification of directly related harmful consequences which it says arises if the appropriate surgery does not have capacity. These can be summarised as follows: Increased waiting times, GP practices reducing their inner catchment areas, GP’s close their lists to new patients, GP’s handing back their contracts.
6. In challenging the Officer’s conclusion that the request for s106 contributions is not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, nor that it is directly related or fairly and reasonably related in scale to the proposed development thereby not meeting the CIL reg122 tests, the ICB disclose 9 planning appeal decisions listed as an Appendix to this representation received on the 8th of December. The ICB also state it has provided evidence for the request for mitigation. It states that the request is related to the additional pressures created by the development itself, therefore the 14.02m2 of additional infrastructure capacity is directly related and fairly and reasonably related in scale, to the proposed development;
7. The ICB challenge the statements made in the Officer’s report relating to: 1) the assumption that HLOW ICB has made regarding all those who occupy the new development represent an additional demand on its services; and 2) the assumption advanced by the Officer that many new occupants will already be living locally and will already therefore, be using the services and will have been accounted for by funding and those who would occupy the affordable homes are likely to be existing local inhabitants. In response the ICB states that the national trend and projections that there are fewer births than deaths, and as such the increases in population must be assumed to be inward migration fuelled by the additional housing stock. The ICB also state that GP catchment areas are relatively small therefore the notion that the occupants of the new development will be from the same small footprint is unlikely and will be attractive to those who are downsizing and releasing existing dwellings into the market that could increase the local population further;
8. The trust advances that some sources and comments made from the Officer’s report appear to have been copied from elsewhere and are irrelevant to the submission made for this particular site on behalf of the ICB.

The ICB representation concludes by stating that the Officer’s Recommendation should be reviewed and updated prior to the committee hearing and the ICB request for infrastructure contributions is fully supported by the authority and included within the s106 agreement should the application be approved.

RESPONSE

The representation received does not deal with the points made in terms of the CIL Reg 122 tests relating to necessity of the contribution on a national and local basis. Nothing has been advanced to illustrate that all who occupy the development shall represent an *additional* demand or pressure upon the identified surgeries. There is no assessment in the tariff-based approach to account for

those who may move and live locally within the area of the development. In terms of the evidence submitted it is simply stated that the 80 homes creates an additional population increase of 192 patients with no assessment provided of population movements locally. So, it cannot be said that this scheme increases the demand to the level and amount suggested. As the Report also states the ICB seeks a contribution to offset the effect of the development for a period until funding settlements are adjusted to account for population change. Essentially creating a funding lag point that has not been fully addressed. The Officer's recommendation remains unchanged.

| Item No | Ref No | Address | Recommendation |
|--|--------------|---|----------------|
| 7 | 23/01496/FUL | The Travellers Rest, Church Road, Newtown | Refuse |
| <p>Officer Presenting: Cameron Taylor <u>Public Speaking</u> Objector: Parish Council representative: Ward Councillor: Supporter:</p> <p><u>Update</u></p> <p>APPLICATION WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT</p> | | | |

| Item No | Ref No | Address | Recommendation |
|--|--------------|--|----------------|
| 8 | 23/01172/FUL | Land North Of Bridge Bungalow, Lower Road, South Wonston | Refuse |
| <p>Officer Presenting: Catherine Watson</p> <p><u>Public Speaking</u> Objector: None Parish Council representative: None Ward Councillor: None Supporter: Jon Wright, Holly Wright, Graham Cole</p> <p><u>Update</u> No updates</p> | | | |

| Item No | Ref No | Address | Recommendation |
|---------|--------------|--|----------------|
| 9 | 23/01240/FUL | Spencer Place, Sandy Lane, Waltham Chase, SO32 2LR | Permit |

Officer Presenting: Liz Young

Public Speaking

Objector: None

Parish Council representative: Cllr David Ogden and Mr Ian Donohue

Ward Councillor: None

Supporter: Robert Tutton

Update

None

| Item No | Ref No | Address | Recommendation |
|---------|--------------|---|----------------|
| 11 | 23/01594/FUL | Three Maids Hill, Andover Road, Littleton, Winchester | Refuse |

Officer Presenting: Liz Young

Public Speaking

Objector: None

Parish Council representative: None

Ward Councillor: None

Supporter: Steven Bainbridge

Update

Email and attachments received from agent dated 6 December 2023 (sent to Committee Members) summarising the case being made in relation to the 'tilted balance' as set out within the NPPF and listing a number of potential questions to be considered in planning committee.

The attached documents include:

- Lux plan which shows additional lights across the site in comparison with the site layout plan (approximately 10 additional lights around the restaurant building and immediately north of the compound area).
- Lighting Strategy
- A Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment which concludes 14.63% net gain
- Updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Reptile Mitigation Strategy
- A copy of the Sustainability Statement (previously uploaded to website)
- Landscape and Visual Appraisal – Addendum Note
- Conditions in the event of overturn

- Odour Statement

These documents have been reviewed but would not alter or impact upon any of the reasons for refusal within the report.

Further email dated 8 December 2023 sent to Committee Members containing odour assessment. A verbal update will be provided in relation to this at the planning committee meeting.

| Item No | Ref No | Address | Recommendation |
|---|--------------|--|----------------|
| 12 | 23/01481/FUL | Bowland House, West Street, Alresford, Hampshire, SO24 9AT | Permit |
| <p>Officer Presenting: Megan Osborn</p> <p>Public Speaking Objector: Andrew White Parish Council representative: None Ward Councillor: Cllr Margot Power Supporter: James Nuttall</p> <p><u>Update</u> None</p> | | | |

| Item No | Ref No | Address | Recommendation |
|---|--------------|--|----------------|
| 13 | 23/02005/TPO | 38 Mead End Road, Denmead, Waterlooville, Hampshire, PO7 6PZ | Permit |
| <p>Officer Presenting: John Bartlett</p> <p>Public Speaking Objector: Patrick Curran & Karen Curran Parish Council representative: Cllr Kevin Andreoli Ward Councillor: Cllr Paula Langford-Smith Supporter: None</p> <p><u>Update</u> None</p> | | | |

End of Updates