NOTICE OF MEETING

BURSLEDON, HAMBLE-LE-RICE AND HOUND LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE

will meet on
Wednesday, 27 January 2010
beginning at
5:30 pm
in
Hamble Primary School, Hamble Lane, Hamble-le-Rice, SO31 4ND
(This meeting replaces the meeting which was to be held on 7 January but was postponed as the school was closed due to adverse weather conditions- the agenda content remains the same)

TO:
Councillor David Airey (Chair)
Councillor Hugh C Millar MInstTA (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Mrs Tonia Craig
Councillor Malcolm Cross
Councillor Steve Holes
Councillor Ms Susan Ingram B.Ed. Hons
Councillor Luke McNulty

Staff Contacts:
Karin James, Democratic Services Officer Tel: 023 8068 8113;
Email: karin.james@eastleigh.gov.uk

Diccon Bright, Area Co-ordinator Tel:023 8068 8436;
E-diccon.bright@eastleigh.gov.uk

RICHARD WARD
Head of Legal and Democratic Services

Copies of this and all other agendas can be accessed via the Council's website -
http://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/meetings
as well as in other formats, including Braille, audio, large print and other languages, upon request.

Members of the public are invited to speak on general items at the start of the meeting, and on individual agenda items at the time the item is discussed. To register please contact the Democratic Services Officer above.
AGENDA

1. Minutes (Pages 1 - 6)
   To consider the Minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2009.

2. Apologies

3. Declarations of Interest

4. Information from the Chair

5. Information from the Area Co-ordinator

6. Community Investment Programme and Revenue Budget Projects 2009/10 (Pages 7 - 10)

7. Review of Parking in Hamble-le-Rice (Pages 11 - 26)


10. Presentation on Planning Guidelines

11. Planning Application - 113 Station Road, Netley (Pages 41 - 58)
    Erection of 14no. terraced And Semi-Detached Dwellings with associated parking and landscaping, with access off Station Road, following demolition of Public House (Ref: F/09/66309).

12. Planning Appeals
    The Head of Legal and Democratic Services to report that the following appeals have been lodged:-

    1-3 Old Bridge House Road, Bursledon - Appeal against refusal of application for construction of 12no. 2 bed town houses within 3 blocks with alterations to access and associated car parking, cycle parking, and landscaping, following demolition of 3no. dwellings. (Ref: F/09/65376).

    Land Adjacent to Pylands House, Pylands Lane, Bursledon, Southampton, SO31 1BH – Appeal against refusal of application for Construction of 3 bed chalet dwelling with associated driveway. (Ref: F/09/65842)

DATE OF NEXT MEETING
Thursday, 18 February 2010 at 5:30 pm
at Hamble Primary School, Hamble Lane,
Hamble-le-Rice, SO31 4ND
BURSLEDON, HAMBLE-LE-RICE AND HOUND LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE

Thursday, 26 November 2009 (5:30 pm – 8:55 pm)

PRESENT:

Councillor Airey (Chairman); Councillors Craig, Cross, Holes, Ingram, McNulty and Millar

RESOLVED ITEMS (SUBJECT TO QUESTIONS ONLY)

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED -

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2009 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

(NOTE: Members were advised that the physical theatre workshops at Pilands Wood Community Centre referred to in the minutes had been well received by residents)

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were invited to declare interests in relation to items of business on the agenda. Any interests declared are recorded in the relevant minute below.

3. INFORMATION FROM THE CHAIR

The Chair advised the Committee that the bus shelters at Hamble Lane nearest the Satchell Lane junction, regularly used by people going to the surgery, were to be equipped with solar lighting panels. It was expected that the panels will be fitted in mid December. Thanks were expressed to Parish Councillor Mike Parker for putting forward this project.

With regard to Hamble parking a consultation meeting had been arranged for 2 December at 7pm at Hamble Primary School with particular relevance for residents of Hamble House Gardens, Meadow Lane, Bartletts and Farm Close. The aim was to try to get a clear indication from residents regarding parking issues within those roads. Consultation undertaken by the Council to date, had not provided the necessary clarification to enable a recommendation to be made at the January Local Area Committee meeting.
4. INFORMATION FROM THE AREA CO-ORDINATOR

The Area Co-ordinator gave the following information:

Drop in for young people in Netley – work with a key group of young people had begun as part of a project jointly funded by Hound Parish Council and the Local Area Committee. Tankerville Pavilion at Station Road Recreation ground would be open 7pm to 9pm on Monday evenings from November 2009 to February 2010. Hampshire County Council would be providing youth workers to staff the venue.

Improvements at the Hard, Victoria Road, Netley – Hound Parish Council, with funding from the Local Area Committee, had carried out improvements to provide a new seafront wall, railings, seating, a new gully, and new slab, notice board, bin and wooden posts to refurbish five bays of slipway walls, grass excavation around seating and an antislip surface to top the seawall.

Community Safety Action Group – Partner agencies met recently and discussed a number of safety issues in the area including: a review of public community safety meeting on 24 September in Netley; planning for the next public meeting on 21 January at Pilands Wood; partnership working at Kanes Hill/Kinsbourne Rise, engaging young people and parents in alcohol awareness; antisocial behaviour in the Coach Road area of Hamble; Hampshire Fire and Rescue community engagement activity; domestic abuse awareness training for school staff.

5. COMMUNITY INVESTMENT PROGRAMME AND REVENUE BUDGET PROJECTS 2009/10

Consideration was given to a report by the Area Co-ordinator (Agenda Item 6) which detailed a number of projects and schemes brought forward for Members formal approval.

RESOLVED -

(1) That the Committee note that £3705 from Developers Contributions was being used to install solar panels for lighting at two bus shelters in Hamble Lane;

(2) That £1294 from Developers Contributions be used for improvements at Cunningham Gardens open space;

(3) That £8,000 from the Committee’s capital budget be used for new street nameplates;

(4) That £250 from the Committee’s capital budget be used to contribute to a stock of temporary road signs;
(5) That £4,385 from Developers Contributions be used for seating at Butlocks Heath, Castle Recreation Ground and Old Netley Recreation Ground in Hound Parish;

(6) That £7,623 from Developers Contributions be used to provide play facilities at Old Netley Recreation Ground including a new kickwall; and

(7) That £100 from the Committee’s revenue budget be used to support Eastleigh Countryside Volunteers.

(NOTE: Councillors Airey and McNulty declared an interest in this item as parish councillors, but took part in debate and voting thereon.)

6. MINUTES OF MEETING WEDNESDAY, 14 OCTOBER 2009 OF BURSLEDON WINDMILL JOINT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLVED -

That the minutes be NOTED.

7. PRESENTATION ON PLANNING GUIDELINES

Development Control staff gave a short presentation on guidelines that had to be taken into account when determining planning applications; in particular the issues that could, and could not, be taken into account. This was set against the broader policy framework.

8. PLANNING APPLICATION – VICTORIA GARAGE, LOWFORD HILL, BURSLEDON

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Development Control (Agenda Item 9) concerning an application for Construction of a motor cycle sales service and MOT centre building, following the demolition of the existing buildings. (Ref: F09/65813).

The Committee was advised that: amended plans had been received showing improved elevations with brick detailing; one further neighbour comment had been received; and it was confirmed there was no objection from the Head of Regeneration and Planning Policy.

RESOLVED -

That permission be GRANTED subject to the recommended conditions and reasons.

(NOTE: Two members of the public spoke with regard to this application one in support and one in objection).
9. **PLANNING APPLICATION - STATION HOTEL, 113 STATION ROAD, NETLEY ABBEY**

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Development Control (Agenda Item 10) concerning an application for Erection of 14 units and a retail shop (class A1) (gross internal floor space 400 sq m) with offices above (class B1a) (floor space 586 sq m), with associated accesses, parking and landscaping following demolition of existing public house (amended description). (Ref. F/09/65869).

The Committee was advised the report attached to the agenda had been amended to include the following additional condition: "Before development commences, a service vehicle and delivery management plan for the retail element of the development must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development must then accord with the approved service vehicle and delivery management plans thereafter in perpetuity. Reason: To ensure the safe use of the highway and to protect amenity for local residents."

RESOLVED –

That permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The proposed retail unit would have an adverse impact upon the vitality, viability and role of the Station Road and Victoria Road Local Centres in Netley in terms of trade diversion from their existing anchor stores contrary to PPS6 and Policy 134.TC (iii) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011);

2. The design of the proposed office/retail unit, in that it comprises two, three and four storeys, does not take into proper account the context of the site character and appearance of the locality and is inappropriate in terms of its mass and scale both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings contrary to Policy 59.BE (i) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011);


(NOTE (1) Twelve members of the public spoke in objection to the application; (2) One letter of objection was read out by the Chair and was supported by a petition containing 134 signatures; and (3) Two people spoke in support.)
**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Declarations of interest were made as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute Title</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment and Revenue Budget Projects 2009-10 (Paragraphs 5&amp;6)</td>
<td>Cllrs Airey and McNulty</td>
<td>Parish Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment and Revenue Budget Projects 2009-10 (Paragraph 1)</td>
<td>Cllr Airey</td>
<td>Regular bus user</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M4049
RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Committee:

(1) agrees that £415 be funded from developer's contributions for a height barrier at Long Lane recreation ground;

(2) agrees that £7,240 be funded from developer's contributions for a new roundabout and surfacing at Station Road recreation ground;

(3) agrees that £33,640 be funded from the budget for the Bursledon Windmill operating costs for 2010/11;

(4) agrees that £2,950 be funded from developers contributions for new surfacing at two play areas at Pilands Wood and;

(5) agrees that £500 be funded from the Committee’s revenue budget to contribute to the Hamble Valley Visitors' Guide.

Summary

This report details a number of projects and schemes where the Area Committee’s support is sought to enable their implementation.

Statutory Powers

Section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000 i.e. promotion or improvement of the economic, social or environmental well-being of the area.

Height Barrier at Long Lane Recreation Ground, Bursledon

1. Bursledon Parish Council has requested funding to install a height barrier at Long Lane Recreation Ground. The Parish Council in the past has experienced fly tipping in this area and although the gates are currently locked each evening, Bursledon Parish Council is looking to reduce their costs and...
leave this gate open, but cannot do so until they can be sure no large vehicles can come in and fly tip. The cost of the barrier is £415 which could be met from the following developer’s contribution:

OS F/06/58429 Mr Rees and Miss Fletcher Re: White Lodge, Bridge Road, Bursledon 4,723.16 (part)

**Hound Parish Council new roundabout at Station Road recreation ground**

2. Hound Parish Council seeks to improve facilities at Station Road Recreation Ground by providing a roundabout in the infant and junior play area which with a 1.2m diameter roundabout would be suitable for many users. The proposal includes a speed restrictor for safety and wetpour surfacing, compliant with latest RoSPA requirements. This measure will improve facilities for small children and those looking after them. The total cost of the roundabout equipment, wetpour surfacing, plus installation is quoted at £7240 which could be met from the following developer’s contributions:

OS F/06/56593 Atlantic Housing Association Re: Garage Court, Rear of 13-16 The Crescent, Netley Abbey £4,086

OS F/07/60176 Mr & Mrs Insch Re: Oakcroft, Gashouse Hill, Netley Abbey £2,267 (part)

OS F/07/60908 Wickborne Homes and Developments, 11 St Marys Road, Netley Abbey £286

OS F/07/61697 221 Limited, Cornerwise, Kelvin Grove, Netley £600

**Bursledon Windmill annual revenue budget 2010/11**

3. For 2009/10 the Windmill’s revenue budget was supported by contributions as follows:

- Hampshire County Council £34,100 (50%)
- Local Area Committee £31,238 (46%)
- Bursledon Parish Council £2,862 (4%)
- TOTAL £68,200 (100%)

4. The 2010/11 budget is set at £66,800, to which the Local Area Committee is being asked for £33,400 (50%). Bursledon Parish Council has been asked for a similar 4% contribution (£2,672), which would reduce the Local Area Committee contribution to £30,728.

5. Eastleigh Borough Council Countryside are no longer able to fund a lease agreed with the previous landowner to allow public access to the adjacent woodland, which enhances the offer to Windmill visitors as well as providing a valuable facility to local walkers. The lease is currently worth £100 per year, plus an estimated £140 maintenance costs for regular inspections, which
could be carried out by Countryside staff. The Windmill Joint Management Committee has asked Local Area Committee to fund this lease as local residents as well as Windmill visitors benefit from the use of the woodland. The total annual cost would be £240. The Committee is therefore asked to agree a total of £33,640. (The budget for 2010/11 will be £31,800 so £1,840 would come from the Committees ordinary revenue budget.)

**Pilands Wood play area surfacing**

6. Both the Woodlands Way play area for younger children, and the play area next to the skate park near Foundry Crescent, are in need of new wetpour surfacing around the edges of the play area. The need for new edging was highlighted as a moderate risk during a recent safety inspection. Both these areas are being transferred to Bursledon Parish Council and should undergo these improvements prior to formal transfer of ownership. The costs are quoted at £2950 which could be met from part of the following developer’s contribution:

OS  F/07/59297 Orchard Homes, Land adj Byways, Sunnyfield Rise, Bursledon £8,117.48 (part)

**Walking Distance – Hamble Valley Visitor Guide**

7. Walking Distance promotes tourism in the Hamble peninsula area. The 2010 edition of the Hamble Valley Visitors Guide will be a useful reference magazine appealing to visitors and local residents to encourage more local days out and providing healthy lifestyle information along with how to be more eco-friendly when on a day out. The 25,000 copies of the 2010 edition will be circulated locally and nationally, inviting local people and visitors to enjoy days out in the area and supporting our tourist economy. The Local Area Committee agreed £450 for the 2009 edition and is recommended to agree £500 from its revenue budget.

**Financial Implications**

8. There are no financial implications apart from the commitments set out for each project. The Committee’s revenue fund currently stands at approximately £22,300. If all the proposals in this report for revenue funding were to be agreed this would reduce the balance by about £2,340 to £19,960. In addition there will be an ongoing revenue commitment of around £240 per year for the lease and inspection of the woodland at Bursledon Windmill (see paragraph 5 above).

**Risk Assessment**

9. There are no identifiable risks attached to these proposals which should be brought to the attention of the Area Committee and Council.
Equality and Diversity Implications

10. An equal opportunities assessment has not been carried out because neither policy nor service delivery are affected by this report. Equalities implications have been described for each proposal above where relevant.

Crime and Disorder Implications

11. The proposals have been considered for the effect they may have on crime and disorder, antisocial behaviour and substance misuse. None of the proposals is considered to have a negative impact on crime and disorder. Crime and disorder implications have been described for each proposal above where relevant.

Conclusion

12. These recommendations for support are now submitted for Members’ approval from the Area Committee’s Revenue Budget 2009/10 or from developer’s contributions. As further schemes are worked up, they will be brought before the Area Committee over the course of the coming months.

DICCON BRIGHT
Area Co-ordinator

Date: 14 December 2009
Contact Officer: D Bright
Tel No: 023 8068 8436
e-mail: diccon.bright@eastleigh.gov.uk
Appendices Attached: 0
*Report No AC694DB

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - SECTION 100D

The following documents disclose facts or matters on which this report or an important part of it is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report:

None
BURSLEDON, HAMBLE-LE-RICE & HOUND
LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE
Thursday 7 January 2010
REVIEW OF PARKING IN HAMBLE-LE-RICE
Report of the Head of Transportation & Engineering

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

(1) The charging hours in the Square car park are reduced from 8am – 8pm to 8am - 6pm. The Committee to fund the cost of amending the Traffic Regulation Orders and associated signage, estimated to be £4,000, from its reserve budget.

(2) Up to two vehicle registrations be allowed on each business parking permit.

(3) The Traffic Regulation Order for a residents’ parking scheme in Hamble House Gardens, Meadow Lane, The Bartletts and Farm Close, as shown in Drawing No. E/TM/01/M/22/035, should be implemented, with operating hours of 8am - 8pm. The Committee to fund the estimated cost of £4,500 from its reserve budget.

(4) If the Committee resolves to proceed with Recommendation 3, the process to amend the Traffic Regulation Order to provide an additional permit bay and ‘no waiting’ restrictions in Hamble House Gardens as shown in Drawing No. E/TM/01/M/22/036, together with designating this area as a separate permit zone, should commence. The cost to be funded from the Committee's devolved Traffic Management budget and the Agency Traffic Management budget.

(5) The environmental study into the area of land referred to as Site B (shown in Drawing No. E/TM/01/M/22/037) should not be undertaken.

(6) The current Experimental Traffic Regulation Order which provided ‘no waiting at any time’ restrictions in Meadow Lane, Farm Close, Satchell Lane and Copse Lane should be made permanent, funded from the Agency Traffic Management budget.
Summary

The use of on and off-street parking in Hamble-le-Rice was monitored during summer 2009 to determine whether a new long stay car park can be justified and therefore whether a study into a potential site should be undertaken. This report also examines the need for a residents’ parking scheme in the Meadow Lane area.

Statutory Powers


Introduction

1. A number of new on and off-street parking controls were introduced in Hamble-le-Rice in autumn 2008. At the Committee’s meeting on 3 July 2008 it was resolved that an environmental study into an area of land which could be a potential site for a new long stay car park should be undertaken, subject to the monitoring of parking in the village.

2. During summer 2009 parking in the centre of Hamble-le-Rice was monitored. The purpose of this was to identify the level of demand for on and off-street parking space to help establish whether the provision of a new long stay car park can be justified. This review also considers whether any of the existing parking controls should be changed. Residents in the Hamble House Gardens and Meadow Lane area were consulted on whether the residents’ parking scheme, which had been put on hold following approval by the Committee on 3 July 2008, should now be implemented.

Parking in the Meadow Lane area

3. All properties in Hamble House Gardens, Meadow Lane, The Bartletts, Farm Close and those in Satchell Lane which have rear access into Farm Close, were sent a questionnaire in August 2009 to ask residents if they would now like a residents’ parking scheme to be introduced. Although the Committee resolved to introduce the scheme in these roads in July 2008, it was put on hold since it was considered that there was not enough support amongst residents. Following the introduction of charges in the Square car park the Council subsequently received a number of requests for the scheme to now be put in place.

4. The proposal which residents were consulted on is shown in Drawing No. E/TM/01/M/22/035. This includes new yellow line restrictions in Hamble
House Gardens as well as a permit parking bay for two cars. Meadow Lane and the culs-de-sac leading from it would become a Permit Parking Area between 8am and 8pm, where vehicles could park anywhere as long as they display a valid permit and do not park on any yellow line restrictions. Two permits per property would be available at a cost of £50 each per annum, plus 75 days of free visitor permits, increasing by 25 days of visitor permits for each additional adult if more than one person lives at an address.

5. 54 replies to the survey were received, which represents a 56% response rate. There were 26 responses in favour of the scheme and 26 against. Two did not state a preference. A break-down of the responses from each road is listed in Appendix 1.

6. The two most frequent comments made by those in favour of the scheme included reference to refuse vehicles having difficulties getting through Hamble House Gardens (eight comments) but also concern about having to pay what some considered to be a high price for permits (three comments).

7. The most frequent comments from those against the scheme included observations that the Square car park is now regularly under-used (seven comments); that a new long stay car park should be provided (five comments); opposition towards the level of charges for permits (four comments); the proposed staggered layout of parking bays in Hamble House Gardens wastes parking space (four comments).

8. Since the results from the consultation were not conclusive a residents meeting was held in December 2009, to which all residents who had been consulted were invited. The purpose of the meeting was to gain a better understanding of residents’ concerns and to seek their views on what should be done. A list of the various comments that were made at that meeting and in other correspondence to the Council are shown in Appendix 2, together with a response to each comment.

9. 44 people attended the meeting, including some members of the Borough Council and Hamble-le-Rice-le-Rice Parish Council. There was clear concern amongst residents about the volume of non-residential parking in their roads and that this not only caused many of them difficulties in finding somewhere to park but also had led to incidents where Council refuse vehicles and also an emergency ambulance had trouble getting through. Many residents were unhappy about having to pay for parking permits to try and resolve a problem that they believe has been caused by the Council when it introduced charges in the Square car park.

10. There was little support for introducing ‘no waiting’ (yellow line) parking restrictions without a permit scheme in order to remove the obstructive parking. It appeared that many of those who attended the meeting thought that the best way of dealing with the parking in the Meadow Lane area would be to remove charging from the Square as it was considered to be under-used during the working week since charges had been introduced. It was thought that many of the non-residential vehicles parked in the Meadow Lane area
belong to people who work in businesses within the village who used to park in the Square.

11. At the end of the meeting residents were asked to raise their hands if they were in support of some type of permit scheme. Approximately two-thirds of those attending were in support, with the remainder against. A petition was also handed in with signatures from six households in Hamble House Gardens and 24 in Meadow Lane, asking for a permit scheme to be introduced and a request that these two roads should be considered in isolation of Farm Close and the Bartletts. The same signatories were also opposed to double yellow lines along Hamble House Gardens as an alternative to a permit scheme.

Other on-street parking controls

12. Earlier in 2009, 'no waiting at any time’ restrictions were introduced on an experimental basis in Copse Lane at its junction with High Street, in Satchell Lane where the road narrows near property no. 38, in Meadow Lane at its junction with Farm Close, and along the entire length of Farm Close. They were provided in response to complaints about parked vehicles obstructing the passage of traffic. No objections to these restrictions were received.

13. The level of usage of the on-street marked parking bays in Satchell Lane, Copse Lane and Spitfire Way was monitored during the summer. On the whole, there was ample capacity on the streets to meet demand. There were no dates surveyed when all on-street parking spaces in the village were occupied.

Use of car parks

14. The use of the public car parks was monitored over the summer. The average occupancy of the Square and Foreshore car parks from survey visits are shown in Tables 1 and 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Weekday Average Occupancy (% full)</th>
<th>Weekend Average Occupancy (% full)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: summary of occupancy surveys in the Square car park
Table 2: summary of occupancy surveys in the Foreshore car park

15. These surveys are based on 118 visits to the Square car park and 112 visits to the Foreshore car park (which is owned by Hamble-le-Rice Parish Council but enforced by Eastleigh Borough Council on its behalf).

16. These figures suggest that both car parks are under-used between Monday and Friday, especially the Foreshore. The weekends have higher usage, as would be expected. It is important to note, however, the figures presented in the tables above represent average occupancies from surveys conducted at various times of the day that the car parks operate, including mornings, afternoons and early evenings. The weather can also have a major impact on how busy the car parks are. There were a number of weekend survey visits when the car parks were full.

17. If the occupancy of the car parks is looked at between solely between the busiest hours of 11.30am and 4.30pm on Saturdays then the surveys produce the results shown in Table 3. This shows that whilst the car parks had a much higher level of occupancy during the afternoon, on most occasions when the surveys took place there were still some spaces available.

Table 3: summary of occupancy surveys undertaken between 11.30am and 4.30pm on Saturdays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Square Average Occupancy from 11.30am - 4.30pm (% full)</th>
<th>Foreshore Average Occupancy from 11.30am - 4.30pm (% full)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. The Parish Council’s Roy Underdown Pavilion car park, which is located at the end of Spitfire Way and has 36 spaces, had been locked except when there were events taking place in the pavilion or on the playing fields. It was locked due to previous problems of abandoned vehicles being left.

19. Although the car park is not in the centre of the village, the spaces are still a resource that can be called upon if other parking spaces are full. The Parish Council has therefore resolved that the car park will be left open for general use. The Borough Council will erect new signage to the car park from High Street and will provide new pedestrian signage from the car park to the centre of the village if they are deemed to be necessary.

Discussion

(i) Meadow Lane area and The Square car park

20. In respect of the Meadow Lane area, although removing charges and controls from the Square car park would be likely to ease the parking problems, it would create other problems that these controls were intended to resolve. Before the controls were in place it was common for the car park to be occupied by vehicles parking all day or even longer. This caused difficulties for the residents of approximately 30 properties in the village who have no off-street parking and rely on the car park as their only parking place. It also meant the Square was often unavailable for visitors who only wanted to park for a few hours.

21. The controls in the Square could be amended to try and encourage greater use during the week whilst still ensuring it remains available for visitors. At the moment 22 businesses in the village are entitled to up to two permits for parking all day in the Square at a cost of £100 each per annum. 11 business permits are presently in use. These permits are only valid in a single vehicle, but it is possible to enable two vehicle registrations to be added to the permit. Whilst it could only be used in one vehicle at a time, if two employees work different days only one permit would be required.

22. The operating and charging hours of the Square car park could also be reduced from 8pm to 6pm to help encourage evening visitors to the village to use the car park rather than park in residential roads. This would result in a reduction in income, but it is expected that this would be recovered through greater usage of the car park. Reducing the charging hours could have an impact on those residents who have no off-street parking, therefore, this would need to be monitored.

23. The Parish Council may also wish to consider asking the Borough Council to amend the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for its Foreshore car park so that its charges also end at 6pm.

24. Although the views of those attending November’s meeting with residents of the Meadow Lane area was not necessarily representative of all residents, the comments received from this and other correspondence from residents makes it clear they would like something to be done to improve the parking situation.
but that yellow line restrictions alone are not popular. It is therefore recommended that the residents’ parking scheme and other parking restrictions that residents were consulted on in August 2009 (as shown in Drawing No. E/TM/01/M/22/035) are implemented.

25. There have been some comments from residents that this proposal does not provide enough permit parking spaces in Hamble House Gardens. There have also been calls for the permit scheme in the Meadow Lane area to be separate to the one that currently operates in the Square (which includes one of the parking bays in Satchell Lane). These changes could be made, but the TRO would need to be re-advertised in order to do this. The legal process for doing so would take at least six months and quite possibly much longer if new objections were received, which would be likely. The current proposal, on the other hand, is ready to implement and could be in place by the summer season in 2010. The current proposal could not be implemented any later than this because there is a two year limit on the time between when a TRO is first advertised and when it is implemented, which means the proposal would effectively expire.

26. At the same time that the current proposal is implemented, the legal process could begin to enable an additional permit parking bay to be provided in Hamble House Gardens and for access to the garages in the road to be improved, as shown in Drawing No. E/TM/01/M/22/036. Although ‘no waiting’ restrictions can be implemented on an experimental basis, which means they can be introduced much more quickly than a permanent TRO, permit parking cannot be introduced in this way.

(ii) Other on-street parking controls

27. It is recommended that the current TRO for experimental ‘no waiting at any time’ restrictions in Farm Close, Meadow Lane, Copse Lane and Satchell Lane are implemented permanently.

(iii) Assessment of the need for a new car park

28. The monitoring of parking over the summer suggests that the construction of a new car park is not justified because the existing public car parks were not at capacity for the majority of the time and there were also many places to park on the streets.

29. It is acknowledged there are currently no car parks in the centre of the village that cater for sailors who need to park for more than twelve hours. Extensive work has been carried out to find sites that could accommodate a car park but the only suitable land within a reasonable distance of the foreshore is the area referred to as ‘Site B’ in Drawing No. E/TM/01/M/22/037. As previous reports to this Committee have highlighted, there are legal and environmental issues that would need to be overcome before this land could be used for parking. Even if a new car park could be located here, the Council would probably have to charge for parking in order to recover the cost of providing it. Since the surrounding streets are available for free parking, and the surveys have shown that they were not frequently occupied during the summer, it is likely
that people would park here rather than pay to park in a new car park. The Roy Underdown Pavilion car park will now be available for use too. In view of this it is not recommended that any further investigations into a car park site should be undertaken.

Financial Implications

30. If the charging hours in the Square car park are reduced from 6pm to 8pm it would result in a reduction in the projected annual income of £5,000. However, the introduction of a permit scheme in the Meadow Lane area is expected to encourage more people to use the car park, which would recover this loss.

31. The car park TRO would need to be changed to enable the charging hours to be reduced. The cost of changing this TRO and the associated signage is approximately £4,000. This would need to be funded by the Committee from its reserve budget.

32. It will cost approximately £4,500 to introduce a permit scheme in the Meadow Lane area. This includes the cost of traffic signs, staff time, a TRO advert, printing permits and literature. This would need to be funded by the Committee from its reserve budget. The total additional funding required from the Committee’s reserve budget for the recommendations is therefore £8,500.

33. If the permit scheme is implemented and an amendment is required, such as splitting the Meadow Lane area into a separate zone from the existing permit scheme in the village, then the TRO will need to be amended. The estimated £1,500 cost of TRO adverts and traffic signs/road markings would be funded from the 2010/11 Traffic Management Agency budget and the staff time could be funded from the Committee’s 2010/11 devolved Traffic Management budget.

34. The environmental study on the potential car park site, which was estimated to cost approximately £7,500, was to be funded by the Community Investment Programme, as approved by Cabinet on 10 July 2008.

Risk Assessment

35. The main risk in relation to this report is associated with large vehicles being unable to access properties in Meadow Lane due to the manner in which some vehicles park. If the current situation is left unchanged there is the possibility that large vehicles will continue have trouble getting through. This is of particular concern if an emergency vehicle needs to get to a property.

Equality and Diversity Implications

36. An equal opportunities assessment has not been carried out because the report does not contain proposals for significant changes to existing services, polices or strategies and does not introduce any new services, policies or strategies.
Conclusion

37. The review of parking in the village has identified that action is sought to improve parking for residents in the Meadow Lane area. The main car parks in the village are well-used at weekends but the on-street parking spaces are not and it is recommended that appropriate and better use of existing parking is encouraged before further consideration of a new car park.

DUNCAN MCVEY
Head of Transportation & Engineering

Date: 21 December 2009
Contact Officer: Paul Garrod
Tel No: 023 8068 8232
e-mail: paul.garrod@eastleigh.gov.uk
Appendices Attached: 2 No. and 3 No. plans
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - SECTION 100D

The following documents disclose facts or matters on which this report or an important part of it is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report:

Minutes from the Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice-le-Rice and Hound Local Area Committee, 3 July 2008.
Responses to survey asking residents if they are in favour of introducing a residents’ permit parking scheme and other parking controls (August 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>No. residents replying in favour of permit scheme</th>
<th>No. of residents replying against permit scheme</th>
<th>No. of residents replying without stating a preference.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamble House Gardens</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow Lane</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Row</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admiralty Row</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bartletts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Close</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satchell Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of comments made regarding parking in the Meadow Lane area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why do residents have to pay for parking permits? In Eastleigh residents are not charged for first permits.</td>
<td>The charge is needed to contribute towards the cost of enforcing and administering the scheme. Similar charging rules would be made for any other new residents parking scheme that are introduced elsewhere in the borough in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why can’t business permits be transferable between vehicles?</td>
<td>Transferable permits are not recommended because of problems caused if the permit slips off the vehicle’s dashboard. If a penalty was issued in such a situation under current arrangements it would be cancelled by the Council if it could later be shown by the owner that the vehicle had a valid permit with its registration number on. Problems also arise with transferable permits in that they could be passed to non-business vehicles and used by people who would not be entitled to a permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action needs to be taken immediately to ensure that emergency vehicles can get through Hamble House Gardens and Meadow Lane.</td>
<td>If a residents’ parking scheme is not introduced it will be necessary to provide some double yellow line restrictions in order to prevent obstructive parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since there was a 50/50 split in support for the residents' parking scheme, why can’t a permit scheme be provided near those properties that wanted it?</td>
<td>Although the permit scheme could be limited to those roads (or parts of roads) where there was greatest support, those roads left out would then be more vulnerable to parking problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the charges and restrictions in the Square car park (which is now under-used) are removed the parking in the Meadow Lane area will improve and there won’t be a need for new parking restrictions or a permit scheme.</td>
<td>The restrictions were introduced in the Square in order to free up space for visitors and to help residents in the village who do not have any off-street parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Meadow Lane area should be a separate permit zone from the rest of the village as there’s no need for businesses to park there.</td>
<td>The current proposal would see the Meadow Lane area become part of the same permit scheme that currently operates in the Square and part of Satchell Lane. The Meadow Lane proposal could, if necessary, be amended to become a separate zone of its own (subject to the outcome of the legal process for changing a Traffic Regulation Order).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of new parking restrictions in the Meadow Lane area will only transfer the parking problem elsewhere.</td>
<td>Restrictions in Meadow Lane are expected to encourage greater use of the Square car park. Parking in the village will be monitored to see if displacement parking occurs and causes problems elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Council needs to improve the signing so that better use is made of the marked parking bays in Spitfire Way and Hamble House Gardens.</td>
<td>There are strict regulations covered by legislation which specify what type of traffic signs can be provided. Unfortunately, direction signs can only be provided for car parks and not on-street parking spaces. A new direction sign will be provided from Hamble Lane to the Roy Underdown Pavilion car park in Spitfire Way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

(1) The Traffic Regulation Order in Woolston Road is progressed as advertised.

(2) The remaining items within the legal order are implemented as proposed as illustrated on plans E-TM-01-M-27-01, 2, 3, 4a, 5a, and 6.

Summary

This report details the objection that was received following the public consultation period of a proposed Traffic Regulation Order to introduce waiting restrictions throughout Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound and recommends how to proceed with the proposals.

Statutory Powers

Section 1 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and Section 101 Local Government Act 1972.

Introduction

1. A request was received from the Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Local Area Committee to progress a review of the waiting restrictions required in various roads in Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound, within the 2009/2010 Traffic Priorities programme.

2. The proposals were:

   1. ‘No Waiting At Any Time’ at the junction of Pound Road, Hamble lane (E-TM-01-M-27-001).

   2. ‘No Waiting At Any Time’ at the junction of Woolston Road, Hound Road (E-TM-01-M-27-002).

4. ‘No Waiting At Any Time’ Pylands Lane (E-TM-01-M-27-004a).

5. ‘Loading Only Bay’ 7am – 12pm Lands End Road (E-TM-01-M-27-005a).

6. ‘No Waiting At Any Time’ at the junction of Grange Road, Victoria Road (E-TM-01-M-27-006).

3. During the consultation period 1 objection was received relating to the proposed restrictions at the junction of Woolston Road and Hound Road.

4. This Committee needs to address the objector’s comments before making a decision on the implementation, or otherwise, of the Traffic Regulation Order.

**Detail of Objector’s Comments**

5. The issues within the objections are detailed below:

6. The objector raised 3 issues concerning the proposed restrictions in Woolston Road.

7. **Objection:** Cars that park regularly at the entrance to Woolston Road will be forced further up the road, this will add to existing on road parking which will cause a regular line of parked cars stretching up Woolston Road.

8. **Response:** The intention of these restrictions is to allow safe egress/ingress of buses and larger vehicles, inevitably displaced vehicles will have to park elsewhere which may change parking habits with some properties having to utilise their off road parking, if restrictions are implemented the area will be monitored to assess the impact of the restriction.

9. **Objection:** Cars of homeowners already have to occasionally negotiate closely parked cars opposite their private drives with annoying multi-turn manoeuvres while school children, fast moving cars and busses move around them. The proposed restrictions will increase this issue.

10. **Response:** Vehicles may not be able to park as closely as they currently do to properties. Although the area has a high amount of school children movement, this is not an all day problem and is limited to start and end of school day. Parking behaviour would have to change in the road with some home owners having to use their available off road parking.

11. **Objection:** At present the vehicles that park near the junction act as natural traffic calming slowing buses and vehicles as they negotiate the parked cars. The restrictions will only aide buses and cars in speeding up the hill and will push accidents further up the road which currently occur at the bottom of Woolston Road.

12. **Response:** The purpose of this restriction is to remove the vehicles that park closely to the junction that cause a hazard for buses turning into Woolston Road forcing them to face oncoming traffic. There are approximately 83 bus
movements on a daily basis at this junction. The restrictions are a relatively short distance which is unlikely to encourage greater speeds. The buses will be able to safely pull in rather than having to enter and swing onto the wrong side of the carriageway.

**Financial Implications**

13. The Traffic Regulation Order and works are to be funded through the Hampshire County Council Agency budget. There are no implications for the Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Local Area Committee.

**Risk Assessment**

14. If the restrictions are not progressed buses and larger vehicles will still encounter issues when entering Woolston Road.

**Equality and Diversity Implications**

15. An equal opportunities assessment has not been carried out because the report does not contain proposals for significant changes to existing services, polices or strategies and does not introduce any new services, policies or strategies.

**Conclusion**

16. The proposed Traffic Regulation Order in various roads has received only one objection to the proposed waiting restrictions in Woolston Road.

17. The Committee needs to decide whether to proceed with the complete Traffic Regulation Order as proposed or to remove proposed restrictions in Woolston Road.

18. The view of the Head of Transportation and Engineering is that the Traffic Regulation Order should be progressed in full as advertised in order to aid the safer movement of buses and larger vehicles entering Woolston Road. As with all implemented restrictions the area, will be monitored to assess its impact.

**DUNCAN MCVEY**  
Head of Transportation and Engineering

Date: 17 December 2009  
Contact Officer: Joe Folland  
Tel No: 023 8068 8849  
E-mail: joe.folland@eastleigh.gov.uk  
Appendices Attached: 6 No. Plans  
Report No: EN1125
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The following documents disclose facts or matters on which this report or an important part of it is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report:
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RECOMMENDATIONS

That:

(1) Bursledon, Hamble-Le-Rice and Hound Local Area Committee recommend that Cabinet:

   i. Approves the Article 4(2) Direction served on the properties identified in the Netley Abbey Conservation Area Appraisal for confirmation;

   ii. Approves the Netley Abbey Conservation Area Appraisal SPD for adoption by the Council (link).

(2) Cabinet supports the above recommendations, subject to any amendments suggested by the Bursledon, Hamble-Le-Rice and Hound Local Area Committee.

Summary

Following a positive response to the consultation on the draft Netley Abbey Conservation Area Appraisal and the subsequent service of the article 4(2) direction, it is recommended that the article 4(2) direction is confirmed and the Netley Abbey Conservation Area Appraisal be formally adopted.

Statutory Powers

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Section 69;

Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (As amended).
Introduction

1. A draft appraisal of the Netley Abbey Conservation Area was approved for consultation at Cabinet on 5 February 2009 and the meeting of the Bursledon, Hamble-Le-Rice, Hound Local Area Committee on 19 February 2009.

2. Following this consultation period, a report was submitted to the meeting of the BHH Local Area Committee on 2 July 2009 and Cabinet on 9 July 2009, where approval was given for the service of the suggested article 4(2) direction. The report set out the steps required to adopt and implement the proposals in the draft document.

3. The adoption of the Netley Abbey Conservation Area Appraisal SPD was postponed until the completion of the statutory consultation period following the service of the article 4(2) direction. This report sets out the representations received in response to that consultation and the subsequent changes made to the draft SPD and article 4(2) direction.

Article 4(2) Consultation

4. A number of properties were identified in the draft SPD as having architectural features worthy of conservation, which can be best protected by using article 4(2) direction under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) 1995 (As amended). These remove permitted development rights thereby requiring householders to seek planning permission for certain changes as set out in the Netley Abbey Conservation Area Appraisal (see Appendix C of the final document). The use of article 4(2) direction therefore allows the Council to exercise greater control over changes to features of these particular buildings.

5. The statutory article 4(2) consultation took place between 22 October 2009 and 23 November 2009 with notice of the article 4(2) direction being formally served on the owners and occupiers of properties affected and a notice placed in the local press. 1 response was received, that was supportive of the direction. This reflects the feedback received during the consultation on the draft Netley Abbey Conservation Area Appraisal, which was reported at the meeting of the Bursledon, Hamble-Le-Rice, Hound Local Area Committee on 2 July 2009 and Cabinet on 9 July 2009, from which a total of 14 responses to the document have been received, all supportive or offering no objection to the proposals in relation to the principle of introducing Article 4(2) direction and the appraisal of the architectural and historic interest of the conservation area.

6. As a result of the consultation, no changes are proposed to the article 4(2) direction that has been served.

Adoption of the Netley Abbey Conservation Area Appraisal SPD

7. The adoption of the SPD will provide the Council with greater control over changes to particular built features of architectural historic interest in the
Conservation Area and provide additional guidance supplementary to the South East Plan, and the Council’s Local Development Framework. The SPD will be a tool to be used by residents and developers when considering development within the conservation area. The Borough Council, as the local planning authority, will use it, together with the article 4(2) direction, to inform planning decisions and future development.

8. As discussed above, a positive response has been received in relation to the appraisal of the conservation area and the SPD produced. As a result of the consultations, aside from a number of minor editorial changes, the content of the SPD is unchanged.

**Financial Implications**

9. Any administrative and printing costs associated with the process will be covered by budgets held by the Head of Regeneration and Planning Policy.

10. Part Two of the appraisal consists of a management strategy which sets out proposals to enhance and improve, where appropriate, the area designated as a conservation area. There may be cost implications with a number of the proposals, however the Council is not committed to providing funding for these and funding would need to be sought prior to the proposals being implemented which would be the subject of separate reports.

11. There is no planning application fee payable for applications made necessary because of the Article 4(2) Direction.

12. There is a statutory requirement to give notice of the confirmation of the Article 4(2) Direction by local advertisement and by serving notice on the owners/occupiers of every dwelling/house to which the Article 4(2) Direction relates. If the Article 4(2) Direction is confirmed a press notice of confirmation will be advertised in the Daily Echo. It is considered that the newspaper advertisement would cost in the order of £1000 and that this will be covered by budgets held by the Head of Regeneration and Planning Policy.

**Legal Implications**

13. The Article 4(2) Direction came into force on the date the notice was served on the relevant owners/occupiers (22 October 2009). From 22 October 2009 the owners/occupiers of the dwelling/houses affected by the Article 4(2) Direction must submit a planning application in respect of works in the second schedule of the Article 4(2) Direction which relate to their property. If the Article 4(2) Direction is confirmed then this will continue to be the case.

**Risk Assessment**

14. An Article 4 direction removes some permitted development rights in order to preserve historical architectural details. Without these controls it is highly likely that the details will be lost, degrading the historical and architectural assets in the area. There is a slight possibility of someone trying to claim against this
loss of freedom, although it only applies to a limited range of built features which are unlikely to result in any justified claim.

Equality and Diversity Implications

15. The consultation carried out has included all those who are likely to be affected by the proposals in the document together with all relevant community groups likely to have an interest in the Netley Conservation Area.

Conclusion

16. The Netley Abbey Conservation Area Appraisal seeks to offer an assessment and understanding of the special interest, character and appearance of the existing conservation area. A number of proposals have been put forward to assist in the implementation of local plan policies and in development control decision making, to preserve and enhance the designated area for existing and future generations.

17. These proposals include the confirmation of an article 4(2) direction that will provide the Council with greater control over architectural details on certain properties. Support for these proposals has been received from local residents and interested parties following comprehensive consultation.

PAUL RAMSHAW
Head of Regeneration and Planning Policy

Date: 2 December 2009
Contact Officer: Tim JS Dyer
Tel No: 023 8068 8247
E-mail: timjsdyer@eastleigh.gov.uk
Appendices Attached: Nil
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - SECTION 100D

The following documents disclose facts or matters on which this report or an important part of it is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report:

- Background Papers:
  Planning Policy Guidance Note 15: Planning and the Historic Environment.
  Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.
  English Heritage Guidance on Conservation Area Appraisals
  English Heritage Guidance on the Management of Conservation Areas
APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR DECISION

BURSLEDON, HAMBLE-LE-RICE & HOUND    Thursday 07 January 2010
Case Officer Louise Cutts

SITE:        Station Hotel, 113 Station Road, Netley Abbey, 
              Southampton, SO31 5AL

Ref. F/09/66309    Received: 02/12/2009   (03/03/2010)

APPLICANT:     Primetower Properties Ltd

PROPOSAL:     Erection of 14no. terraced and semi-detached 
              dwellings with associated parking and landscaping, 
              with access off Station Road, following demolition of 
              public house.

AMENDMENTS:   18/12/09

RECOMMENDATION:

Subject to a legal agreement for the provision of 14 units of affordable 
housing;

PERMIT

CONDITIONS AND REASONS:

(1) The development hereby permitted must be begun within a period of 
three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted. 
Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning 
Act 1990.

(2) Plans and particulars showing the proposals for all the following aspects 
of the development must be submitted to and approved in writing by the 
Local Planning Authority before the development is commenced. The 
development must then accord with these approved details. Reason: In 
order that these matters may be considered by the Local Planning 
Authority.

   a: The colour and texture of facing materials, roofing detail and materials, 
   fenestration, plinth, coping, rainwater goods, meter boxes and vents 
   and all landscaping materials.
b: The drainage of the site

c: The provision to be made for street lighting and/or external lighting.

(3) No development shall take place until the applicant has carried out an adequate assessment of the risks, to or arising from, the proposed development, and a report of this assessment, including recommendations for protection of the development, has been received and approved in writing by the LPA. [British Standard BS10175:2001 ‘Investigation of potentially contaminated sites-Code of Practice’ is a useful source of advice on site investigation] Any recommendations for protection of the development, the remediation scheme, must be supervised by a competent person and a completion certificate provided by that person to the LPA to certify that the works have been implemented in accordance with that scheme. Reason: To minimise the risks of pollution and to ensure the site is satisfactorily decontaminated.

(4) Developments shall not begin until a scheme of works to deal with dust from site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed scheme shall then be implemented and retained to the satisfaction of the local Planning Authority. Reason: To protect the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining properties.

(5) Details of Contractor's site hut location and any areas designated for the storage of building materials must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The development must then accord with these approved details. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 site huts and building materials must not be stored elsewhere on the site without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority. Reason: To ensure that natural features are not damaged.

(6) Details of external security lighting, lockable gates and all other crime prevention proposals must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The development must then accord with these approved details. Reason: In the interests of crime prevention.

(7) The existing former public house building must be demolished and all resultant materials removed from the site before development pursuant to this permission is commenced. Reason: To protect the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties.

(8) Due to the possibility of a small number of slow-worms being present on the site, reptile-proof fencing should be erected prior to any clearance works to prevent reptiles migrating on to the site from the adjacent railway corridor. Any slow-worms encountered on the development site should be removed and placed beyond the fence along the railway corridor. This
should take place in May and take the form of a destructive search and be conducted by an ecologist. Reason: To prevent harm to reptiles

(9) No burning of materials obtained by site clearance or from any other source to take place on this site during the construction and fitting out process without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In the interests of amenity.

(10) No construction or demolition work must take place except between the hours 0800 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays or 0900 to 1300 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Reason: To protect the amenities of the occupiers of nearby dwellings.

(11) No clearance of vegetation shall occur on the site during the bird-nesting season (between 1st March and 31st August inclusive in any given year), unless supervised by an appropriately qualified ecologist. Reason: To prevent harm to breeding birds.

(12) The screen walls and/or fences shown on the approved drawings must be constructed before the adjacent development is occupied and must be subsequently retained. Details of the materials and design to be used must be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. Reason: To enhance the appearance of the development and/or to provide privacy.

(13) Details of the type of construction proposed for the roads and footways including all relevant horizontal cross sections and longitudinal sections showing the existing and proposed levels together with details of street lighting and the method of disposing of surface water and details of the programme for the making up of the roads and footways must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before development commences. Reason: To ensure that the roads are constructed to a standard which will enable them to be taken over as publicly maintainable highways.

(14) The roads and footways must be laid out and made up in accordance with the specification, programme and details approved and in any event shall be so constructed that, by no later than the time any building erected on the land is occupied, there shall be a direct connection from it to an existing highway. The final carriageway and footway surfacing must be commenced within three months and completed within six months from the date upon which the erection is commenced of the penultimate dwelling or building for which permission is hereby permitted. Reason: To ensure that the roads are constructed to a standard which will enable them to be taken over as publicly maintainable highways.

(15) Before development commences a layout plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing provision for a temporary car park within the site to accommodate operatives and construction vehicles during the construction and fitting-out period must
be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall indicate the eventual use of that area. The development must accord with these details. 
Reason: To avoid obstruction of the adjoining highway.

(16) Before development commences measures must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, to prevent mud being deposited on the public highway by vehicles leaving the site must be implemented during the whole of the construction period. No vehicle shall leave the site unless its wheels have been sufficiently cleaned to prevent mud being deposited on the public highway. 
Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

(17) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development (Amendment) (No 2) (England) Order 2008, the buildings must not be extended or altered and there shall be no structures erected within the curtilage without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority. Reason: The development is high density and therefore the impact of any extension will need consideration to ensure no undesirable impacts arise.

(18) The areas defined on the approved plans as amenity land and must be retained for those uses and shall not be incorporated into private garden land or other uses without the prior consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Reason: To ensure that these areas are not fragmented and remain to fulfil their original functions.

(19) The burning of materials obtained by site clearance or from any other source must not take place within 3 metres of the furthest extent of the canopy of any tree, or group of trees to be retained on this site or adjoining land. Reason: To protect the health of the trees to be retained on site.

(20) No trenches for services or drains shall be sited within the crown spread of any trees that are to be retained on site. Reason: To protect the health and stability of the trees to be retained on site.

(21) The landscape scheme must be completed within 12 months from the completion of the last building shell, or by such later date as the Local Planning Authority may determine. Any trees or plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased during the first five years must be replaced during the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory.

(22) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning General Permitted Development (Amendment) (No 2) (England) Order 2008, no access other than that shown on the approved plan shall be formed to the site. Reason: In the interests of highway safety.
(23) The development hereby permitted must not be brought into use until the areas shown on the approved plan for the parking, loading and unloading of vehicles shall have been made available, surfaced and marked out, and the areas must be retained in a condition to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, and reserved for that purpose at all times. Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

(24) The development must be carried out in accordance with the recommendations as set out in the Arboricultural Method Statement by ACD Arboriculture dated 23/2/09. Reasons: To ensure the protection of the retained trees on the site.

Note to Applicant: It is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions and any obligations attached to this permission, the proposed development is acceptable because it will not materially harm the character of the area, the amenity of neighbours or highway safety, or result in the loss of vitality or viability to existing nearby village centres and it is in accordance with the policies and proposals of the development plan, as listed below, and after due regard to all other relevant material considerations the local planning authority is of the opinion that permission should be granted.

The following development plan policies are relevant to this decision and the conditions attached to it:


Under the Town and Country Planning [Fees for Applications and Deemed Applications][Amendment][England] Regulation 2008, a fee is now required for Discharge of Condition Applications.
N.B. Conditions not fully discharged, invalidate the planning permission.

This application has been referred to Committee because it is controversial.

The site and its surroundings

1. The site occupies a triangular island of land between Station Road and St Mary’s Road on the main approach road into Netley. To the rear of the site lies the Grade II Listed Netley Station and the railway line. To the north-west the site is bounded by St Mary’s Road and the south-east, Station Road and The Badgers. The junction of Station Road and St. Marys Road lies at the apex of the site. The pub which is located fairly centrally on the site was closed in the summer of 2008 and has
been boarded up. The main vehicular access to the site is from St. Mary’s Road leading to a large frontage parking area. Surrounding the site are mostly residential properties although there is also Royal British Legion Club nearby.

2. The site is located in a sustainable location with bus stops located very nearby and providing frequent services to Southampton City Centre and Hamble together with the railway and Netley Station to the rear of the site.

Description of application

3. The proposal seeks to demolish the existing vacant pub building, fell some of the lower category protected trees and construct 14 dwellings. It follows a refusal of planning permission at a previous Bursledon, Hamble and Hound Local Area Committee which included a commercial building housing a Tesco Store and 3 offices above. The commercial element has been removed from this application.

4. The 14 dwellings would be accessed from Station Road. The dwellings would all contain three bedrooms and be positioned around a central courtyard. Plots 1 and 2 would be a pair of semi-detached dwellings which would face the internal courtyard. Plots 3 to 10 form a terrace of dwellings also facing the internal courtyard with rear gardens adjacent to the treed area to the north-east. Plots 11 to 14 are a staggered terrace of four dwellings that will overlook a small parcel of open land owned by Network Rail towards The Badgers.

5. In terms of parking, 21 mostly unallocated spaces are proposed positioned around a central courtyard.

Site area

Residential development (net)

Topography

6. Flat but with a slight incline towards the rear of the site. Rear of site lower than St. Mary’s Road as it rises over the railway bridge.

Trees

7. There is quite dense tree coverage to the rear of the site and along parts of the St. Mary’s road frontage. There is a particularly good Sweet Chestnut tree towards the frontage of the site on Station Road frontage which would be retained and informs the layout of the site and the position of the access road. All trees are protected by a Tree Preservation Order and the applicants have therefore been required to carry out a detailed tree survey to assess the health and amenity value
of each tree. A number of trees would be felled as a result of this proposal, many of which are lower category in terms of health and form.

**Boundary treatment**

8. Around the rear gardens to the rear of the site, a 1.8m high close boarded fence is proposed. An open boundary to the open space along Station Road is proposed. The existing dense tree screening and undergrowth adjacent to St. Mary’s Road will be retained. Behind this and adjacent to the courtyard parking area, a formal hedge is proposed to grow through low post and wire fencing.

**Character of locality**

9. The character of the locality has been captured within the Character Appraisal for this area. The site lies adjacent to but is mentioned within Character Area BHH 7 which lies to the south west of the site. This area has a moderate strength of character which has been retained despite significant recent change due to the proportions and form of the former development of Victorian and immediate post-war villas which are set back from the road. The view towards the Station pub and its open foreground is considered significant within this Character Area. However the site itself is located within Character Area BHH 9 within which a mixed dwelling type is identified from Victorian to present day and again set back from the road. Overall it can be concluded that the character surrounding the site is mostly residential with a mixture of Victorian and more modern developments.

**Relevant planning history**

10. Erection of 14 units (detached, semi detached and terraced houses) and a retail shop (class A1) (gross internal floorspace 400 sq.m) with offices above (class B1a) (floor space 359 sq.m), with associated accesses, parking and landscaping following demolition of existing public house. Withdrawn July 2009.

11. Erection of 14 units and a retail shop (Class A1) (gross internal floor space 400 sq.m) with offices above (Class B1a) (floor space 589 sq.m) with associated accesses, parking and landscaping following demolition of existing public house. Refused November 2009/

**Representations received**

**Consultation responses**

12. **Head of Regeneration and Planning Policy** – No objection.

13. **Head of Transportation and Engineering** – No objection subject to conditions.
14. **Head of Housing** – No objection. There are currently 722 households on the Council’s Homechoice register waiting for 3 bed roomed accommodation and this proposed development would help to meet this need. This is a very sustainable site given its location close to local amenities. The supporting information makes reference to the provision of affordable family housing although the scheme is under the threshold of 15 units. Whilst there have been discussions with a local Housing Association, these negotiations are still ongoing and no contract has been entered into at this time.

15. **Head of Countryside and Trees** – As before. No objection subject to conditions re trees and wildlife.

16. **Head of Environmental Health** – comments awaited

17. **Head of Direct Services** – No objection.

18. **County Education** - No objection

19. **Southern Water** – No objection

20. **Network Rail** – No objection.

21. **Crime Prevention Officer** - Pleased that applicant has acknowledged the need to expand on crime prevention measures. Liaison is required if applicants intend to apply for a Secured by Design Award.

22. **County Archaeologist** – No objection

23. **Environment Agency** – no objection

24. **Telecommunications Mast Operator** – no objection

25. **The Badgers Residents Association** – no response received

26. **Parish** – No objection subject to concerns about wildlife and trees being addressed.

**Policy context: designation applicable to site**

- Within Urban Edge
- Within site of archaeological interest
- Affects Setting of Listed Building
- Tree Preservation Order covers the site.

**Development plan policies**

- Regional South-East Plan – no relevant policies.

• Supplementary Planning Guidance:
  i) Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh.
  ii) Environmentally sustainable development.
  iii) Planning Obligations
  iv) Public Art Strategy.
  v) Residential Parking Standards
  vi) Storage and Collection of Waste and Recyclable Materials
  vii) Affordable Housing (Draft)
  viii) Character Area Appraisal

Planning policy guidance / statement

• PPS 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development
• PPS 3 – Housing
• PPG 9 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
• PPG13 – Transport
• PPG15 – Planning and the Historic Environment
• PPG 17 – Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation
• PPS 23 – Planning and Pollution
• PPG 24 – Planning and Noise

• Draft PPS4 – Planning for sustainable economic development.

Legislative Framework

27. Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:

28. “If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise”.

29. In addition, the proposal affects the setting of a Listed Building and section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:
“In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a Listed Building or its setting, the Local Planning Authority…..shall have regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”.

Assessment of Proposal

Principle

The site is located on a main bus route and railway line within the urban area which contains local centres in Victoria Road and Station Road that provide a good range of facilities. In principle there is no objection to the residential redevelopment of the proposal in line with Policy 72.H which requires high densities in sustainable locations.

Loss of pub (community facility)

46. Local Plan policy 185.IN states that development proposals which would result in the removal or loss of an established community facility will not be permitted unless suitable alternative provision is made which is of an acceptable quality and siting or is more appropriate to the needs of the community or the existing facility can be shown to be surplus to local needs.

47. Despite revamps and remarketing over the last 20 years, the Station pub entered a period of steady decline resulting in its closure in June 2008 with no interested parties having come forward since that time to re-establish the use. In addition there have been no expressions from the local community mourning its closure as, for some time, the pub was a hub for significant anti-social behaviour. In terms of the relevant planning policy, the former pub was not considered by the local community to be of benefit and therefore alternative community provision would be more appropriate. Approaches were made to other community uses who might wish to relocate to the site but little interest has been shown. In addition, alternative pub facilities and other community facilities are available nearby (open spaces, sports clubs, members clubs, parish offices. The loss of the pub in this particular case is not considered unacceptable.

Site Constraints informing proposed development

48. The site is bounded to the rear by the railway line and this has noise impacts upon the proposed residential properties. Therefore in line with Policy 29.ES, a noise report has been submitted to allow assessment of the effect upon existing and proposed residential amenity.
49. Another constraint to development is the trees on the site. When the site initially became available and approaches were made to Eastleigh Borough Council for redevelopment, it was considered appropriate to protect all the trees on the site with a Tree Preservation Order. This prevented any pre-application large scale clearance of the site which would not have otherwise required planning permission. It also requires a developer to submit a full Tree Survey with any application that allows a considered assessment of the health and form of the trees in line with Policy 59.BE. On this particular site, there are some good, mature trees on the highway boundary with St. Mary’s Road and a very good Sweet Chestnut tree to the south of the site which is very visible from the surrounding area. Much of the remainder of the tree coverage is with very young or malformed specimens or trees that can be compensated with in the proposed landscaping scheme. There is no objection to the loss of the trees proposed to be felled from the arboricultural officer.

50. The surrounding residential properties, including a residential care home for the elderly, also present a constraint to site development. Care is required in the layout to ensure any adverse impact in terms of noise, disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, loss of outlook, crime and security etc is reduced to an acceptable minimum in accordance with Policy 59.BE.

51. The site is bounded to the east by open space land owned by Network Rail on which there are a number of attractive and protected trees. Although the landowner has been approached in order to consider a more comprehensive redevelopment of the site, confirmation has been received that they are unwilling to negotiate a release of their land. This also presents a constraint in terms of the site layout.

52. Another factor informing the proposed layout of site is the nearby Listed Building. There is a requirement to take into account the setting of the Listed Building the desirability of its preservation.

53. A full ecological survey has been carried out indicating no bats, badgers or stag beetles present on the site although a small number of slow worms were found. However it is accepted that these are pioneering sub-adults. The breeding adults and young slow worms are more likely to occupy the more suitable habitat offered by the nearby railway line embankments. Nevertheless it is considered that pioneering sub-adult slow worms should be prevented from entering the site during the build stage.

54. These constraints are important in the consideration of the proposal as the identified policies in the Local Plan require account to be taken of the site’s context. They also inform how the layout of the proposal has evolved.
Design, Layout and Landscaping

55. Current government guidance places increasing emphasis on the importance of good design. PPS1 states that ‘good design is indivisible from good planning’ and that ‘design which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area should not be accepted’, PPS3 takes this guidance further, stating that good design is fundamental to the development of high quality new housing, and that innovative approaches should be encouraged to help deliver high quality outcomes. In terms of Local Plan policy, 59.BE of the adopted local plan requires proposals to take full and proper account of the context of a site and ensure they are appropriate both in themselves and in relation to the surroundings.

56. Moving around the site layout, adjacent to the commercial building along St. Mary’s Road are Plots 1 and 2. This is a semi-detached pair of two storey dwellings facing the internal courtyard. Their rear gardens lie between the houses and the commercial building (which is two stories high at this point). The position of these dwellings has been altered from that proposed in the previously withdrawn application to ensure that their rear gardens are not beneath the largest trees found on the site. Their gardens now face south west. The elevations of these houses have also been amended to ensure that they provide sufficient architectural detail to be pleasing.

57. Across the courtyard lay a terrace of 8 houses. These houses are also two storeys in height and their frontages also face the internal courtyard with their rear gardens facing towards the rear of the site. As their gardens face north-east and lie adjacent to some wooded railway land, they are likely to experience some shading. However the site’s geometry and topography is so constrained as to make this inevitable. It is not unacceptable to have gardens facing in this direction and this aspect can be commonly found in residential areas. The terrace is articulated and has varied but complementary window designs with interest provided in the stepped building lines and roof lines. The elevations have been slightly amended to ensure pleasing architectural detail and the courtyard landscaping changed to provide defendable frontage to each plot.

58. Turning the internal corner into Station Road, a stepped terrace of four dwellings is proposed. Again elevations have been slightly altered to provide more architectural detail but the design is uncomplicated and agreeable. These plots face Station Road over a triangular piece of land owned by Network Rail. The land is grassed and has a number of protected trees planted on it at regular intervals. The design and layout of these four houses presents an attractive frontage to Station Road and The Badgers and also along the main route to the station for users of the railway. There is a small risk that the occupants of these houses could lose their outlook by development of the very small piece of land immediately in front of their front elevations. However this is considered
unlikely as it would require the felling of protected trees and any application for planning permission would take this into account. This small risk needs to be balanced against the opportunity for an attractive and traditional outward looking residential frontage along the boundary of this site. The rear gardens to these houses (except No 14) face towards the centre of the site.

59. The access to the residential element has required careful planning as there is a very good sweet Chestnut tree in this area. The road would be located mostly outside the root protection zone but constructed with hand dug foundations within its root protection area.

60. The landscaping of the proposal would be essential to its success. The applicants have submitted a detailed landscaping plan which, in terms of the soft landscaping, allows space for the worthwhile planting of trees and shrubs that would both provide some setting for the housing and soften the built forms and spaces. The landscaping plan has been subject to much discussion and in terms of the hard landscaping and now provides a palette of surfacing materials including differing sizes and shades of paviours and in terms of boundary treatments, a variety of materials including brick, wood and metal. The Head of Planning Policy and Design has no objection to the proposals providing they are controlled through planning condition.

61. Overall, the design and layout of the site is considered in accordance with policy 71. H, 72.H, 59.BE, and 63.BE which looks for secure and appropriate high quality design and landscaping whilst making the most efficient use of land.

Setting of the Listed Building

62. Netley Station is a Grade II Listed Building. The approach to the building is along Station Road which on the northern side is laid to grass and treed. On the southern side the older residential buildings turn the corner into The Badgers, a newer residential development. When considering development adjacent to Listed Buildings, it is important that the design and layout of the site and the buildings do not detract from the setting of the historic building. It is considered that the simple layout and design of the proposed houses on Station Road do not impact adversely upon this setting. The treed, open space area to the front of the houses will not be changed but visually enhanced by the provision of houses overlooking it. Currently this open space appears somewhat ‘leftover’ and to visually incorporate it into the development is considered to enhance the existing setting in this area.
Access, Parking and Traffic

63. The access to the site from Station Road is considered acceptable and the Head of Transportation has no objection to these proposals. The access accords with Policy 102.T of the Local Plan.

64. The parking provision for the housing is considered acceptable. 21 spaces are provided (1.5 spaces each if all used at the same time), and is in accordance with Policies 104.T and 105.T.

65. In terms of traffic generation, the proposal, like all development, will increase traffic levels. The proposal has been assessed for its peak hours impact which is when the impact is likely to be most apparent and is considered to be acceptable. The increase in traffic is not considered to have a detrimental impact upon the local highway network. In addition the use is located on a site that is well served by public transport, cycling and walking and therefore is in line with relevant national guidance contained within PPG13 for this type of use and Policy 100.T of the Local Plan. The extra traffic generation is not a reason to refuse the application unless there is evidence that highway safety will be jeopardised. There is no highway safety reason for refusal proposed by the Head of Transportation. Normally contributions would be required toward sustainable transport measures. However in this particular instance, these have not been agreed by the applicant due to viability issues (see below in Planning Obligation considerations).

Environmental Sustainability

66. The applicants have proposed Code Level 3 for their residential units which is considered acceptable and in line with our sustainability SPD, In addition 3 homes of lifetime home standard are proposed.

67. In terms of waste and bin storage, sufficient areas are provided for both the storage and collection of refuse and the internal access road has been designed to enable the manoeuvring of a refuse vehicle.

68. As bats and slow worms had been sighted within the area, the applicants were required to carry out an ecological survey. This showed that there was no evidence of bats roosting in the trees or buildings on the site but that slowworms did enter the site from nearby breeding grounds along the railway line to the rear of the site. Conditions are recommended to ensure that slow worms do not enter the site during the construction period and also that no clearance of vegetation is carried out in the Bird Nesting season. Subject to these conditions the Head of Countryside and Recreation has no objection.

Residential Amenity

69. Existing neighbours are concerned with regard to a number of factors not least the proposed traffic and parking. Although activity on and
around the site will definitely increase, the increase is not of a magnitude that is unexpected in an urban area. Without an objection from the Highway Authority, any refusal on this basis could not be substantiated. The same principle applies to parking.

70. Overall it is considered that residential amenity will be maintained. This will not mean that there would not be significant extra activity accompanying the proposal, nor does it mean that visual outlook from existing properties will not be changed. However, the site is located within an urban area where residential use is considered acceptable. Sufficient space is maintained around the site to ensure that residential amenity standards are preserved. In this way the proposals are considered in accordance with 59.BE of the Local Plan.

Planning obligation /considerations

71. In line with policies 147.OS and 185.IN and the recently adopted Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document, the applicant has been required to make contributions towards the infrastructure, facilities and amenities made necessary by the development. With the application that was recently refused and included a retail store with offices over, the applicant stated that in the specific circumstances of that particular development, full provision would make the scheme unviable. Members will be aware of our recently adopted Planning Obligations SPD which is clear on the process required in these instances. The applicant has followed this process which involves an open-book approach to be taken and a viability assessment to be submitted to the District Valuer. The District Valuer has confirmed that with this particular proposal, limited funds are available. With this new application, it is not considered that another viability assessment is necessary as the proposals do not include the retail element. The mix of retail, together with the funding from the Housing Association and subsidy from the applicants portfolio of developments makes the scheme just viable. To take the retail element out makes the provision of contributions even less likely.

72. However, whilst there is no policy requirement for affordable housing with regard to this particular development as the number of units is below 15, the applicant has stated that the site is only likely to go forward to implementation in the current market if the residential element is offered to a Housing Association. Negotiations with an affordable housing provider are well advanced although, as above, these discussions fall outside our housing policy requirements. Therefore, rather than require affordable housing under the relevant housing policy, it is proposed to require affordable housing in accordance with the Local Plan contributions Policy 185.IN. The affordable housing element would then constitute a contribution in kind.
Other material considerations

73. The site is now a derelict one requiring redevelopment. However this does not mean that design quality needs to be lowered or excessive amounts of development allowed in order to remove what is rapidly becoming an eyesore. Negotiations have been ongoing with the applicants for a number of years to establish the most appropriate and viable alternative to the existing situation. The applicant has stated that the site can only be developed in the current market in partnership with a Housing Association and financial subsidy from more profitable developments in the applicant’s portfolio. The applicant also states that the likelihood of development in the near future will shrink if this application is not considered acceptable. Members are advised that this is considered likely to be the case, as with many sites within the Borough in the present recessionary climate.

Conclusion

74. In terms of providing a viable redevelopment opportunity, this proposal is one to be encouraged. The proposal offers a residential development of an affordable nature adjacent to bus routes and a railway line and in terms of sustainability is to be supported. The layout of the proposal provides an appropriate response to the site constraints in a way that maximises development density. The design of the dwellings is simple but appropriate. The impacts upon local residents have been considered and taken account of in the design and layout. Most of the required contributions towards infrastructure, services, facilities or amenities have been independently confirmed as unaffordable and as the required process in terms of viability assessment has been followed, it is unreasonable to insist on their provision. So overall the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the relevant policies contained within the Local Plan and accordingly approval is recommended.
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