

7. **13/02672/FULLS (REFUSE/PERMISSION) 28.11.2013** **10 – 59**
SITE: Former Council Offices, Duttons Road, Romsey,
ROMSEY TOWN (ABBHEY)

CASE OFFICER: Katherine Fitzherbert-Green

8. **14/00872/OUTS (REFUSE/PERMISSION) 10.04.2014** **60 – 98**
SITE: Land Off Peel Close, Romsey,
ROMSEY EXTRA

CASE OFFICER: Paul Goodman

APPLICATION NO.	13/02672/FULLS
SITE	Former Council Offices, Duttons Road, Romsey. ROMSEY TOWN (ABBEY)
COMMITTEE DATE	01 July 2014
ITEM NO.	7
PAGE NO.	10-59

1.0 VIEWING PANEL

1.1 A Viewing Panel was held on the 1st July 2014. Apologies were received from Councillors Dowden, Hatley, and Long.

2.0 REPRESENTATIONS (in response to amended plans)

2.1 Romsey Town Council – no objection.

2.2 Objections received from 18, 20, 24 and 26 Station Road; and 6 Jubilee Road.
Comments in summary:

Design

- The existing building is three storeys; the proposed will be four storeys with balconies. The height is out of character with other 2-3 storey properties;
- Will the roof be covered in solar panels?
- The semi-detached dwellings are behind the building line impacting upon the rear aspect of adjacent properties, will be out of keeping with properties on that side/area of Station Road which are predominately large and detached dwellings;
- Overdevelopment - The TVBC SHLAA base point is 40-50 units per hectare. HCC quote 40 dwellings per hectare. The site proposes 56 units on 0.42ha The building line appears to have moved from the existing building to within 1.5-2m of the boundary hedge to the rear of 18 Station Road which given the height of the proposed building will result in loss of light and overshadowing;
- Layout and density of the proposed building is too large for the site.

Residential amenity

- Overlooking from apartments, some with balconies to rear gardens resulting in a loss of privacy;
- Noise and disturbance resulting from use 24hrs a day, 7 days a week. The former council office building was only occupied during office hours;
- Jubilee Road is extremely narrow with semi-detached houses and one bungalow. The development would tower above these properties; be intimidating, imposing, encroach on privacy, block natural light and be out of character with the rest of the area;
- Building to boundary distance to 24 Station Road is at most 7m. This is less than stated in the report which cites building to building distances;
- Scale of the building will result in loss of light to rear garden of 24 Station Road.

Other

- A battery car/cycle store building will be located adjacent to the hedge to 18 Station Road. Lead-acid batteries (common in cars/electric wheelchairs) are hazardous waste containing highly corrosive acid and can cause fires from short circuits;
- Waste collection areas are not shown on the drawings. Consideration should be given to smells, turning and loading of refuse vehicles plus other delivery vehicles;
- Access to the proposed parking area will be close to the traffic lights and at a busy junction and is therefore undesirable;
- No consideration given to the majority of residents. Request members of the Planning Control Committee not only visit the site but all surrounding roads to fully appreciate residents' concerns/objections;
- The decision on the two dwellings should be delayed and separated from the main development to allow adequate consideration of the impact on Station Road;
- More time should be given for consideration of other, possibly better uses of the site (e.g. amenity, parking, a single property);
- Objections in the SAPC report are not properly addressed within the remainder of the report with regards to residents of Station Road;
- Change of use;
- The amended plans do not appear to have changed from the originals and do not show details of any revisions made and the dates they were updated;
- Human Rights Act.

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

3.1 Additional condition:

19. The development is to be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- **ASP.13.035.101 Rev E – Proposed site plan;**
- **ASP.13.035.102 Rev B – Proposed ground floor plan;**
- **ASP.13.035.103 Rev B – Proposed first floor plan;**
- **ASP.13.035.104 Rev B – Proposed second floor plan;**
- **ASP.13.035.105 Rev A – Proposed roof plan;**
- **ASP.13.035.110 Rev B – Proposed elevations;**
- **ASP.13.035.111 Rev A – Proposed elevations;**
- **ASP.13.035.112 Rev B – Proposed elevations.**

Reason: In the interests of an appropriate and comprehensive development in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006 policy DES02.

APPLICATION NO.	14/00872/OUTS
SITE	Land Off Peel Close, Romsey, Hampshire, , ROMSEY EXTRA
COMMITTEE DATE	1 July 2014
ITEM NO.	8
PAGE NO.	60-98

1.0 **VIEWING PANEL**

1.1 A Viewing Panel was held for members on the 1st July 2014. Apologies were received in advance from Cllr's Dowden, Hatley and Long.

2.0 **S106 Agreement**

2.1 Although the terms of the agreement have been settled between TVBC and the developers/land owners, Hampshire County Council are also signatories to the agreement in relation to education contributions. Hampshire County Council as the education authority have agreed the level of contribution to be secured but there remains some concern that, given the internal processes of the County Council, that the agreement would not be signed by HCC in time to meet the original deadline of 10th July specified in the officers report. As a result it is proposed to extend the period for completion of the agreement to 31st July. In addition the alternative recommendation, in the event that the agreement is not completed, has been revised to reflect the amended date.

3.0 **AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**

3.1 **Delegate to the Head of Planning & Building for OUTLINE PERMISSION subject to conditions, notes and an S106 agreement to secure financial contributions towards highways improvements, open space, education, affordable housing and a public right of way through the site between the existing turning head in Peel Close and Winchester Road to be completed by 31st July 2014.**

3.2 **Alternative recommendation in the event that the S106 agreement is not Completed by 31st July 2014.**

3.3 **REFUSE for the reasons;**

1. **The proposed development is contrary to policy ESN22 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan and Infrastructure and Developer Contributions SPD in that no contribution is provided in order to address existing deficiencies in Public Open Space provision in the parish resulting in the development having an unmitigated additional burden on existing facilities.**

- 2. The proposed development is contrary to policy TRA01 and TRA04 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan and Infrastructure and Developer Contributions SPD in that no contribution is provided in order to address existing deficiencies in non-car modes of transport provision in the parish resulting in the development having an unmitigated additional burden on existing infrastructure.**

- 3. The proposed development is contrary to policy ESN30 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan and Infrastructure and Developer Contributions SPD in that no contribution is provided to address deficiencies in educational facilities in the town resulting in the development having an unmitigated additional burden on existing infrastructure.**

- 4. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure the provision of affordable housing and its retention in perpetuity to occupation by households in housing need, the proposal is contrary to policy ESN04 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006 and the Infrastructure and Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (2009).**