

UPDATE PAPER

Southern Area Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, 8th October 2019

Time: 5.30 p.m.

**Venue: CROSFIELD HALL, BROADWATER ROAD,
ROMSEY**

**Southern Area Planning Committee – 8th October 2019
Update Paper**

The purpose of the report is to provide information on planning applications which has been received since the agenda was printed.

Report of Head of Planning

1. Background

- 1.1 Reports on planning applications are prepared for printing on the agenda some 10 days before the date of the Committee meeting but information and representations received after that time are relevant to the decision. This paper contains such information which was received before 10.00am on the date of the meeting. Any information received after that time is reported verbally.

2. Issues

- 2.1 Information and representations are summarized but the full text is available on the relevant file should Members require more details. The paper may contain an officer comment on the additional information, amended recommendations and amended and/or additional conditions.

7. **19/01116/FULLS (PERMISSION) 09.05.2019** **10 – 26**
SITE: 3 Bracken Place, Chilworth, SO16 3NG
CHILWORTH
CASE OFFICER: Mr Mark Staincliffe
8. **19/01459/FULLS (PERMISSION) 09.05.2019** **27 – 37**
SITE: Mobile Home, Wellow Wood Paddock, Wellow
Wood Road, West Wellow, **WELLOW**
CASE OFFICER: Mr Nathan Glasgow

APPLICATION NO.	19/01116/FULLS
SITE	3 Bracken Place, Chilworth, SO16 3NG, SO16 3NG, CHILWORTH
COMMITTEE DATE	08 October 2019
ITEM NO.	7
PAGE NO.	10 - 26

1.0 **CORRECTION**

1.1 At Paragraph 8.27 of the committee report it states the following:

'The 60 quoted by local residents was the maximum number originally granted by application TVS.04727/7. The maximum number was subsequently increased to 100 when planning application TVS.04727/8 was granted planning permission.'

1.2 To clarify, it was in fact planning application TVS.04727/7 that granted planning permission for an extension to the building and for up to 100 children to use the facility at any one time. Planning application TVS.04727/8 granted planning permission for alterations to the design of the extension approved by the earlier planning permission

1.3 Condition 12 has been amended to correctly identify the maximum number of children permitted on site. As drafted in the report Condition 12 states 91 Children. This should read 96 Children.

2.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

2.1 **Highways** – No objection. Comments below:

2.2 Existing Site & Surrounding Highway Network

In order to review the existing highway operation within the vicinity of the nursery, the highway authority undertook site visits between 0730-0900 and 1600-1800 on 2 separate days during October 2019 (in addition to previous site visits to the site). During these visits, the highway authority observed a staggered arrival/departure profile during both the AM and PM peaks which is attributed to the varying arranged drop-off and pick-up times of the children on site. While there was a slight concentration of vehicles arriving at around 8am on both days, very few vehicles were observed to arrive/depart the Bracken Hall apartments to the north during this time and therefore there were very few occasions where vehicles had to give way to one another on Bracken Place or the M27 bridge at this time. Between 0830 and 0900 there were instances where vehicles egressing the apartments and nursery (on the east side of the bridge) had to give way to vehicles travelling across the bridge from the west. These instances resulted in a short delay to the give way vehicles (up to approximately 20 seconds) with a maximum queue of 2-3 vehicles observed on the eastern side. This level of temporary queuing and delay during the peak periods has resulted from development previously permitted by the LPA with no further traffic generation proposed by this application. On the western side

of the bridge, Bracken Place narrows where it becomes private adjacent to Bracken Lodge with one passing place located between Bracken Lodge and the bridge. This passing place is well position to accommodate vehicles when required and two vehicles were observed passing one another in this area safely and without significant delay or inconvenience.

2.3 Bracken Place joins the A27 at the A27/Winchester Road gyratory where it shares an arm with the Hilton Hotel. With respect to connections for pedestrians, footways are present on Bracken Place between the A27 and eastern end of the M27 bridge. No footways are present on Bracken Place on the eastern side of the M27 Bridge however the low traffic flow and vehicle speeds witnessed during the site visits are conducive to an environment where pedestrians could walk within the carriageway with care. Bus stops are located on Winchester Road and at the Chilworth roundabout which provide connections to Winchester and Southampton City Centre. These stops are approximately 15 minute walks from the nursery which is considered an appropriate walking distance.

2.4 Proposed Development

The Applicant is seeking permission for the erection of a new nursery building and the realignment of the existing car park. It is understood that following construction of the new building, should this application be permitted, the number of children in the existing building on the site would be reduced and the existing building would no longer be used as a nursery. The proposed capacity of the new nursery building is 96 children whereby the existing building was granted permission to accommodate up to 100 children by Test Valley Borough Council under application TVS.04727/7. It is understood from the planning application form that the total number of staff would be retained at 21 full-time and 5 part-time staff members. As part of the realignment of the existing car park, the proposed development incorporates 22 parking spaces which is a slight increase from the existing 21 spaces on site.

2.5 Access

The existing vehicular access from Bracken Place is to be retained to serve the proposed development, this is deemed acceptable by the highway authority. The access width shown on the site layout drawing measure 7.8m wide which is sufficient to allow a family sized car and service vehicle to pass one another.

2.6 Internal Site Arrangement and Parking (Servicing)

The proposed site layout is shown on drawing CSL.101 Rev A. The drawing shows the existing access being retained together with a short section of internal road around the north of the existing building with leads to the realigned car park. Scaling from this drawing, the internal road measures between 4.4m and 4.8m in width which would allow two family size cars to pass one another (as outlined within Manual for Streets which gives a minimum carriageway width of 4.1m for such movements). With respect to the proposed parking spaces, these measure 2.5m x 5m with 6m aisle widths between spaces to allow for manoeuvring vehicles which is considered acceptable by the highway authority and consistent with industry guidance. While Test Valley Borough Council should review the total number of spaces

provided as part of their role as local parking authority, it should be noted that during site visits undertaken by HCC Officers, no excessive or indiscriminate parking on Bracken Place was observed (a total of 3 vehicles were parking on the verge/layby opposite the nursery access at any time between 0730-0900 and 1600-1800 on the survey days – while this section of Bracken Place is private, this is not deemed to represent a detrimental impact in terms of road safety, capacity or operation). This would suggest that the existing parking provision at the nursery is suitable to accommodate the demand and given that the proposal does not increase the total number of children at the nursery, the slightly larger proposed car park should continue to accommodate the parking demand. The highway authority support the Case Officer's recommended Condition 5 regarding provision of the car park prior to the commencement of use of the building in order to ensure parking demand continues to be accommodated on site.

2.7 Highway Safety

Hampshire County Council's Safety Engineering Team have reviewed the existing road safety record for the highway network surrounding the site and have not raised any objection to the proposed development in terms of potential impact on road safety. Within the adopted sections of the surrounding highway network (Bracken Place between "Bracken Lodge" and A27/Winchester Road gyratory), only 2 accidents have occurred within the most recent 10 year period (June 2009 – May 2019). Both of these accidents occurred on the circulatory of the A27/Winchester Road gyratory, one during 2016 and one during 2018. The 2016 accident involved a car and pedal cyclist who was knocked down when the car overtook the cyclist and turned across the cyclists path and the 2018 accident involved a goods vehicle colliding with a vehicle in the adjacent lane. The recorded contributory factors in both accidents included "driver failed to look properly", "poor turn or manoeuvre" and "careless/reckless [driving]". It is clear that when reviewing the contributory factors recorded by the attending Police Officers at these accidents that they did not result from any deficiency in the highway network and therefore it is not expect that the development would result in a worsened road safety record in the area.

2.8 It is noted that some of the objections are based on highway safety and in particular accidents which are reported to have occurred within the private sections of Bracken Place (north of Bracken Lodge, the M27 bridge and Bracken Place east of the bridge). Having reviewed the accident record, these accidents do not appear to have been reported to or recorded by Hampshire Constabulary and therefore the specific details and likely contributing factors are unavailable. It should however be noted that the highway authority has reviewed both the adopted and private sections of highway in terms of road safety and as above, there does not appear to be any deficiency in the highway network and therefore it is not expect that the development would result in a worsened road safety record in the area.

2.9 Development Impacts

The development proposal falls below the threshold of requiring a full Transport Statement or Assessment as outlined by the County Council's

guidelines (threshold of 2,500sqm of floorspace for education land uses - proposed new nursery building is 466sqm internal floor area). As outlined above, the capacity of the proposed new nursery building is slightly less than the consented capacity of the existing building on site at 96 children (current nursery has 100 child capacity) while the staff numbers will remain as existing. On this basis, the development is not likely to result in increased number of vehicular trips generated by the site as the application, if permitted, will not result in any intensification of use of the site. The Officer's report outlines the requirement for a condition to limit the total number of children on site at any one time to 96 as "an increase in these numbers could result in the need for additional park or wider impacts on the local highway network" which the highway authority is in agreement with - the Officer's recommended includes such a Condition (Condition 12).

2.10 In order to determine the likely capacity of Bracken Place between Bracken Lodge and the east side of the M27 Bridge (including the bridge itself), a review of research into the capacity of single lane roads with passing places has been undertaken together with a review of design guidance for rural roads with passing places produced by South Ayrshire Council in Scotland. With respect to the design of passing places, the South Ayrshire guidance states that passing places should be "intervisible or up to a maximum of 150m apart". It has already been outlined above that carriageway widths are sufficient at each end of the M27 bridge to allow vehicles to pass one another and it has been observed that the available forward visibility allows drivers at each end of the bridge to see one another (meaning that these points where vehicles can pass are intervisible) and the length of the bridge span is approximately 90m. On Bracken Place there are points where vehicles can pass one another, spaced 90m apart and these points are intervisible. In terms of capacity, the most recent research into this topic (Sweet, TRICS, 2012 (Somerset County Council)) indicated that the capacity of a 180m single lane stretch of road (twice the length of the single lane section of Bracken Place) with 1 passing place was between 100 and 300 vehicles/hour depending on vehicle speed (lower capacity at higher speeds, higher capacity at lower speeds). This assumed an equal flow of vehicles in each direction (which is what was observed during surveys undertaken by the highway authority) and this indicated capacity is consistent with earlier research into capacity of rural lanes, some of which dates back to the 1960s. During the surveys undertaken by the highway authority during the peak periods, the highest total hourly flow across the M27 Bridge was 78 vehicles which indicates that there is some spare link capacity on this section of Bracken Place.

2.11 It should be noted that there is no other current UK design guidance or standards relevant to single lane roads with passing places other than that referenced above.

2.12 **Summary and Conclusions**

The development proposals are considered "like-for-like" in terms of the maximum number of children at the nursery (albeit the proposed nursery has a slightly reduce capacity in terms of total number of children) and total staffing numbers and on this basis the proposal will not result in additional trips being

generated. There are no identifiable existing concerns regarding highway safety in the surrounding area which would be exacerbated by the development proposals. The proposals have been considered by the highway authority in the context of the NPPF (Feb 2019) and it is concluded that the development would not result in a severe impact on the highway network (the only grounds in which development should be prevented or refused on highways grounded – Para 109).

- 2.13 Based on the above, the highway authority wish to reinforce the recommendation of no objection. This recommendation has been reached following a detailed review of the submitted information by the Applicant and following site visits and peak hour surveys. The conditions detailing maximum number of children on site and provision of the proposed car park prior to commencement of the use are supported by the highway authority.

3.0 **ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATION**

- 3.1 **1 x additional letter** making the following additional comments:

I have now been able to read the final version of your report, as published with the documents for the Planning Committee meeting for 8th Oct.

- 3.2 I would comment on your references to ‘representations’ regarding the number of children attending the nursery, and believe that you have misrepresented what we have stated about the maximum number of children. I am asking you to correct this error at the earliest opportunity, and well before the Planning Committee meeting. I give the details below.

- 3.3 Your para 8.26 “There appears to be confusion with regards to maximum number of children that could be accommodated on site at any one time. The supporting statement accompanying the planning application states that the nursery is registered to accommodate up to 96 children, whereas representations state that the maximum number permitted by previous applications is 60.”

- 3.4 The representations you are referring to do not state that the maximum permitted is 60.

- 3.5 Referring to the submissions other than mine. I hold no brief for what has been stated by the objectors. However, the only reference to places I can see is by Mr Spencer, who wrote:

“I am writing to object to the proposed expansion at 3 Bracken Hall Nursery, from an average of 60 places to 96

- 3.6 Although, for residential objectors who don’t have access to precise figures, a minor deviance should be understandable, this appears to be clear and correct. The point he was making, and you should have been able to understand, was that, last year, the average working capacity (children per day) was indeed taken as about 60, as then confirmed by the Applicant. In fact, it is not much above that level this year (despite the current claims of the

Applicant). We know that the evident intention of the applicant is to raise this to 96. Thus, Mr Spencer was not claiming as you stated that the maximum 'permitted' is 60. He was observing that there is a threat that the operating number of places will be rising as he stated. I take a very dim view of your apparent attempt to invalidate the view of my fellow resident who was making a perfectly reasonable point.

3.7 Referring to my submission

I wonder if you have been subject to 'confusion' to use your word. In my Section 2, I referred back, in some anger, to the treatment that our objections received from your department last year. The reason that I, in 2018, believed that the limit was 60 rather than 100 was solely as a result of inefficiency or incompetence on the part of TVBC. The 100 limit was known to you and your colleagues, but because the document had not been scanned, it was not on the website alongside the previous permissions – as we had every right to expect.

3.8 In this year's submission, I have not confused 60 with 100. You will see under my Section 3.1 that I have specifically stated the change of maximum and when it occurred. There is no other reference to 60 (in the context of children) in my document.

3.9 I demand an email apology from you or your manager in good time to be able to distribute it to the Councillors who will be attending next week's meeting, and who will expect to be supplied with correct information.

3.10 Officer Comments (Point of Clarification)

Para 8.26 refers to confusion with regards to the number of children that can be accommodated on site. Officers have simply reported the content of representations and the applicants understanding of the number of children permitted on site.

3.11 The paragraph was not intended to apply to every representation made on the application. Indeed, the report at Paragraph 8. 26 is clear that the applicant's own conclusion on this matter was incorrect and not the true planning position as planning application TVS.04727/7 allowed the site to be used by up to 100 children.

4.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

4.1 **PERMISSION subject to conditions and notes as per main agenda report recommendation, and amended Condition 12:**

12 No more than 96 children shall be on site at any one time.

Reason: for the avoidance of doubt and to ensure compliance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) policy T1 & T2.

APPLICATION NO.	19/01459/FULLS
SITE	Mobile Home Wellow Wood Paddock , Wellow Wood Road, West Wellow, SO51 6EP, WELLOW
COMMITTEE DATE	8 October 2019
ITEM NO.	8
PAGE NO.	27

1.0 VIEWING PANEL

1.1 A Viewing Panel took place on Friday 4th October; the following Members attended the site visit:

- Cllr Bailey
- Cllr Cooper
- Cllr C Dowden
- Cllr J Parker
- Cllr A Warnes

1.2 Apologies were received from the following Members:

- Cllr Bundy
- Cllr A Dowden
- Cllr Finlay
- Cllr Ward

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

PERMISSION subject to conditions and notes as per main agenda report recommendation