



Mr G Framallicco
Development Control Officer
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
Civic Offices
London Road
Basingstoke
Hampshire RG21 4AH

6 February 2009

By email and post
Giorgio.Framallicco@basingstoke.gov.uk
Our ref. AW/MM/162015

Dear Giorgio

**RE: FORMER VICTORIA AND ELI LILLY SITES, KINGSCLERE ROAD,
BASINGSTOKE RG21 6XA**

We write in response to your letter dated 23 January, which set out a number of issues regarding the outline planning application at the above site.

For ease of reference, we have used the headings set out in your letter.

Policy Issues

Hotel Issues

We note your request for further information to deal with the PPS6 issues in respect of the re-use of the White Building as a hotel. This matter will be dealt with under separate correspondence dated 9 February 2009.

Dwelling Size and Mix

In respect of the size of small dwellings, paragraph 4.21 of the adopted local plan states that:

'In order to ensure that the majority of small dwellings will provide basic and therefore relatively inexpensive accommodation, the Borough Council will aim to achieve a standard of 80% of the small dwellings (maximum of two bedrooms) on any development having a gross floor area not exceeding 70 square metres.'

We confirm that the proposed development achieves 80% of small dwellings having a gross floor area not exceeding 70 sqm and we enclose a plan (dwg no. 126 (12) 304 Rev B) of a typical 2 bedroom unit with a gross floor area of 65 sqm and fully complies with Policy C3 of the adopted Local Plan.

Confirmation was also requested that 15% of the market dwellings will be designed to Lifetime Mobility Standards. We confirm that this can be achieved as part of the proposed development (as per dwg.no 126 (12) 304 Rev B) and are content that a planning condition be imposed to the planning permission to

Indigo Planning Limited

Swan Court
Worple Road
London
SW19 4JS

T 020 8605 9400
F 020 8605 9401
info@indigo.planning.com
indigo.planning.com

Registered Office
Swan Court
Worple Road
London SW19 4JS
Registered number 2078863

Director's
Simon Neate
BA (Hons) MRTPI

Philip Villars
BA (Hons) MRTPI

Ian Laverick
BSc (Arch) BArch (Hons 1)
RIBA FRAIA

Bill Davidson
BA (Hons) DipTP DipUD MRTPI

Mathew Mainwaring
BA (Hons) MRTPI

Sean McGrath
BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Tim Waring
BA (Hons) MRTPI

Stewart Miller
BA (Hons)

Helen Greenhalgh
BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

Doug Hann
BA (Hons) MTP ML MSc MRTPI

Associate Directors
Rob Crofts
BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

Gregory Dowdon
BA (Hons) Dip TP MA LLB MRTPI

Caroline Wilberforce
BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

Tania Tindale
BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

Consultant
John Spain
BBS MRUP MRICS MRTPI MIP

Also in Leeds, Manchester
and Dublin

secure this objective.

In terms of inaccuracies in the planning application, all of the issues raised in respect of the Planning Statement were fully addressed in our letter dated 8 December 2008, however, for ease of reference a comprehensive note of inaccuracies raised (including those in the Transport Assessment and the Residential Travel Plan) is appended to this letter. This approach of cataloguing inaccuracies and commenting on them accordingly with updated information where necessary should make it easy for any statutory consultees, members of the public and other interested parties to easily identify any changes through future re-consultation.

It should be noted that the application forms submitted are accurate and furthermore, the details of the proposed development contained on the dedicated Council web page are correct. In respect of the Planning Statement, the points raised are largely typographical errors contained within the narrative text.

Viability Statement

We await the Council's response to the submitted Viability Statement. In dealing with the viability statement, you confirmed that you would be in receipt of advice from the District Valuer by 31 January 2009. To date we have heard nothing on the outcome of this advice. We would be grateful if you could communicate your position on this matter as soon as possible and as a matter of urgency.

Highways

With regard to Hampshire County Council's (HCC) letter dated 16 December 2008, we confirm that the applicant's response was submitted to HCC on Monday 26 January. Three copies of the Peter Brett submission are enclosed with this submission. To accompany the highway response, Peter Brett Associates met with Steve Jenkins and a colleague (HCC) on Tuesday 27 January to present and answer questions on the submitted information.

The PBA submission made on 26 January responds to all HCC issues raised in respect of the relationship between the development and the operation of the surrounding road network. The submission demonstrates the very significant improvements that will be delivered to the operation of the local road network, including Churchill Way West, as a result of the highway improvements to the junction of Chapel Hill and Vyne Road that will be delivered by the scheme. These improvements will also result in significant benefits to assist in the delivery of other Council promoted developments such as South View, if and when these come forward.

In terms of the parking proposals for the different uses within the scheme, it is worth recapping on a few key points.

1. The parking proposed for the residential element of fully complies with the

Council's Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) adopted on the 1 September 2008. This is based on the site being located in an inner urban areas with 50% unallocated parking as required by the SPD.

2. The parking for the office element is provided at 1:45 sq m as required by policy.
3. The parking for the retail has been increased to again to accord with policy.
4. The parking for the hotel element is slightly above that required by policy, albeit we have reduced the parking from 150 spaces originally proposed. In the event that officers or planning committee members require parking provision for the hotel to be reduced further, the applicant will be happy to accept the imposition of a planning condition.

Your letter also sets out a number of bullet points which require further information. We consider that many of these issues do not require such detailed consideration at this outline planning application stage; however, we have provided a full response to the bullet points in a separate Highways Note appended to this letter.

Open Space

We have revised the open space provision to meet the requirements articulated by you and your colleagues in the parks department. These changes are set out in the amended site layout drawing and in dwg no. 126(12)105 Rev A. In respect of the open space to the south of the apartment block on the Avenue, we are keen for this space to be utilised partly for games (with the introduction of suitable hard surfacing for part of the area) and partly to be used as an informal play space incorporating features of high quality landscape design. We are keen to avoid standard off the shelf products which might detract from the overall concept being created.

In respect of the off-site contributions to open space, these can be discussed as part of the wider section 106 discussions viability appraisal matters.

Noise issues

The site plan has been amended and is attached (dwg no. 126(12)100 Rev E and dwg.no 126 (12) 102 Rev F) to indicate the location and extent of the proposed gabion wall along the southern boundary of the site.

Rather than provide a very basic and unattractive noise screen as erected at Victory Hill, the application proposes the use of a gabion wall which not only provides the required noise amelioration but also acts as a landscape design feature as far as the boundary treatment of the more southerly parts of the site are concerned. This contemporary approach to boundary treatment will also allow for planting to become established overtime creating an interesting mix between the boldness of the gabion wall feature and the softening created by

the planting. The detail of the gabion wall structure is also provided on the attached drawing (dwg no. 126(12)125 Rev B) titled "Detailed Boundary Section Gabion Wall." It indicates how the wall will sit in the site, and how it will form part of the natural landscape environment.

Urban Design and Landscape Issues

The site layout plan was not intended to define the extent of the application site boundary. The areas shaded green were intended to define areas which contribute to the provision of landscaping or areas which provide for green corridors for wildlife, regardless of whether these areas are in the application site or not. To provide greater clarity the site layout plan has been revised and the extent of landscaping has been adjusted accordingly (dwg no. 126(12)100 Rev E).

In addition, dwg no. 126(12)125 Rev B indicates the boundary planting for this area taking into account the gabion wall and the parking spaces. This clearly provides a significant contribution in terms of landscaping.

Drawing dwg no. 126(12)125 Rev B provides further detail on the gabion wall and landscaping between the proposed dwellings in Terrace A and the Pelton Road frontage that abuts the site. We do not consider that the proposed development would prejudice or conflict with the operation of the adjacent employment site and raise issues in respect of policy EC2 (ii) given that there is a significant distance between the front of the dwellings and the proposed gabion wall which boards the site (approximately 14 metres). The gabion wall itself, will provide an adequate level of safeguarding in respect of any potential noise or disruption from the adjacent site. The relationship between Terrace A and the Pelton Road site is also not dissimilar to a number of existing relationships between residential units and employment sites, for example the properties located on Hillary Road closely border the employment site on Joule Road. The proposed approach is therefore consistent with the relationships that exist in the area already.

In terms of the open spaces between (terraces G, H, K and L), these have now been altered as a result of the open space discussions. Please refer to dwg 126 (12) 105 Rev A and the amended proposed ground floor plan (dwg no. 126(12)102 Rev F).

Drawing no 126 (12) 126 Rev A, attached, shows that the street trees planned for The Avenue will be able to succeed and allow sufficient space for pedestrian and vehicle movements in addition to underground services and access to undercroft car parking. As you suggest, this can be further considered as part of reserved matters applications.

In respect of your query as to how trees would be successfully grown in areas where undercroft parking is shown, this is demonstrated by drawing no. 126 (12) 126 Rev A accompanying this letter. It outlines that large galvanized containers can be sunk into the ground, above the undercroft, to contain the root ball and allow for future growth. Again, landscaping is a reserved matter.

Additional Tree Issues

In relation to which trees are to be retained and removed on the site, Drawing no 126 (12) 106 Rev A clearly illustrates which of the existing trees on site are to be retained as part of the overall scheme.

Prior to considering the loss of individual trees, it was worth reflecting on the issue of the urban and landscape design vision for the site as a whole. In developing the urban design rationale, the architects have sought to build a concept which includes the retention of the White Building. To emphasize this aspect, the main entrance to the site from Kingsclere Road at its junction with Sherborne Road has been widened to signal the main entrance to the development. Integral to this urban design approach and the spaces between buildings that this approach creates, is the opportunity for this important entrance to site to also be marked by high quality landscaping proposals. The landscaping proposals for this entrance to the site will be important and the scheme has been designed to enable the detailed proposals of substance to be delivered to compliment the urban design approach.

The location of trees, T23 – T27, are visible in the street scene in so far as the site to which they relate have little development context i.e. there are little or no buildings. With the advent of the proposed development the location for any significant landscape features will shift to the south east and the main entrance to the development. Consequently the loss of T23-27 will be supplanted by the creation of new landscaping which can include the use of semi-mature and mature species and will provide the correct focus for the landscaping of the site for the future.

Other established trees to the Kingsclere Road frontage, particularly trees T1 - T10, which are of good quality, ranging in both age and maturity are a positive feature of the scheme.

An appropriately designed and specified landscape scheme, including the use of advanced nursery stock or semi-mature trees, can more than adequately deal with the removal of trees, T23 – T27. This will provide for a more diverse and sustainable tree stock on the site with a staggered age class distribution to provide for long-term continuity of tree cover. Such a landscape scheme can be secured by condition to the grant of planning consent to the outline application.

Art Gallery

The art gallery will complement the diversity of uses proposed at the site, creating a cultural focal point for meeting and provide an artistic and aesthetic interest to the centre of the site. It will be privately run and privately funded and will not require public subsidy.

Biodiversity

Natural England were consulted early on in the pre-application process, and

were issued with a copy of the "Desk Study and Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey" which concluded that the site is of low ecological value, and suggested several potential ecological enhancement measures which could enhance the ecological interest of the site after redevelopment. We agree that some of these measures, such as native planting; retention of wildlife; provision of bat boxes etc could be incorporated into the scheme. As such, details will be provided at reserved matters stage when addressing landscaping and detailed design.

Housing

As already discussed with you, we would be happy to meet with one of your colleagues in the Housing Services department to discuss the proposed mix of dwellings.

We hope this information provided above has clarified the points raised in the consultation process and the determination of the application can proceed. If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely



Mathew Mainwaring

Enc: 3 x Highways Note – Feb 2009
3 x Inaccuracies Note – Feb 2009
3 x drawings as follows:

- Proposed Site Plan – Colour dwg no. 126(12)100 Rev E
- Basement Plan dwg no. 126(12)101 Rev F
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan dwg no. 126(12)102 Rev F
- Open Space Plan dwg no. 126(12)105 Rev A
- Tree Removal Plan dwg no. 126(12)106 Rev A
- Car Parking Allocations Plans dwg no. 126(12)107 Rev B
- Bin & Bicycle Storage Plans dwg no. 126(12)108 Rev B
- Detailed Boundary Section dwg no. 126(12)125 Rev B
- Boulevard Cross Section dwg no. 126(12)126 Rev A
- Typical Apartment dwg no. 126(12)304 Rev B

3 x Transport Information submitted to HCC dated 26 January 2009 (+CD)
3 x Preliminary Design Submission dated January 2009 (+CD)

cc: Steve Jenkins, Hampshire County Council – letter and enclosures
Andrew Gale, Drivers Jonas – letter and enclosures
David Philips, Lemon Land – letter only