

CONTACT REPORT

Client:	McCarthy & Stone
Project:	38-44 London Road, Purbrook
Date:	Wednesday 8 th July 2015
Location:	St John's Church Hall, London Road, Purbrook
Attendees:	Matthew Shellum (MS) – The Planning Bureau Sarjay Patel (SP) – The Planning Bureau Patrick M (PM) – BDB Design Miles Willshire (MW) – Remarkable Engagement Andrew Ovenden (AO) – Remarkable Engagement

Each of the meetings covered the following:

- Explaining the purpose of the 121 meetings.
- Brief outline of McCarthy & Stone.
- Details of the preliminary proposals.
- Understanding the individual nature of 38-44 London Road.
- Showing the initial plans and drawings for up to 42 Retirement Living apartments and 2 commercial units with provisions for 35 car parking spaces and a private courtyard garden.
- Outline information on the upcoming exhibition date.

Meeting 1 – 10:00-10:30: Mr & Mrs Toogood - 5 Old Van Dieman Close

- Mrs Toogood did not show up for the 10:00am meeting but arrived later at 12:10pm. MW had a brief discussion with her in which she expressed that she was supportive of the scheme.

Meeting 2 – 10:30-11:00: Councillor Gwen Blackett (Purbrook ward)

- Councillor Blackett had forgotten about the meeting and arrived at around 10:45am
- MW introduced the team.
- Councillor Blackett explained straight away that she had no objections to the scheme but was concerned that the proposed scheme might be a 'high-rise.' However, so long as the designs were of a reasonable height she saw no reason that there would be a problem.
- Councillor Blackett informed the team she has spoken to a number of residents in the area and felt that the perception was favourable so long as the building didn't tower above other developments in the area. She highlighted that Fielder Court was a good development.
- MS confirmed that the proposals would be two to three storeys.
- Councillor Blackett agreed that this was not too high and drew the comparison to Fielder Court being a similar height.
- PM talked through the layout and design of the proposals.
- Councillor Blackett enquired as to who might occupy the commercial units.
- MS explained that the road is allocated in the local neighbourhood retail commercial area and, as a result, there would be a requirement for ground floor commercial units. These would most likely be independent retail shops but this wouldn't be known until the development went to market.
- Councillor Blackett asked for confirmation that the proposals would be more detailed when they are presented to the council. MS confirmed.
- Councillor Blackett referenced some cottages in the local area which are listed buildings. MS explained that these were further down the road and therefore unaffected.
- MS drew attention to the use of flint work.
- Councillor Blackett said that the proposals looked "*quite attractive on paper.*" She reiterated that she had spoken to a number of residents and hadn't had any negative responses so far. She felt that the site was a good location for what is proposed.

Conclusion

This was a promising start to the 121 meetings. Councillor Blackett appeared supportive of the proposals and satisfied with the height of the development. Her comments regarding the positive perception of the planned redevelopment of the site among the local community were encouraging.

Meeting 3 – 11:00-11:30: Mr & Mrs Smees - Flat 5, Fielder Court (and Councillor Gwen Blackett)

- Councillor Blackett was also present through this meeting.
- MW introduced the team.
- PM talked through the layout and design of the proposals.
- Mrs Smees asked whether the current flint-work building would be retained. MS explained that it would not.
- Councillor Blackett enquired what percentage of potential residents would have a car and whether 35 parking spaces would be sufficient. She commented that parking in the area is “*horrendous*.”
- MS explained that McCarthy & Stone’s parking allocations have increased over the years. They tend to find that 50-60% of users have a car to begin with but this tends to decline after the first 12 months of full occupation as residents find they use their vehicle less frequently.
- Mr Smees explained that Fielder Court has 15/16 parking spaces for 19 flats and highlighted that this proves difficult for visitor parking, particularly in the holiday period. He pointed out that there are parking restrictions behind the Woodman pub and that he was concerned about where people would park.
- Mrs Smees asked if McCarthy & Stone had considered a car share scheme.
- MS answered that one or two schemes are looking at piloting a car share scheme but there is a commercial element to consider regarding whether it would be cost effective for users. Furthermore, it can prove difficult to find a provider due to insurance.
- Mr Smees asked where services would access the site.
- MS highlights that the main access to the site is from London Road, while refuse services will use the Stakes Road access.
- Mrs Smees asked which access would be used during construction.
- Mr Smees explained that service access to Fielder Court has been hindered by the parking on Stakes Road.
- Councillor Blackett highlighted that parking is one of the biggest problems in the area.
- Mr Smees said “*[it] would be lovely to see residents rather than commercial outlets*.” He felt this would benefit the existing shops on London Road.
- Mrs Smees enquired what retail units might occupy the commercial space provided by the scheme.
- Mr Smees gave some background to the vacant lot also on London Road. The site was a former garage which was demolished for residential units. Tesco then acquired an interest in the site but pulled out when Morrisons redeveloped the former Leopard pub, further up the road. The site has lain vacant since.
- MW began to conclude the meeting, including providing an explanation of the ongoing consultation process and the public exhibitions to be held in the near future.
- Mrs Smees asked if the on-site lighting would be capped. Mr Smees added that he would not want to see ‘globe lights.’ SP confirmed that lighting would face downwards.
- Mr Smees enquired whether the development would utilise solar panels. MS defined McCarthy & Stone’s commitment to sustainable development and explained that the site would not use photovoltaics, instead favouring air source heat pumps.
- Councillor Blackett reiterated the issue of parking in the area.
- Before leaving, Councillor Blackett offered to assist the team if we should want a notice displayed regarding the public exhibition.

Conclusion

Mr & Mrs Smees seemed supportive in principle to the redevelopment of the site but clearly had reservations regarding issues of parking and the potential impact that traffic and construction would have on them as nearby residents. Councillor Blackett appeared to agree with their concerns over parking.

Meeting 4 – 11:30-12:00: Mr Rick Pheasant (PAWARA)

- MW introduced the team.
- Mr Pheasant introduced himself as the Treasurer for PAWARA. He explained Councillor Hughes would usually attend these meetings in his capacity as Chairman of the association. He stated that his intention was to get an idea of the design and impact of the development and relay this to other association members.
- Mr Pheasant continued, saying that his major concern was with the site opposite – the old Manor Filling Station. He is inclined to look favourably on these proposals as they might encourage someone to develop this *“blight.”* He stated that McCarthy & Stone’s proposals had *“come a little bit out of the blue.”*
- MS talked through the proposals.
- Mr Pheasant enquired whether the development would take dementia sufferers. MS said that it would depend on the severity, as Retirement Living schemes don’t offer the necessary additional care.
- With regard to the commercial units, Mr Pheasant stated that there seemed to be *“more empty shops than open shops in Waterlooville.”* He felt that occupying the proposed commercial units would be a rental charge issue.
- Mr Pheasant asked whether the proposals would encompass all of the businesses currently on the site. MS confirmed.
- PM talked through the site layout, designs and materials.
- Mr Pheasant commented that the scheme looks attractive. He explained that when he heard it was going to be a residential home, he thought it would be a good location for it. However, he has reservations about the commercial units.
- MS said he understood these concerns and McCarthy & Stone would be keen to have these occupied.
- Mr Pheasant acknowledged that the commercial units were close to the bus stops, which would be convenient depending on what they sell.
- Mr Pheasant said that he liked the use of flint and red brick. He felt this would enhance the centre of the village, saying *“what we have at the moment is not exactly an attractive site.”*
- He asked whether McCarthy & Stone would provide any assistance to the current businesses moving down the road. MS confirmed that the deal is with the land owner, not the tenants.
- Mr Pheasant asked if McCarthy & Stone are involved in the development near the roundabout. MS confirmed that they are not.
- MS highlighted the local economic benefits.
- Mr Pheasant enquired whether any information was available online. MS confirmed that it will become available following the public exhibition.
- Mr Pheasant explained that PAWARA grew out of proposals for 5,000 houses nearby. He stated that the development was always going to be built but their influence helped to scale back the development. He stated that with the proposals for Manor House their main concern was the elevations. He asked if there had been any concerns about this. MS explained there had not been any yet.
- AO asked about the publication date of PAWARA’s next newsletter.
- Mr Pheasant stated the next issue would be in around three months. He then asked about the timescale for the proposals.
- Mr Pheasant asked questions regarding the construction impact on the high street and traffic implications. He then asked if we would be retaining the flint wall.
- Mr Pheasant summarised his position saying *“I think in general, we will favour the development. Ideal location.”*

Conclusion

This was a productive and encouraging meeting with Mr Pheasant. He appeared satisfied with the designs and supportive of the proposals. It will be important to continue engagement with PAWARA to ensure they are kept up to date with the proposals and, hopefully, support the scheme as a key consultee. Their newsletter is distributed to around 3,000 local residents and could prove a useful source of publicity if the next publication date coincides with stages of this project.

Meeting 5 – 12:00-12:30: Mr & Mrs Harvey - 28 London Road

- MW introduced the team
- Mr Harvey noted that the flint-work building would be demolished but asked whether the wall would be retained. MS explained that it is proposed that the wall would be retained. He continued to say that, on balance, the site would need to be developed comprehensively and that the benefits of the proposed scheme outweigh the loss of the building.
- Mr Harvey questioned the two access points. MS stated that this was acceptable in planning terms. From a commercial view, London Road is the main road and there would probably be more issues in using Stakes Road.
- Mrs Harvey highlighted that there is free parking on Stakes Road and parking in the area is difficult.
- Mrs Harvey asked whether McCarthy & Stone have approached the hairdressers and beauticians next to the proposed site in regard to purchasing their garden space. The gardens are unkempt and could potentially supply additional parking space.
- Mr Harvey stated that he felt the height of the proposals is *“well disguised.”* Saying that it *“doesn’t look like three storeys.”*
- Mrs Harvey asked if the proposals intended to use flint. PM confirmed.
- Mrs Harvey commented that she thought there would have been more units.
- Mrs Harvey asked who might use the shops.
- Mrs Harvey enquired regarding the provision of social housing. MS explained that due to the nature of these proposals this would be highly unlikely.
- Mr Harvey asked for clarification as to whether there would be residential apartments above the commercial units.
- Mrs Harvey stated she felt there should be some sort of access footpath to the public car park on Parkside Close.
- Mrs Harvey said that some people wouldn’t like the three storeys but noted that any south-facing rooms would have good views.
- Mrs Harvey expressed that she hoped the businesses would be able to relocate.
- MW concluded the meeting with reference to the public exhibition due to be held in the near future.

Conclusion

Mr & Mrs Harvey seemed to express some sentimental views with regard to the loss of the flint-work building and well-established local businesses but were satisfied that the proposals looked to retain the flint wall. In general, they appeared to be quite happy with the designs but drew attention to local issues such as parking and the difficulties faced by local retail businesses.

Meeting 6 – 12:30-13:00: Councillor Robin McIntosh (Hampshire County Council)

- MW introduced the team and asked Councillor McIntosh for his general feelings on development of the site.
- Councillor McIntosh stated that it would depend on the designs, highlighting that the site is currently industrial.
- MS provided an outline of the development and PM elaborated on the design and elevations.

- Councillor McIntosh asked whether the flint-work building would be demolished. He stated that, speaking on behalf of a few local residents, this building was a cornerstone and a prominent part of the village. He felt that we may encounter objections over the loss of this building.
- Councillor McIntosh noted the 35 parking spaces and enquired regarding visitor parking. He explained that parking is a problem in the area and highlighted that London Road is a busy main road. He continued by asking whether there would be more or less traffic coming on to London Road from the new development. MS explained that research suggested there would be less.
- Councillor McIntosh stated that he understood the need to build houses and flats but that they would need to preserve some of the village. He felt the proposed frontage would see objections.
- Councillor McIntosh explained that the nearby small car parks are often full. He did not believe that car ownership would fall and carers and visitors would cause car parking issues.
- Continuing his point, Councillor McIntosh stated that he was disappointed that the proposals are fronting the road, saying that it would have been nicer if an open aspect has been considered.
- With regard to converting commercial to residential, he felt that most people wouldn't have a problem but encouraged the team to keep the 'Old Vicarage.'
- MS explained that the loss of this building was identified as an issue early on but from a commercial and townscape view, it doesn't do all it can.
- With regard to the public exhibition, Councillor McIntosh stated that August was a bad time for consultation.
- Councillor McIntosh highlighted that in order to use the London Road access point the site would need to be approved by the Highways authority.
- MW concluded the meeting.

Conclusion

Councillor McIntosh provided some interesting comments that had not been expressed in the meetings so far. He acknowledged that, at a County level, he would have relatively little say over the proposals. However, Councillor McIntosh is a well-known local figure with close relationships with a number of Borough councillors and residents and will hold significant influence as a result. It was difficult to gauge Councillor McIntosh's attitude toward the proposals. While it seems that he had no objection to the principle of redevelopment there were issues with the design, parking allocation and the loss of local heritage that would prevent him from supporting the project.

Meeting 7 – 14:00-14:30: Mr & Mrs Bennett - 7 London Road

- MW introduced the team
- Mrs Bennett asked whether the 'Old Vicarage' would be retained.
- Mr Bennett stated it would be a shame to lose it, before commenting *"but, progress is progress..."*
- PM talked through the design and layout.
- Mr Bennett enquired regarding access points.
- Mr Bennett asked whether the commercial units would have affordable rent. He drew attention to the fact that chain stores would require deliveries, which could prove problematic for access. MS highlighted that there is a loading bay on the London Road but the commercial units would most likely be occupied by independent retailers.
- Mrs Bennett stated that her main concern was height.
- Mr Bennett said the proposals *"look really nice. Very much in keeping with the area,"* and that he likes the idea of retail. He felt the main problem would be parking.
- Mr Bennett explained that there may be an issue accessing London Road. It is a busy main road. He suggested that the proposals might want to consider a reveal.
- Mrs Bennett asked if the original flint wall would be retained.
- Mr Bennet stated that from their point of view, the proposals are great. He felt that they would improve their aspect.
- Mr Bennett explained that their property has been on the market for four years and they have lost sales due to the current use of the site.
- MS indicated the timeframe of the project.

- Mr Bennett said *"I think it will be a great benefit."*
- MW began concluding the meeting
- Mr Bennett referred back to the loss of the building, stating that it has been *"messed around so much it's lost its character"*
- Mrs Bennett acknowledged the use of flint work.

Conclusion

Mr & Mrs Bennett were very positive about the proposals and seemed pleased with what is proposed. They had a pragmatic attitude toward development and appeared supportive of the scheme.

Meeting 8 – 14:30-15:00: Mr Lovett, Mr Ashbury and Ms B??? – Marrels Wood Gardens

- Before introductions could be made, Mr Lovett asked if the site had been purchased.
- Mr Ashbury stated that he hadn't received a letter.
- Mr Lovett asked about the intentions for the 'Old Vicarage.'
- PM talked through the design and layout.
- Mr Lovett enquired about the size of the roof tiles.
- Ms B??? asked about access points, questioning why the access point on Stakes Road is not the main access.
- Ms B??? stated that she doesn't like the three storey design.
- Mr Lovett stated that he doesn't like the fact the old building is being removed; he is also opposed to the height and access point on London Road.
- Otherwise, Mr Lovett believes the materials are in keeping with the area.
- Ms B?? asked why we don't extend the flint wall.
- Ms B?? stated that she will fight against the three storeys and believes the access point presents a safety issue.
- Mr Ashbury said he was concerned about the loss of business and does not approve of the three storey design.
- Ms B?? said she could foresee problems with the Highways authority. She also highlighted that the site would need decontamination.
- Mr Ashbury asked what sort of retail might occupy the commercial units.
- Mr Lovett stated that if more shops are built, there would be a need for more parking.
- Ms B?? said *"if I'm honest, I don't want it there."*
- Mr Lovett agreed, adding *"what we really want is the other side of the road."*
- Mr Lovett asked if there would be enough parking for residents.
- MW concluded the meeting.

Conclusion

It was evident from the beginning of the meeting that these three residents were opposed to the development and were very blunt about their views. They each objected to the three-storey height of the building as well as expressing concerns over parking and traffic, the loss of business and heritage. Mr Lovett was the only member of the group to express any positives about the site, referring to the use of materials.

Meeting 9 – 15:00-15:30: Mrs Porter – 30 St Johns Avenue - and Mr & Mrs Hoy – 32 Stakes Road

- MW introduced the team.
- Mrs Hoy asked if the development was only apartments. MS confirmed.
- PM talked through the design and layout.
- Mrs Hoy noted that we wouldn't know what the retail units might be yet.
- Mrs Hoy commented that the flint looked *"very nice."* She added that the development *"doesn't sit too high."*

- Mrs Porter asked if we felt this was a good place to have elderly people, noting that the area is “*terribly noisy*.” MS drew attention to the acoustic reduction measures.
- Mrs Hoy commented that the development looked much nicer than Fielder Court.
- Mrs Hoy asked what was to happen to the ‘Old Vicarage.’
- Mr Hoy noted that he had hoped it would stay.
- Mrs Porter commented that it is nice that the designs keep the flint aspect.
- Mr Hoy asked if it was possible to use the main road for the access point, referring to this as a potential highway issue.
- Mrs Hoy enquired about the timescale of the project and rough prices.
- Mrs Porter asked if there would be a residential manager.
- Mrs Porter questioned whether there was a resale clause on the apartment. MS confirmed that this is not the case anymore and the owner would retain equity.
- Mrs Porter commented that she had been pleasantly surprised with the appearance.
- MW began concluding the meeting.
- Mr Hoy stated that his only reservation was the loss of the ‘Old Vicarage.’
- Mrs Hoy commented that she felt that it would be an improvement to the village.

Conclusion

Mr & Mrs Hoy and Mrs Porter seemed very positive about the proposals. They voiced a handful of concerns and potential issues but appeared satisfied with the answers they received.

Meeting 10 – 15:30-16:00: Mr & Mrs Sprake – 3 Parkside Close

- MW introduced the team
- Mr Sprake enquired where delivery access would be.
- Mr Sprake highlighted that the Masonic Centre has a music licence. This mainly caused disruption on weekends; however, the centre is hired out for functions.
- Mr Sprake asked about access points. MS explained. Mr Sprake was accepting of the lower traffic generation.
- MS drew attention to the distance of the building to the residents’ home in comparison to the current site.
- Mr Sprake enquired regarding timescales.
- Mr Sprake asked for confirmation of construction access points.
- Mr Sprake expressed that he had concerns over disruption and looked to clarify in what order the site might be constructed.
- Mr Sprake explained that they are thinking of moving next Spring.
- Mr Sprake stated that, ultimately, the site would be an improvement.

Conclusion

Mr & Mrs Sprake continued the theme of fairly positive feedback received from the local residents. Their concerns were primarily regarding the impact of construction, particularly in light of their intention to move.

Meeting 11 – 16:00-16:10: David Alexander (SIG)

- MW introduced the team.
- Mr Alexander explained that he had been sent to find out more information on the proposals with regard to SIG’s tenancy. He explained that they lease the property from Battman Brothers and this is due to expire 10th January 2016, adding that the landlord can oppose the lease renewal on grounds of development.
- Mr Alexander asked for information regarding timescales. MS confirmed.

Conclusion

As a representative of SIG, it was not necessary to talk Mr Alexander through the proposals. The team answered his questions as best they could but noted that some of the information he was looking for was not yet available or was more likely to be obtained from the landlord or the land team.

Meeting 12 – 16:10-16:30: Mr Coventry (Purbrook Garage Services), Mr Dixon (Purbrook Tyres) and Jackie (Jacqueline's Hair & Nails)

- MW introduced the team
- Mr Coventry stated that he was not happy with the letters that had been sent out. He explained that he has had calls from customers thinking the company is closing and a member of staff hand their notice in.
- Mr Coventry stated the problem is the way in which this has all been handled.
- Mr Dixon enquired regarding the timeframe with regard to their leases.
- Mr Coventry explained that they have tenancy until the end of next year but the landlord won't speak to them.
- Mr Dixon added that they need to speak with the landlord.
- Mr Coventry agreed that they needed to set up a meeting with the landlord.
- Mr Dixon commented that an understanding of what is being done might help to ease their concerns.
- Jackie joins the meeting.
- MS and PM talk through the proposals.
- Mr Dixon asked if we are aware of the number of accidents that have happened from the access point on London Road. He explained that the bus stop impedes visibility.
- Jackie questioned the parking in relation to unit numbers.
- Jackie asked if the retail units would be leased or sold.
- Mr Dixon highlighted that there are problems with parking in the area.
- Mr Coventry noted that the flint building is being demolished.
- Jackie enquired whether Stakes Road could be used as the main access point. She stated that if the access point is from the London Road entrance, something would need to be done to the road. She confirmed that the bus stop used to be at the lay-by.
- Jackie explained that there is no side or back entrance for the shop and asked if it would be possible to have an alleyway or footpath to give her access to the garden, commenting that it would be "a great help!"

Conclusion

Mr Coventry and Mr Dixon were clearly upset with the way they had come to learn that the site was being proposed for redevelopment. They eventually accepted that this was not the fault of our team but that of the landlord. The team have agreed that they will try to open a line of communication for the tenants. Neither of the tenants offered an opinion on the design of the scheme but were helpful in highlighting traffic and parking issues in the area. Jackie contributed to this discussion also but her main concern was that a rival business might occupy one of the commercial units.

Meeting 13 – 16:30-17:00: Stakes Road residents (2 males & 3 females)

- MW introduced the team.
- MS introduced the scheme.
- Male 2 asked what sort of retail units might occupy the commercial space. MS explained this would most likely be independent retailers. Male 1 and Female 1 agreed this was similar to what was already on the high street.
- Female 3 commented that if retail units were introduced there would be a need for shopper parking, before asking how many parking units are supplied for residents.

- Female 1 commented that “if you’re 60, you can still be working.” MS drew attention to this sort of development being a ‘needs based’ accommodation and therefore, this being unlikely for residents.
- PM talked through design and layout.
- Female 2 asked if the flint wall will be retained.
- Female 1 asked if there would be apartments above the commercial units.
- Female 2 enquired whether there would be pedestrian access on Stakes Road.
- MS said that pedestrian entrances would only be accessible by residents of the site.
- Male 2 questioned whether it would be possible to get double yellow lines on Stakes Road.
- Male 1 stated that he would like to keep the wall and that it is nice to see flint in the design, before adding that it was a shame for the current occupiers.
- Female 1 said that she could understand the landlord selling if the site was vacant.
- Female 3 stated that it was possible to build residential units anywhere but not in the middle of the shopping village. She added that there isn’t enough parking as people will still be working and have cars.
- MS highlighted again that this accommodated tends to be ‘needs based’ and that this is unlikely to be the case.
- Female 1 and Female 3 commented that there are already noise complaints from Fielder Court regarding the Masonic Centre. MS confirmed that we had spoken with other residents about this earlier in the day and explained the acoustic reduction measures being taken.
- Female 1 stated that her main concern was with parking and access.
- Male 2 asked for clarification of construction access and parking.
- Male 1 enquired what barrier would be erected between the site and the Masonic Centre.
- MW concluded the meeting.

Conclusion

The Stakes Road residents presented a mix of views but did not seem to either support or object the application. They were primarily concerned with the impact the site would have on their road in terms of access and parking, but also voiced concerns over the character of the area.

Meeting 14 – 17:30-17:30: Councillor Gary Kerrin (Stakes ward)

- Councillor Kerrin did not arrive for his meeting.