

Houghton, Michelle

From: Richard Osborn <RichardO@pro-vision.co.uk>
Sent: 21 March 2022 10:35
To: Eaves, David
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: APP/21/00678 Land W of Havant Crematorium, Bartons Rd
Attachments: SC_HBC_Letter of Support 2022 03 15.pdf

CAUTION: This email came from outside of the council - only open links and attachments that you're expecting.

Hi David

I write further to my letter of 21/2 and our subsequent telephone conversation of 4/3 during which we discussed the current RM application and the Council's position. My apologies for not writing sooner.

You advised that whilst you are always open to continuing the dialogue regarding the proposals, you do not see the merit in meeting until there is some meaningful change from Redrow regarding the eastern part of the layout.

We also touched on the status of the (soon to be withdrawn) draft Local Plan and the impact this might have on the RM proposals. You emphasised the need for good place-making and confirmed that you do not expect the layout concerns to fall away with the draft Local Plan. Consequently, you advised that you are reluctant to recommend the current layout to Members.

I have since spoken with Redrow Homes.

They are in agreement with the need for good place-making which is at the heart of their company ethos. There is, however, some concern over the Council's position on the layout.

Redrow were contractually obliged to agree the draft proposals with the crematorium prior to submission. Nevertheless, Redrow has listened to the Council's concerns and worked hard to address them. The layout has been amended to include a more significant landscape buffer. However, the Council continues to express concerns regarding the relationship between the development and the crematorium access, despite no objections from the crematorium.

Redrow has recently met with the operator of the crematorium (Southern Co-operative Ltd) again to discuss the Council's concerns. I attach a letter from the operator confirming their support for the current RM proposals. Redrow are therefore unclear why this issue appears to be becoming a determinative issue.

Importantly, the land was purchased at a price based on the layout originally agreed with the crematorium. The layout has been amended to try and accommodate the Council's concerns, but any further changes (along the lines of the suggestions in our meeting) could have a detrimental effect on the overall viability of the scheme.

Accordingly, the applicant notes that:

1. they have made a commitment to delivering the strategic cycle route along Bartons Road, despite this not being a clear requirement of the OPP;
2. the required mix cannot be enforced – it is not a reserved matter – it should have been specified in the OPP;
3. the proposed mix has been evidenced by a report on the local market;
4. there are no other outstanding RM issues;
5. the emerging Local Plan is to be withdrawn;
6. the LPA has scored less than 75% on the housing delivery test; and
7. the adopted local plan is out of date and hence NPPF paragraph 11(d) is engaged; and
8. delivery will commence without delay, and hence the proposals will make a valuable contribution to the local housing land supply;

As the Council itself points out in its Planning Policy Committee report^[1] to Full Council on 16/3:

"In the absence of a five-year housing land supply and in the context of the Council's Housing Delivery Test measurement (74%), the 'tilted balance' under paragraph 11d) of the NPPF is engaged. In these circumstances, the policies most important for

determining the application are considered out of date. **This means granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits** (emphasis added), when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.”

Officer’s advice to Full Council is that the need to boost the supply of housing and the tilted balance should be afforded substantial weight in the planning balance.

Unless the Council can evidence sufficient harm to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits – which we don’t consider it can – Redrow are struggling to understand (or agree with) the Council’s position.

Redrow are committed to delivering these homes without delay and hence would like a determination as soon as possible. If the Council consider that this RM application must be considered by Members, we look forward to hearing your response as a matter of urgency along with confirmation that it will be on the Agenda for the 28/4 Committee.

In the meantime, the following amended plans to support information submitted to address conditions #7 & #34 (landscape buffer), and condition #29 (space standards) can be found here

- JSL3850_100Q_Landscape Masterplan
- JSL3850_105J_Site Entrance
- JSL3850_401B_Cross Section
- JSL3850_501H_Software Proposals_1 of 3
- JSL3850_502H_Software Proposals_2 of 3
- JSL3850_503L_Software Proposals_3 of 3
- HT.MARO.p E_Marlow floorplans
- HT.WINS.p D_Windsor floorplans

I look forward to hearing from you.

With thanks

Richard

Richard Osborn BA (Hons) | T 01962 677 044
Associate Director



THE LODGE, HIGHCROFT ROAD, WINCHESTER, SO22 5GU

www.pro-vision.co.uk

Information for visiting our office

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are privileged and confidential (within the meaning of applicable law) and are intended solely for the use of the individual to whom they are addressed. Unauthorised dissemination, distribution, publication or copying of this e-mail is prohibited. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify admin@pro-vision.co.uk or telephone 01962 677 044 and delete it from your system. Whilst every endeavour is taken to ensure that our e-mails do not contain viruses, no liability can be accepted and the recipient should use their own virus checking software.
PV PROJECTS LTD - UK Registered Office - The Lodge, Highcroft Road, Winchester, SO22 5GU Reg No. 03296321

[1] Paragraph 5.23