

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

28 July 2005

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)

Bennetts (P)

Beveridge (P)

Chapman (P)

Davies (P)

Evans (P)

Jeffs (P)

Johnston (P)

Mitchell (P)

Pearce (P)

Pearson (P)

Read (P)

Saunders (P)

Sutton (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Campbell and Knasel

251. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (BUGLE INN, TWYFORD) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC570 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Bugle Inn, Twyford) Sub-Committee held on 4 July 2005 (attached as Appendix C to the minutes).

The Chairman reported that this item was deferred to allow the Director of Development to advise the Committee at a future meeting on issues relating to highways and conservation.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Bugle Inn, Twyford) Sub-Committee held on 4 July 2005, which recommended deferral of the item for further information, be approved and adopted.

252. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (CHESIL STREET THEATRE, WINCHESTER) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC564 refers)

Councillor Davies declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item as he was a Trustee of the St Johns Winchester Charity, the applicants, and he withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust who had commented on this application, and he spoke and voted thereon.

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Chesil Street Theatre, Winchester) Sub-Committee held on 20 June 2005 (attached as Appendix B to the minutes).

The Director of Development reported that this item was deferred for the reasons as set out in the minutes.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Chesil Street Theatre, Winchester) Sub-Committee held on 20 June 2005, which recommended deferral of the item for further negotiation, be approved and adopted.

253. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC565 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 10 June 2005 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 10 June 2005 be received.

254. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC579 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 8 July 2005 (attached as Appendix D to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 8 July 2005 be received.

255. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**

(Report PDC573 refers)

The Schedule of Development Control decisions arising from the consideration of the above report is circulated separately and forms an appendix to the minutes.

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 12 and 13 as he was a member of the Council of the City of Winchester Trust who had commented on these applications, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Evans declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 20, 21, 22 and 23 as she was a member of Wickham Parish Council, who had made representation on these items, but she was not on the Parish Planning Committee that had considered these applications, and she spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Busher declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 4 as she was personally acquainted with both parties that were supporting and objecting to the application and left the meeting room for consideration of this item.

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 12 and 13 as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust who had commented on these applications, and he spoke and voted thereon.

In the public participation part of the meeting, the following items were discussed:

In respect of items 1 and 2 – West Hoe Farm, West Hoe Lane, Bishops Waltham - Mr H Thomas (architect) spoke in support of the application and against the officers' recommendation for refusal. Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission and listed building consent in respect of items 1 and 2 and delegated authority to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to agree conditions.

In respect of item 4 – 31 Langton Road, Bishops Waltham - Mr Carr spoke in objection to the application and Mrs Gillies (applicant) spoke in support. The Vice-Chairman took the Chair for consideration of this item. Following debate, the Committee approved the application as set out.

In respect of item 5 – Wangfield Nursery, Wangfield Lane, Curdridge - Mr Brett spoke in objection to the application and Mr Bray (agent) spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Knasel (a Ward Member) stated that he supported the views of Mr Brett in objection to the application and that he also spoke on behalf of Curdridge Parish Council who also objected to the application. In summary he stated that the site had generated a considerable amount of enforcement action with the latest Breach of Condition Notice leading to a planning application. The site had now become subject to intensive use which was an unsustainable. The intensification of use had affected the quality of life of residents in the vicinity of the access road, including Mr Brett. Following debate, the Committee supported the application as set out.

In respect of item 9 – Hill Crest, Gordon Road, Curdridge - Mr Whitewick (applicant) spoke in support of the application and against the officers' recommendation for refusal. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Knasel (a Ward Member) stated that he also supported Mr Whitewick's application. Following debate, the Committee approved the application to grant planning permission and delegated authority to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to agree conditions.

In respect of item 11 – The Sawmills, Durley – Mrs Compton spoke in objection to the application, as Trustee of the nearby Thresher Rooms. The Committee took into consideration the objections raised and following debate, in which the Director confirmed that there would be no vehicular access to Gregory Lane from the site, the Committee supported the application as set out.

In respect of item 14 – Land between Arbour Cottage and Tangelwood, Upham – a representative of Upham Parish Council spoke in objection to the application and Mrs Bartlett (an applicant) spoke in support. During debate, Members raised concerns regarding the location of the site, since the majority of the proposed dwelling and all of the proposed garages fell outside the development frontage area as defined in the Revised 2003 Deposit Local Plan. Concerns were also raised regarding the large scale of the proposed dwelling and Members also noted that the red line of the application failed to include access to the property. For these reasons, the Committee agreed that the application should be refused and delegated authority to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to agree reasons.

In respect of items 17 and 18 – Little Croft, Church Street, Upham – Mr Goddard (on behalf of the applicant) and Councillor Knasel (as a Ward Member, but also as a representative of Upham Parish Council and Upham Church Council) spoke in support of the application and against the officers' recommended refusal. Councillor Knasel commented that the majority of the local community had welcomed the proposals as an improvement to the Conservation Area and that the increased on-site car parking would ease street parking outside the church on Sundays. The Director explained that since the publication of the report, a further four letters had been received in support of the application. However, following debate, the Committee agreed with the officers' recommendation to refuse the applications as it would unbalance the appearance of the listed building from the street frontage and that the scale of the proposed extensions would dominate the original building.

In respect of item 19 – Bumble Cottage, 6 Liberty Road, Newtown – Mr Ansari (a neighbour), Mrs Bradbury (a representative of Soberton Parish Council) and Councillor Campbell (as a Ward Member) spoke in objection to the application and Mr Cox (on behalf of the applicant) spoke in support. In summary, Councillor Campbell considered the proposed amendments in the application too slight to warrant approval above the previous application's refusal. She requested that the remaining proposed garage should be removed to reduce massing at the front of the building and commented that the proposed bay-windows at the first floor rear did little to reduce overlooking. Councillor Campbell also underlined that, as the building had been erected 1.8 metres closer to the road than was permitted in the original application, this increased the difficulty for vehicles to turn on-site and ensure that their egress onto Liberty Road was in a forward gear. She considered that this was particularly important given the site's close proximity to a dangerous corner. However, in response, the Director confirmed that Highway Development Control Engineer had demonstrated that it was possible to turn a vehicle within the front of site and that a Highways objection to the application was not sustainable.

During debate, the Chairman reported that she had received a letter of objection to the application from other properties in Liberty Road which, as well as echoing the comments made earlier, proposed that the scheme be refused as the applicant had not submitted a Design Statement. However, in response the Director explained that the submission of Design Statements were usually only required for larger developments.

Following consideration of the concerns raised, the majority of the Committee agreed to approve the recommendation as set out in the report, subject to additional conditions regarding the design of the rear first floor bay windows to ensure that they were not walk-in windows, and that the side panels of these windows should be (in perpetuity) glazed with obscured glass and non-openable, following negotiation with the applicant. The Committee also agreed to a further condition removing permitted development rights to retain control over future changes to the dwelling in the interests of protecting the amenities of neighbours.

In respect of items 20 and 21 – Beechleigh, Southwick Road, Wickham - Mrs Jezeph spoke in support of the application and the Director corrected an inaccuracy in the report by stating that the size of the existing dwelling and extension was 262m² (not 160m²) and that the proposed replacement dwelling would measure 280m² (not 240m²). Following debate, the Committee approved the applications as set out, subject to the above correction.

In respect of item 22 – The Lower House, Winchester Road, Wickham – Mr Taylor (on behalf of the applicant) spoke in support of the application. During debate, the Committee noted an error in the report which required the deletion of the recommendation in bold towards the end of page 196 and the complete deletion of page 197. The Committee agreed to refuse the applications in accordance with the officers' recommendation as set out, subject to the above correction.

In respect of item 24, Braeside, Liberty Road, Newton – Mrs Pritchard (a neighbour) Mrs Bradbury (a representative of Soberton Parish Council) and Councillor Campbell (as a Ward Member) spoke in objection to the application and Mr Denham (on behalf of the applicant) spoke in support. In summary, Councillor Campbell stated that the submitted plans had inadequate details and that procedurally, there had been little opportunity for local residents to comment on the scheme. She also added that the proposed dwellings were too large and out of character with surrounding buildings. In response, the Director confirmed that the opportunity for public comments met the usual statutory requirements and that the application had been considered by this Committee so that it could be decided within the 8 week target set by Government. He also added that whilst the applicant had been requested to submit more detailed plans, he had not done so but those which were submitted were sufficient to determine the application.

The Director stated that following the publication of the report, written objections had been received from Soberton Parish Council and a further nine neighbouring properties. He explained that these raised concerns regarding the need to preserve the character of the area and the gaps between dwellings, in addition to other concerns similar to those recorded in the report. Following debate, the application was granted as set out in the report.

In respect of item 7 - Waterside, Durley Brook Road, Durley, Southampton, which was not subject to public participation, the Committee agreed that informatives be added to the granting of planning permission to relate to drainage.

In respect of items 12 and 13 – The Pightle, Kingsgate Road, Winchester – which was not subject to public participation, the Director corrected an error in the report's summary, in that the officers' recommendation was "to approve" and following debate, the Committee supported the applications as set out.

In respect of item 16 – Land to the rear of Beaconfield, Botley Road, Curbridge – which was not subject to public participation, the Committee agreed the application as set out with an additional amendment, delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman, to ensure the satisfactory disposal of horse manure relating to the proposed stables.

RESOLVED:

1 That the decisions taken on the Development Control Applications as set out in the Schedule which forms an appendix to the minutes be agreed.

2 That in respect of items 1 and 2 – West Hoe Farm, West Hoe Lane, Bishops Waltham authority be delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to agree conditions for the granting of planning permission.

3 That in respect of item 9 – Hill Crest, Gordon Road, Curdrige, authority be delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to agree conditions for the granting of planning permission.

4 That in respect of item 14 – Land between Arbour Cottage and Tanglewood, Upham, that the application be refused for the reasons set out above and against the officers' recommendation in the report.

5 That in respect of item 16 – Land to rear of Beaconfield, Botley Road, Curidge, that authority be delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to agree conditions for the granting of planning permission.

6 That in respect of item 19 – Bumble Cottage, 6 Liberty Road, Newtown, that authority be delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to agree conditions for the granting of planning permission.

256. **BUMBLE COTTAGE, 6 LIBERTY ROAD, NEWTOWN, FAREHAM**
(Report PDC571 refers)

RESOLVED:

That Officers be instructed to review the site no later than one month after the outcome of the current appeal and, should it be necessary in the light of that review, the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to issue an enforcement notice requiring the following steps:

- i) the reconstruction of the Building in accordance with the plan approved under Planning Permission W17401/04 (namely drawing 04.284.02, stamped 9 June 2005) or any such plans subsequently agreed.

257. **AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO A REVISED SECTION 106 LEGAL AGREEMENT FOR LAND AT SOLENT 2, WHITELEY**
(Report PDC577 refers)

RESOLVED:

That authority be given to enter into a revised Section 106 agreement in respect of the greenway and electricity cable at Solent 2, Whiteley, on terms to be agreed by the City Secretary and Solicitor (including the revocation of the existing supplemental agreement).

258. **PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS**
(Report PDC576 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

259. **Ms EMMA NORGATE**

The Committee noted that this meeting would be the last attended by the Senior Planning Officer, Ms Emma Norgate. The Committee unanimously thanked Ms Norgate for her expert contributions and assistance and wished her good luck in her new post working for a private planning consultancy in Bristol.

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 9.00pm

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE10 June 2005Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Busher (P)
Davies (P)
Pearson (P)Read (P)
Sutton(P)Officers in attendance:

Mrs J Pinnock (Senior Planning Officer)

260. INSTALLATION OF 15 METRE MONOPOLE WITH 6 NO. ANTENNAE, 2 NO. MICROWAVE DISHES, EQUIPMENT CABINETS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS (RESUBMISSION OF W01549/08) – MAYBUSH, OLIVERS BATTERY GARDENS, OLIVERS BATTERY, WINCHESTER

The Sub-Committee met at the application site at land at Maybush, Olivers Battery, Winchester.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Hewat, from the applicant's agent, Waldon Telecommunications. Also present was Mr Sharman from Olivers Battery Parish Council and three local residents.

The application site was accessed via Olivers Battery Gardens and formed agricultural land associated with the residential dwelling 'Maybush'. The site already contained 2 existing masts. The mast was to be located to the rear of a field close to trees and it was noted that the proposal was to be approximately one metre higher than the existing masts.

Mrs Pinnock explained that a full planning application had been received from Vodafone UK for the erection of a 15 metre high monopole with 6 antennae (of which 3 would be intended for implementation on the mast in the future), 2 microwave dishes together with two small equipment cabinets and associated works. The proposal was to be housed in a compound measuring approximately 4.2 metres x 3 metres and to be enclosed by a 1.8 metre chain-link fence topped with barbed wire. The total height of the mast, including antennae, would be 17.7 metres.

Mrs Pinnock demonstrated the exact positioning of the proposal and advised that it was adjacent to a public right of way. The mast would also be approximately 200 metres away from Olivers Battery Primary School to the north west. To the west of the site were South View Park Homes. To the west and north of the site were residential properties in Olivers Battery. Mrs Pinnock reported that the mast would be visible from views from the south including from Badger Farm Road, especially in the winter when tree cover was limited.

Mrs Pinnock detailed the planning history for telecommunications equipment at this site in the context of this application. It was explained that the proposal was a resubmission of an application for a 16 metre high cypress tree style mast considered by Members on 7 January 2005. Although planning permission had been granted, this was on condition that the mast should be for a pine tree style as this was more suitable in this area. However, since this time, the operator had discovered that for operational reasons this could not be achieved and they had therefore resubmitted the application, slightly moderated, for a monopole.

Mrs Pinnock reported that the application was in accordance with national and local planning policies and that the applicant had submitted certification of ICNIRP compliance for the cumulative effect of the masts on this site.

Mrs Pinnock reported on representations received and consultations undertaken. The Council's landscape architect had made no objection although suggested that the monopole should be painted 'Van Dyke Brown'. The County Council's Rights of Way Officer had no concerns. Olivers Battery Primary School had been informed of the proposals but had not responded. Three letters of representation had been received from local residents. Two of the letters detailed objections including visual intrusion, industrialisation of the site and health concerns while one letter was in support of the proposals. At the conclusion of her presentation, Mrs Pinnock stated that officers considered that the proposed mast would not be excessively visually intrusive as it would be viewed against the existing tree line and therefore recommended that the application be approved.

With the permission of the Chairman, Mr Sharman (representing Olivers Battery Parish Council) advised that the Parish Council considered that this was the best site for the location of a new mast.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Hewat responded to technical questions including the direction of the dishes to gain the required coverage. Furthermore, he clarified that the positioning of the monopole would not damage the root systems of nearby trees.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr and Mrs Bristow and Mr Shackleton (residents of Olivers Battery) addressed the Sub Committee. Mr and Mrs Bristow were opposed to the application as they considered that it would be visually intrusive and that there was too many masts at this site. Responding to a question, Mr Hewat advised that only 3 antennae and 1 dish would be implemented initially, the remainder at a future date. He also explained why alternative sites outside of this area would not be suitable to gain the coverage required. Mr Hewat also confirmed that the proposal was intended to improve coverage to areas of Winchester including the Olivers Battery area.

Following discussion, Members agreed that landscaping of the proposals should include a planting condition and that the proposed chain link fence be replaced with a wooden fence. Members also raised concerns over the use of Van Dyke Brown at this location given the greener colouring of the two existing masts. It was agreed that negotiations regarding landscape and boundary treatment and the colouring of the mast, be delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman. In conclusion, the Sub-Committee unanimously agreed to support the recommendations of officers, subject to these negotiations. Subsequent to the meeting the Chairman in consultation with the Director of Development agreed to the conditions as set out below.

RESOLVED:

THAT PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:-

01 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.

01 Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

02 The mast, antennae, satellite dish and equipment cabins shall be painted a suitable dark green colour to be agreed in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

02 Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.

03 A detailed scheme for landscaping, tree and/or shrub planting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The scheme shall specify species, density, planting, size and layout. The scheme approved shall be carried out in the first planting season following the occupation of the building or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. If within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, any trees, shrubs or plants die, are removed or, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or defective, others of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, in the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

03 Reason: To improve the appearance of the site in the interests of visual amenity.

04 No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, design and materials of the boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall comprise a timber fence, which shall be erected upon completion of the development hereby approved. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

04 Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

Informatives

01. This permission is granted for the following reasons:

The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

02. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: TC1

Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: FS.4, EN.5

Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit:
DP.3, DP.17

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 10.15am.

Chairman

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (CHESIL STREET THEATRE, WINCHESTER)
SUB-COMMITTEE****20 June 2005**1 **Attendance:**

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)

Bennetts (P)

De Peyer (P)

Evans (P)

Mitchell (P)

Read (P)

Saunders

Sutton (P)

Deputy Members in Attendance:

Councillor Chapman (Standing Deputy for Councillor Saunders)

Officers in Attendance:

Mr D Dimon: Acting Planning Team Manager

Mrs E Patterson: Principal Planning Officer

Ms T Matthews: Sites and Monuments Officer

Mr R MacCulloch: Conservation Officer

261 **RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND EXTENSION TO BIRD IN HAND ACTIVITY
CENTRE, 14 CHESIL STREET AND CHESIL STREET THEATRE, WINCHESTER.**
(Report PDC556 refers)

The Sub-Committee met at the Guildhall, Winchester. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting five representatives of the applicants (St Johns Charity and the Chesil Street Theatre) and as well as five local residents.

The proposals contained three applications – listed building consent for internal alterations in the Grade II* listed Chesil Theatre building (including the creation of a new opening in a medieval wall); conservation area consent for the demolition of Nos 14, 16, 18 and 20 Chesil Street; and permission to erect five terrace dwellings with a flat over a new extension to the Chesil Theatre building.

A previous application for the site had been considered by the Sub-Committee on 29 September 2004. Mrs Patterson explained that the latest application contained amendments to the 2004 application including a revised elevation to Chesil Street and the introduction of a “jetty” at the second floor level from these buildings on Chesil Street towards the builder’s yard. Following Members’ comments at the previous Sub-Committee, the design of the dwellings’ roof terrace had also been amended to prevent overlooking into the neighbouring Watersmeet Residential Care Home. Therefore the 1.1metre high stainless steel balcony had been moved away from the building’s edge.

Mrs Patterson reported that subsequent to the publication of the report, further representations had been received from the City of Winchester Trust who welcomed the scheme, its joint approach between the applicants and the daytime access to the bridge.

The Sub-Committee also noted a letter dated 25 May 2005 from Mr Collins who owned the builder's yard that was not included in the application site. In this letter, Mr Collins objected to the application as the proposed buildings and proposed trees were too close to his boundary, that there would be poor egress onto Chesil Street, that the appearance of the design was awkward and that there were errors in the plans.

Following on from Mr Collins' comments, Mr Jackson (the Director of St Johns Charity) explained that Mr Collins had recently accepted an offer for his land from the applicants, subject to contract. The Sub-Committee acknowledged that if this was to proceed, the availability of this land was likely to result in the submission of a further amended (and significantly improved) application. Although Members were minded to deal with the application before them, the debate concentrated on those aspects that would be unaffected by the availability of Mr Collins' land.

In response to a Member's question, Mr MacCullagh clarified that the positioning of the proposed residential development at right-angles to Chesil Street would be detrimental to the street's medieval and meandering character.

During discussion on the proposed alterations to the walls of the listed building, Mr MacCullagh reported that there had been no historical assessment submitted with the application. He added that whilst the proposed entrance was compliant with the Disability Discrimination Act, he suggested that the new entrance would be better located through the tower. However a representative of the applicant stated that English Heritage had recently visited the site and had agreed that in order to adapt the building to its current use, it was necessary to create the new entrance through the listed wall. Following debate in which some Members raised no objection to the new entrance, the Chairman requested that English Heritage's consultation be presented in writing to the next Committee.

During discussion, Mrs Patterson clarified Members' questions regarding the plans published in the report. It was noted that there were errors in the plans regarding the roof of the residential building's staircase (and the applicant explained that a similar design had been used at the 1984 re-development of The Dolphin, High Street, Winchester) and the ridge height measurements.

Members considered the new refectory, caretaker's flat and hall to the rear of the theatre and it was noted that the hall was likely to have a variety uses, including a day centre for the St Johns Charity and as a rehearsal room for the theatre.

The application included a bridge across the River Itchen from the St Johns Charity site at the Weirs to the rear of the application site. Mrs Patterson explained that an amendment was required to ensure that both sides of the river were included within the application's red-line and that a Section 106 Legal Agreement was required to cover access to the bridge. During discussion, Members noted that the bridge would be gated to allow daytime access only and that a brick and flint wall would be erected on the Chesil Street bank. Members also noted that the Environment Agency had independently contacted the applicant regarding the bridge and location of the proposed refectory. Members requested that officers monitor the outcome of these negotiations.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a member of the public questioned what she considered to be a compromised fire escape from Watersmeet (the adjacent residential buildings) as a result of the development and Mrs Patterson confirmed this was a Building Regulations matter.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Members welcomed the principle of the development and did not object to the alterations to the listed building. However, some Members had concerns regarding the bulk of the proposed buildings and the modern design of the new dwellings in comparison to its neighbouring properties. Notwithstanding this, it was agreed that the application be deferred for further negotiation (pending the possibility of including Mr Collins' land within the application) and to receive comments from the Environment Agency.

RESOLVED:

That the application be deferred for further negotiation (pending the possibility of including Mr Collins' land within the application) and to receive comments from the Environment Agency.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 11.10am.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (BUGLE INN, TWYFORD) SUB-COMMITTEE**4 July 2005**Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Bennetts (P)
Beveridge (P)
Davies (P)
Johnston (P)Read (P)
Pearson (P)
Saunders (P)
Sutton (P)Others in Attendance who Addressed the meeting:

Councillors Bidgood and Wagner

Officers in Attendance:Mr D Dimon: Acting Planning Team Manager
Mrs J Pinnock: Senior Planning Officer
Ms C Hollis: Assistant Traffic Engineer
Mr N Culhane: Engineer
Mrs H Brushett: Conservation Officer

262. **THE BUGLE INN, PARK LANE, TWYFORD, WINCHESTER – ERECTION OF 2 NO. TWO BEDROOM AND 2 NO. THREE BEDROOM DWELLINGS; ALTERATIONS TO OUTBUILDING, DEMOLITION OF TOILET BLOCK, INTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO PROVIDE TOILETS AND LARGER KITCHEN; ALTERATIONS TO ACCESS – PLANNING REFERENCE W03580/07**
(Report PDC568 refers)

The Sub-Committee met at the Guildhall, Winchester. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately 17 members of the public and Mr Davies and Mr Smith on behalf of the applicant, Intown Pub Company Ltd.

The application sought permission for the erection of 2 no. two bedroom and 2 no. three bedroom dwellings on the car park in front of the Bugle Inn, Twyford. The scheme also proposed internal alterations to the public house (to provide toilets and a larger kitchen) and alterations to the outbuilding, car park and access.

The proposed terraced dwellings

Mr Smith explained that the design and location of the four terraced houses onto High Street, Twyford had followed officer advice. He suggested that the buildings would restore the historical street frontage and make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area.

The style and the materials proposed for the new terraces reflected surrounding buildings, with natural slate and clay tiles. Mr Smith added that the materials and style of the proposed brick work could be controlled by condition. The dwellings would feature chimneys and dormer windows and had a ridge height of 8.2 metres.

Members discussed the size of the proposed dwellings and Mrs Pinnock explained that the 4 bedrooms were more likely to be used as 3 bedroom properties with a small box room.

Members were concerned that, as the proposed dwellings fronted onto the busy High Street and backed onto a public house car park, the occupiers of the new dwellings would have little opportunity to open their windows without noise nuisance. Mrs Pinnock explained that the applicant had submitted an acoustic report which had been assessed by the Council's Environmental Protection Team, who confirmed that the report met the assessment standard. However they recommended a condition to ensure acoustic glazing be used in accordance with a scheme to be first approved by the Council. Mr Smith added that the dwellings would be designed with a "total refreshment system" to ensure good circulation of air without the need to open windows.

Highways Issues

The Sub-Committee noted that there was difference in opinion between Engineers and Planning Officers regarding the highway issues of the site. Mr Culhane had raised a highways objection to the application which the Planning Officers thought would not be sustainable at an appeal.

Mr Culhane explained that part of his objection to the scheme centred on the applicant's failure to demonstrate the adequacy of the proposed access into the site from Park Lane, which passed through the existing aperture of the Coach House. He added that the tight nature of the car parking area made it particularly difficult for large vehicles to turn on site, and that on leaving, they would therefore be forced to reverse out onto Park Lane.

Members discussed whether a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) along Park Lane would help alleviate parking problems in the area and improve access to the site. In response, Ms Hollis explained that a TRO could not be imposed as part of a planning condition, that the TRO process took on average 6-9 months to implement and that a TRO was likely to generate significant opposition from local residents in Park Lane. Ms Hollis added that a TRO was unlikely to significantly improve the ability of large vehicles to swing into the site through the Coach House, given that Park Lane had only an approximate width of 5.5 metres.

However, in response, Mr Smith stated that there were many public houses operated by the Inntown Pub Company Ltd that had restricted on-site access. He added that most of the suppliers would use small, flat-bed Transit style vehicles that could easily access the site through the Coach House. Members also noted that the applicant was willing to enter into a legal agreement prohibiting the use of larger vehicles servicing the public house.

During discussion, Mr Davies confirmed that the developer had proposed to install electronic bollards to protect residents' parking bays and Mr Culhane advised that the parking standard for the public house included staff parking.

Mr Davies explained that the applicant had considered increasing the aperture of the Coach House but during discussion, Mrs Brushett stated that views of this building would remain from Park Lane and that there would still be highways objections to the proposals even if this building was altered.

The Sub-Committee also discussed the 1 in 20 gradient of part of the site and although it was confirmed that the access through the Coach House would be flat, Members requested further detailed information in this regard.

Members questioned the proposed location of the disabled parking bay in the scheme and Mrs Pinnock stated that its position had been selected as it was nearest to the public house. At the invitation of the Chairman a member of the public stated that, primarily because of its slope, the disabled car parking space did not comply with the Disability Discrimination Act.

The Bugle Inn

The Sub-Committee discussed the internal changes to the public house. In summary, it was proposed to bring the toilet facilities inside the public house and that the kitchen would be enlarged by taking some space from the restaurant area. The refurbishments were necessary to comply with the Disability Discrimination Act.

Some Members were concerned that the public house had no garden and would therefore have limited opportunities to provide children's facilities.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a representative of the Save The Bugle Inn Action Group spoke against the application. He raised concerns regarding the future viability of the public house since the proposed terrace of housing to the front would partially obscure the Inn from potential passing trade. He added that as a large number of the Inn's patrons came from surrounding villages the reduction in the number of car parking spaces would further damage its viability.

In response to these concerns, Mr Davies reported that following its refurbishment, a new tenant would be managing the public house from September 2005. Mrs Pinnock highlighted to Members the officers' recommendation to require the applicant to enter into a legal agreement to ensure that none of the new dwellings should be occupied until the public house had been refurbished and opened to the public.

Other Issues

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Bidgood (as a Ward Member) commented on the application. Members noted that, as the property was not listed, the applicant could make internal alterations to the public house without requiring planning consent.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Wagner (as a Ward Member) commented on the site's gradient and that the proposed terrace of housing would obscure views of the public house. He added that the poor access to the site was made worse by drivers' inability to see if all the car parking spaces were full without first turning into the site.

Mrs Pinnock explained that officers did not consider that the public house would be obscured from public view, and that cars would access the car park and if full, turn within the car park and exit the site in a forward gear.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a number of the members of public present spoke in opposition to the scheme, including representatives of Twyford Parish Council and the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) and it was noted that more than 700 letters of objection had been submitted to the planning authority. During discussion, many local people did not consider the car park in front of the public house to be an “unattractive gap” as stated in the report and instead commented that the proposals would not enhance the character of the area. In summary, several of those who spoke recommended that the application be amended to reduce the number of proposed dwellings to two, which would allow access from the High Street without use of the Coach House.

Other concerns raised included the possibility of increased parking congestion along Park Lane as many of the existing properties had no off-street parking. Members also noted that Park Lane had no pavement and yet was frequently used by people visiting the nearby Hunters Park. In addition to its patrons, the Bugle Inn car park was also used by customers of the nearby shops, as Twyford had no public car park.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a member of the public (Mr Barlow) illustrated a photograph of the Bugle Inn taken during the First World War which showed the open space in front of the public house. However, in response Mrs Brushett showed Members the historic maps dating from 1843 which demonstrated that there had been a development frontage to the site.

Conclusion

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chairman summarised the concerns of the Members which principally related to the highways issues, the location of the disabled parking and the site’s gradient.

No formal recommendation was made, although the majority of Members made it clear that they would recommend refusal on the application as it stood. The Sub-Committee asked the applicant to submit further information on highway issues, including the swept path, levels and cross sections through the site which would be considered at the next Planning Development Control Committee.

However, whilst some Members raised no objection to the principle of developing a frontage onto the High Street, the Sub-Committee was unanimous in voicing its support that the public house should remain open to the public.

RECOMMENDED:

That the application be deferred for further information as outlined above.

The meeting commenced at 11.00am and concluded at 1.15pm.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE8 July 2005Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Davies (P)
Johnston (P)
Pearson (P)Read (P)
Sutton(P)Officers in attendance:

Miss E Norgate (Principal Planning Officer)

263. INSTALLATION OF 15 METRE TELECOMMUNICATION MONOPOLE WITH THREE ANTENNAE, RADIO EQUIPMENT HOUSING AND ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT – OPPOSITE ENTRANCE TO SOUTH WINCHESTER GOLF CLUB, ROMSEY ROAD, PITT, NEAR WINCHESTER

The Sub-Committee met at the application site at land on the verge of the A3090 opposite to the entrance to South Winchester Golf Club, Romsey Road, Pitt, near Winchester.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Ms Marsden from AWA Telecommunications on behalf of the applicant Hutchinson 3G (UK). Also present was Mr Stickland from Hursley Parish Council.

A demonstration mast raised to the height of 15 metres was observed from the road verge and from the entrance to South Winchester Golf Club located opposite.

Miss Norgate explained that a prior notification application had been received from Hutchinson 3G (UK) for the erection of a 15 metre high telecommunications tower with associated equipment. This was to be the total height, including both antennae.

Following questions, she confirmed that an area of 'grasscrete' was to be set out measuring 2.2 metres x 7.8 metres so as to allow access to the proposals. There were to be 3 cabinets, the highest being 1.49 metres. There was to be no boundary treatment.

Miss Norgate reported that the application was in accordance with national and local planning policies and that the applicant had submitted certification of ICNIRP compliance. In drawing Members' attention to the representations made regarding the proposals as set out in the report, Miss Norgate advised that the Council's Landscape Architect had now commented on the application. It was considered that the proposals would be visually intrusive in what was an Area of Special Landscape Quality (ASLQ) and therefore recommended refusal of the application.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms Marsden addressed the Sub-Committee. Responding to questions, she detailed alternative sites considered and why these had been rejected and explained that the mast was required to be 15 metres high due to the elevation of the area.

With the permission of the Chairman, Mr Stickland (representing Hursley Parish Council) addressed the Sub-Committee. He reiterated the Parish Council's opposition to the application on the grounds of its prominence and that the sharing of masts elsewhere in the vicinity should be undertaken.

In determining the application, Members acknowledged the comments of the landscape architect. However, after taking into account the positioning of the structure within the context of nearby power-lines and the filling station, on balance the majority of Members agreed to support the application. In making its decision, the Sub-Committee took into consideration that it would be preferable for a single mast to be located on the road side than on potentially more intrusive sites elsewhere within the vicinity, although the Sub-Committee did not wish the granting of planning permission to set a precedent for such a sensitive area. It was agreed that negotiations regarding the colouring of the mast be delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman.

RESOLVED:

That subject to authority being delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to determine the colouring of the mast, no objection be raised to the siting and appearance of the tower and ancillary equipment.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 10.15am.