

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**16 February 2006**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)

Bennetts (P)

Beveridge (P)

Chapman

Davies (P)

Evans (P)

Jefferies (P)

Johnston

Mitchell (P)

Pearce (P)

Pearson (P)

Read (P)

Saunders (P)

Sutton (P)

Deputy Members in attendance:

Councillor Bidgood (Standing Deputy for Councillor Johnston)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Wagner and Wright

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Tait

---

1. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**  
(Report PDC615 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 Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 2, as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust which had commented on the application and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Bidgood declared a personal and prejudicial interest respect of item 6, as he had objected to the application, which was adjacent to his property. Councillor Bidgood withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of this item.

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 2, as he was a member of the Council of the City of Winchester Trust which had commented on the application and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Sutton declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 6, as she was a member of Colden Common Parish Council which had commented on the application. Councillor Sutton had taken no part in the Parish Council's discussion on the application, and she spoke and voted thereon.

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

In respect of item 1 – Wallers Ash Tunnel, Alresford Drove, South Wonston – Mr Partridge and Mr Parker spoke in support of the application and Councillor Wright, a Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor Wright declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in this item as a member of the Clay Pigeon Shooting Association and as a resident who lived approximately 1.5 kilometres from the application site.

The Director of Development highlighted to the Committee an error in the Report (the officers' recommendation should have read to "Refuse") and that this was corrected in a supplementary report. The principal reason for the recommendation to refuse was because of the significant number of heavy goods vehicles travelling along the unmade Alresford Drove that were needed to transport material to construct large bunds around the shooting area and that these movements could continue for up to four years. However, the Director advised that after the publication of the Report, the County Council's Rights of Way Officer had withdrawn their objection to the application. He therefore advised that the application be deferred to further investigate why this objection had been withdrawn, and following debate, this was agreed by the Committee.

In respect of item 3 – 13 Little Mead, Denmead - Mr Powell spoke in objection to the application. Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission and delegated authority to the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman, to agree an additional condition to ensure that obscured glazing be used in the first floor rear bathroom window of the proposed dwelling, to reduce the potential overlooking of neighbouring gardens.

In respect of item 4 – Norton Manor, Bullington Road, Norton - Mr Crooks, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application. Councillor Wright, a Ward Member, also spoke in support of the application. In summary, Councillor Wright explained that the proposals were supported by the local community (including Wonston Parish Council) as they would enhance the facilities available to the public and would help the local economy. During debate, the Director corrected an error in the report at page 38, Condition 11 which should have read: "existing vehicular access on the *western* boundary." Members considered the proposed landscaping, drainage, contribution to public transport services, restoration and improvement of the setting of the historical buildings, concerns about lighting and the lake and boat house (which, it was noted, did not form part of the application). Following debate, the Committee resolved to grant planning permission as set out.

In respect of item 5 – Land Rear of Silver Birches, Botley Road, Curdridge – Mr Wyath spoke in objection to the application and Mr Hecks (on behalf of the applicant) spoke in support. The Director explained that subsequent to the publication of the Report, the applicant had submitted statutory declarations which stated that construction work on the dwelling that was granted permission in 1988/1992 had begun before the permission expired in 1994. It was noted that this proposal was a stand alone application (not a renewal) and that the planning policies of both the statutory and emerging Local Plans restricted housing development in the countryside and that these policies did not support, in principle, the development of this site. However, the history of the land was relevant as the principle of development had already been established on the site (which was formerly a builder's yard). Residential permissions had been granted in order to facilitate the relocation of the

yard and one dwelling (Woodside) had already been built. It was likely, although not certain, that the construction on the approved dwelling could, in effect, resume at any time. The City Secretary and Solicitor advised that the historic use as a builder's yard had been abandoned and the previous permission could be relied upon if works had commenced in time and any relevant planning conditions had been discharged. The current application replaced the dwelling, for which permission had been previously granted, with a larger dwelling of a different design. Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission and delegated authority to the Director of Development to agree necessary landscaping conditions in response to Members' comments.

In respect of item 6 - Pippins, 66 Church Lane, Colden Common – Mr Middleton spoke in objection to the application. Councillor Wagner, a Ward Member, also spoke in objection to the application. In summary, Councillor Wagner questioned why a similar application for a rear extension had been refused at a neighbouring property, 73 Church Lane, whilst this application was recommended for approval. In response, the Director stated that all applications were determined on their individual merits and that the application at 73 Church Lane had been refused principally as the extension would be, by virtue of the property's location on the corner of Church Lane and Brickmakers Road, detrimental to the public realm and the character of the area. By contrast, the Pippins application could only be glimpsed from public realm through gaps between dwellings. Following debate in which the Committee considered overlooking and the bulk of the extension, the majority of the Committee resolved to grant the application as set out.

#### 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 item 1 – Wallers Ash Tunnel, Alresford Drove, South Wonston – the application be deferred to further investigate why the objection by the County Council's Rights of Way Officer had been withdrawn.

3 That in respect of item 3 – 13 Little Mead, Denmead, planning permission be granted and authority be delegated to the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman, to agree necessary conditions to ensure obscured glazing be used in the first floor rear window to reduce the potential for overlooking.

4 That in respect of item 5 – Land Rear of Silver Birches, Botley Road, Curdrige – planning permission be granted and authority be delegated to the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman, to agree necessary landscaping conditions.

2. **MINUTES OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE HELD ON 20 JANUARY 2006**

(Report PDC614 refers)

The Committee received the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 20 January 2006 (attached as Appendix B to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 20 January 2006 be received.

3. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC612 refers)

The minutes of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 10 January 2006 had been previously approved at the meeting of the Committee held on 2 February 2006 (Minute 772 refers), but had been omitted as an Appendix to those Minutes in the Council Minute Book dated 23 February 2006. The Minutes are therefore attached as Appendix A to these minutes.

The meeting commenced at 9.30 am and concluded at 1.20 pm.

Chairman