

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**21 December 2006**

Attendance:

Councillors:

	Jefferies (Chairman)	
	Read (Vice Chairman in the Chair) (P)	
Baxter (P)		Johnston (P)
Bennetts (P)		Lipscomb (P)
Beveridge (P)		Ruffell (P)
Busher (P)		Saunders (P)
de Peyer (P)		Sutton (P)
Evans		
Huxstep (P)		

Deputy Members in Attendance:

Councillor Higgins (Standing Deputy for Councillor Evans)  
Councillor Pearson (Standing Deputy for Councillor Jeffers)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Collin, Spender, and Verney

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Cook

---

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Evans and Jeffers.

2. **APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN**

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Baxter be appointed Vice Chairman for this meeting.

3. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**

(Report PDC661 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 4 (Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd, Badger Farm Road, Winchester) as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on the application, and he spoke and voted thereon.

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

Item 1 – Old Park Wood Industrial Estate, Old Park Road, Bishops Sutton – Case Number: 06/02931/FUL

Mr Carey-Thomas (agent) and Councillor Verney (Ward Member) spoke in support of the application.

In summary, Councillor Verney explained that the proposal was a good opportunity to improve the site and had therefore been welcomed by the local community and the Parish Council. He added that the proposal should reduce the amount of traffic and particularly heavy goods vehicles that used the surrounding narrow country lanes. Councillor Verney also recommended that the Committee visit the site to assess the application in greater detail.

In discussing the points raised by Councillor Verney, the Committee noted that the applicant's claim that the proposal would lead to a reduction in traffic levels was based on a comparison between the proposed development and the amount of traffic that could be generated from the full occupation of the current buildings. However, the Director of Development explained that the Council's assessment of the traffic impact of the proposal was that traffic levels would increase, as it was unlikely that full occupation of the current buildings would be achieved. He added that, whilst the environmentally friendly aspects of the application (such as its low carbon footprint features) were commendable, its rural location and its lack of nearby facilities made it unsustainable and inappropriate for development.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application for the reasons set out in the schedule.

Item 2 – 10 Berewecke Way, Winchester – Case Number 06/03179/FUL

Mr Selmon spoke in objection to the application and Mrs Showell (applicant) spoke in support.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant Planning Permission as set out in the Schedule.

Item 3 – Land at Wickham Holt, Wickham – Case Number 06/03188/FUL

Mr McGarry and Mr Carter (Wickham Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Mr Harris (agent) spoke in support.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to defer the application to allow for further negotiation between officers and the applicant. The Committee advised that these negotiations should be based on reducing further the size of the garage which served Plot 3, so as to reduce its impact on the neighbouring property (Lower Wickham Lodge) and as an attempt to retain as many trees on the site as possible.

Item 4 – Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd, Badger Farm, Winchester – Case Number 06/03160/AVC

Mrs Scammell and Councillors Spender and Collin (as Ward Members) spoke in objection to the application and Mr Lowin (agent) spoke in support.

In summary, Councillor Spender questioned the need for the proposed enlarged sign for the store and stated that it would have a negative impact on the character of the area and the amenity of nearby residents. He added that the illumination of the sign would further add to its intrusion and that Badger Farm Parish Council (who's Community Centre was included on the notice) also objected to the application.

In echoing the comments raised above, Councillor Collin also spoke against the application but added that if, regretfully, the Committee were minded to grant approval, the hours that the sign could be illuminated should be limited to coincide with the store's opening hours and not the petrol station's. He advised that the sign should not therefore be illuminated before 7am or after 10pm. He also raised a concern regarding the Council's procedures to notify neighbours, as the application was on the border of several parish councils. Although the boundary of parish councils would normally make no difference to neighbour notifications, the Director agreed to check this process after the meeting with regard to this application and respond to Councillor Collin accordingly.

In response to the comments made, the Director of Development explained that the nearest residence to the sign was 63 metres away and that its illumination was well within guidance levels. Furthermore, the application was for an illuminated sign and therefore it would be unreasonable to impose a condition stating that it should be un-illuminated, but it was possible to control the hours of illumination by condition. The Committee also noted that the need for the sign was not a material consideration.

The Director of Development reported that, since preparing the Report, officers had agreed that Condition 6 should be removed, as a landscaping condition was considered unnecessary on an application for a sign. The Director also recommended a change to Condition 4 as follows:

"4. The sign hereby approved shall only be illuminated during the agreed opening hours of the retail store excluding the petrol filling station. NB The hours of opening of the store are controlled under the terms of the relevant planning permissions and can only be varied by further grant(s) of planning permission."

Following debate, the Committee agreed that, on balance, against the backdrop of mature trees and other street furniture adjacent to the roundabout, the sign would not be overtly intrusive. It therefore agreed to grant consent, with the amended conditions above, for the reasons set out in the Schedule.

#### Item 5 – Humphrey Farms, Hazeley Road, Twyford – Case Number 06/01972/FUL

Mr Corcoran (Twyford Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application. The Committee also noted that Councillor Wagner had intended to speak on this item, but was unable to attend the meeting because of a family illness.

The Director of Development stated that since preparing the report, an additional letter of objection had been received, the detail of which was provided to the Committee.

Following debate, the Committee approved the granting of planning permission as set out.

Item 6 – Humphrey Farms, Hazeley Road, Twyford – Case Number 06/01974/FUL

Mr Corcoran (Twyford Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application. The Committee noted that Councillor Wagner had intended to speak on this item, but was unable to attend the meeting because of a family illness.

Following debate, the Committee approved the granting of Planning Permission 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 3 (Land at Wickham Holt) consideration of the item be deferred to a future meeting to allow further negotiation between the Director of Development and the applicant with regard to the garage serving Plot 3.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 2.15pm

Chairman