

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

21 February 2007

Attendance:

Councillors:

Jeffs (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)

Bennetts (P)

Beveridge (P)

Busher

de Peyer (P)

Evans (P)

Huxstep (P)

Lipscomb (P)

Johnston (P)

Read (P)

Ruffell (P)

Saunders (P)

Sutton (P)

Deputy Members

Councillor Hammerton (Standing Deputy for Councillor Busher)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Cook and Pearson

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Busher.

2. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**

(Report PDC664 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 as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust which had commented on the application and he spoke and voted thereon.

By way of personal explanation, Councillor Hammerton drew attention to Item 8 (The White Swan, Bank Street, Bishops Waltham) where her level of prior involvement with the application as Ward Member may have risked the perception of predetermination. Therefore, she addressed the meeting as a Ward Member, sitting apart from the Committee, and she did not vote on this item.

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

Item 1: Station Mill, Station Road, Alresford – (new office building consisting of 6 units of accommodation over three floors, and car parking below) - Case Number: 06/03532/FUL

Mr Gard and Councillor Cook (a Ward Member) spoke in support of the application.

In summary, Councillor Cook suggested that the visual and architectural design of the resubmitted proposal, and changes to its configuration, had overcome a number of weaknesses in the originally approved scheme. In addition to the proposal's appearance being more sympathetic and less obtrusive to the adjacent listed Mill building, it would provide a more lettable space. Referring to the Environment Agency's objection to the proposal, Councillor Cook questioned why its concerns of mediation of potential contaminants had not been raised in the previous application. He requested that this matter be addressed by condition.

The Director of Development reminded Members that this application (and the consent granted for the earlier scheme) was linked by conditions, to ensure that new office accommodation was provided following the conversion of the adjacent Mill building from a commercial let to residential flats.

The Director clarified that the Environment Agency had indicated that it would not support the addition of a condition to any subsequent approval relating to contamination of the site and would maintain its objection at appeal if necessary. Reason 2 for refusal related to this.

The Director also advised that a letter sent by Councillor Hollingbery (as a Ward Member) had been omitted from the Report. In summary, the letter detailed his support for the proposals and that he considered that the design was superior to that of the approved scheme.

During discussion, the Director commented on the importance of the design, bulk and appearance of the building so as to not detract from, and to be subservient to, the adjacent Mill. It was also clarified that the colouring of the render on the approved scheme was not specified in the agreement and would be decided by the applicant in consultation with officers.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the report

Item 2: Station Mill, Station Road, Alresford - (conversion of existing Mill building into seven flats over the four floors) – Case Number: 06/03536/FUL

Mr Gard and Councillor Cook (a Ward Member) spoke in support of the application. Both their comments were also in reference to Item 3 below, for the necessary listed building consent to carry out the conversions.

In summary, Councillor Cook advised that the proposal to convert the building to flats was important, to bring the historic building back into use and to provide much needed accommodation. He considered that as the Mill was not unique, necessary alterations to its historic fabric should be allowed in order to best facilitate the conversion. The revised proposal, which showed 2 flats on each level, would provide more habitable accommodation space in comparison to the approved scheme. Councillor Cook also reminded the Committee of the support of the Alresford Society and the Town Council for the revised scheme.

Further to questions, it was explained that various aspects of the revised scheme, notably the inclusion of a lift, new stairs and insertion of 10 roof lights, would require some significant permanent alteration to the historic fabric of the building. The Committee was mindful that the previous consent had not necessitated significant alterations and therefore the Conservation Officer had raised no objections, unlike the current application which had raised conservation concerns.

During discussion, the Director of Development confirmed that, although an agreement to make a contribution towards provision for Public Open Space had been submitted with the previous application, this had not been forthcoming with the resubmission. Members appreciated that this had probably been a misunderstanding and that the applicant did intend to enter into such an agreement. However, the City Secretary and Solicitor advised that, should the Committee be minded to approve the application (against the recommendation of officers) then this would be subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 agreement. If the Committee was minded to refuse the application, the absence of a Section 106 agreement at this time should be recorded as a reason for refusal, albeit that it could be disregarded in the context of an appeal, if the applicant had by then made the payment.

The Director also clarified that Reason 4 for refusal in the Report incorrectly referred to Policy E1, instead of E2.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to support the officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the report.

Item 3: Station Mill, Station Road, Alresford – (listed building application for necessary conversions) – Case Number: 06/03537/LIS

Mr Gard and Councillor Cook (a Ward Member) spoke in support of the application. Both their comments were also in reference to Item 2, above, for the detail of the conversion of the Mill building to residential accommodation.

After debate, the Committee agreed to support the officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the report.

Item 6: Walterson, Hambledon Road, Denmead – Case Number: 06/03514/FUL

Mr Hallett (representing Denmead Parish Council) spoke in opposition to the application and Mr Theobald spoke in support.

The Director of Development advised that, since publication of the Report, an Open Space Payment had been made by the applicant.

In referring to the reasons for refusal of the previous scheme, the Director confirmed that he was satisfied that the new proposals would not detract from the character of the area, or be detrimental to its visual amenity.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed the application as set out in the Report, subject to an additional condition to be agreed by the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman. The purpose of that condition would be to require that, before development commences, the applicant provide details of the ownership and height of the hedge at the boundary with the neighbouring properties, in order that an appropriate landscape scheme could be agreed as far as possible, to ensure the maintenance of the hedges at an appropriate height to prevent overlooking.

Item 7: Selhurst Poultry Farm, Heath Road, Soberton Heath – Case Number: 06/03514/FUL

Mr Corcoran spoke in support of the application and Councillor Pearson (a Ward Member) spoke against.

Councillor Pearson reiterated the objections of Soberton Parish Council to the proposals.

The Director of Development advised that, since publication of the Report, Soberton Parish Council had submitted representations by e mail objecting to the application (a copy of the objection would be placed on the application file).

The Director reminded Members that the aspirations of the Parish Council, as expressed in its e mail, were not material planning considerations with regard to the determination of this application.

During discussion, it was confirmed that any demolition or rebuild of the structures on site would require a separate planning consent. The Director also advised that he would investigate whether the portacabin and container situated within the site had proper consents.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to support the recommendation to grant planning permission for the reasons set out in the Report, with the addition of a Condition regarding the submission of landscaping scheme.

Item 8: Public House and Premises, The White Swan, Bank Street, Bishops Waltham - Case Number: 06/03352/FUL

Mr Bigthorne and Councillor Hammerton (a Ward Member), spoke against the application and Mr Benn spoke in support.

In summary, Councillor Hammerton was concerned that due to inadequate parking provision on site, additional on-street parking may be generated and that Upper Basingwell Street was too narrow to accommodate this. There was also no provision on site for turning space. She advised that a large portion of the car park of the White Swan had been previously taken to form part of a separate redevelopment. Furthermore, she was concerned that the density of the proposals was excessive. Although the number of bedrooms was to increase only from an existing 8 to a proposed 9, this was questionable as some rooms had been previously utilised by the pub as function rooms.

The Director of Development advised that, since publication of the Report, Condition 4 was to be replaced by the following:

“No development, or works of site preparation or clearance, shall take place until details, including plans and cross sections of the existing and proposed ground levels of the development and the boundaries of the site and the height of the ground floor slab and damp proof course in relation thereto, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory relationship between the new development and adjacent buildings, amenity areas and trees.”

During discussion, the Director reminded the Committee that the site was close to public car parks and therefore the parking provision on site was considered acceptable. He also clarified that the adjacent development of a detached house to the rear of the existing car park was the subject of a separate application.

Members noted that officers were satisfied that the inclusion of a café as part of the proposals represented the retention of a similar community facility to that of the pub,

and so therefore conformed with planning policies. However, it was also noted that the White Swan had ceased trading approximately 6 months previously and Members questioned whether this was enough time for its non-viability to have been proven.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission, subject to the Conditions as set out in the Report and the replacement of Condition 4 as detailed above.

During consideration of items that were not subject to public participation, the following items were discussed:

Item 4: 190 Stockbridge Road, Winchester - Case Number: 06/03567/FUL

The Committee agreed to grant planning permission, subject to the Conditions set out in the Report.

Item 5: Touchwood, Church Road, Shedfield 06/02688/OUT

The Director of Development advised that this item be deferred to a future meeting of the Committee to allow for clarification of the detail of the officer's recommendation.

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 5, this item be deferred to a future meeting of the Committee to allow for clarification of the detail of the officer's recommendation.

5. **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE HELD ON 25 JANUARY 2007**
(Report PDC666 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 25 January 2007 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes) which related to applications at Littleton and Wickham.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 25 January 2007 be received.

6. **PLANNING APPEALS**
(Report PDC671 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the Report be noted.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned for lunch at 1.00pm, recommenced at 1.45pm and concluded at 3.50pm.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**25 January 2007**Attendance

Councillors:

Jeffs (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)	Johnston
Bennetts (P)	Lipscomb (P)
Beveridge (P)	Read (P)
Busher (P)	Ruffell (P)
de Peyer (P)	Saunders (P) (for Minute ##1 only)
Evans (P) (for Minute ##2 only)	Sutton (P)
Huxstep (P)	

Deputy Members:

Councillor Pearce (Standing Deputy for Councillor Johnston)

Others in Attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Jackson) (for Minute ##1 only)
 Councillor Clohosey) (for Minute ##2 only)

Officers in attendance:

_(for Minute ##1 only):
 Mr J Hearn (Planning Team Manager, East)
 Mrs J Lee (Principal Planner)
 Mr N Culhane (Engineering Assistant)
 Mr B Lynds (Principal Legal Officer)

_(for Minute ##2 only):
 Mr S Finch (Planning Team Manager, West)
 Mr N Mackintosh (Principal Planner)
 Mr K Cloud (Arborcultural Officer)
 Mr B Lynds (Principal Legal Officer)

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Johnston.

2. **RUTLEDGE, 29 MAIN ROAD, LITTLETON**
1 NO 4 BEDROOM HOUSE WITH DETACHED GARAGE, 1 NO 2 BEDROOM
BUNGALOW AND 1 NO 2 BEDROOM BUNGALOW
CASE REFERENCE 06/03066/FUL
 (Report PDC664 refers)

The Sub-Committee met at St Catherines Church Hall, Littleton where the Chairman welcomed to the meeting the applicant and also Mr Elsmore (Littleton and Harestock Parish Council) and approximately 30 members of the public.

The application had been considered by the Planning Development Control Committee at its meeting held on 11 January 2007. At that meeting, Members had

established the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee to determine the application after further consideration. Members were concerned about the application's potential effect on the character of the area through a possible overdevelopment of the site, the effect on surrounding properties, the substantial hedge that marked the site boundary, bin storage areas, and access issues. The Committee also requested that the plots of the proposed buildings be pegged out and that they were able to view the site from adjacent properties. Authority had been delegated to the Sub-Committee to determine the application.

Immediately prior to the public meeting, the Sub-Committee viewed the application site and noted the position of the proposed buildings, the access, the relationship to adjoining buildings and boundaries and its height. With the permission of the owners, the Sub-Committee also viewed the probable impact of the development from the neighbouring properties of 31a Main Road and 2, 4 and 6 Valley Road, Littleton.

Mrs Lee explained the application to the Sub-Committee. It proposed the erection of 1 no. four bedroom house with detached garage and 2 no. two bedroom bungalows in the rear garden of 29 Main Road, Littleton. The bungalows would be built on the site of the existing stables at the far end of the garden and the four bedroom house would be built nearer 29 Main Road, which would be retained. Access was proposed through an extended driveway to run along the boundary with 31 and 31a Main Road.

During the public participation element of the meeting, Mr Buchanan (an agent representing neighbouring properties) spoke against the application. In summary, he stated that, at 30 dwellings per hectare, the application was an overdevelopment of the site and was unsympathetic to the character of the surrounding area. He considered that the gardens were too small for family houses and that access and parking were too close to the boundaries (the noise and fumes from which could not be mitigated by the hedges). Mr Buchanan also raised a concern that the proposed four bedroom dwelling would overlook and be overbearing in relation to 4 Valley Road and that the access was inadequate.

In response to another comment made by Mr Buchanan, Mr Hearn agreed that the Report to PDC664 was inaccurate insofar that the applicant did not have the control of land to the north within the visibility splay.

Mr Elsmore (Littleton and Harestock Parish Council) spoke against the application. In summary, he stated that the application had not conformed to the Village Design Statement, had been unsympathetic to the semi rural nature of the area and that the banks should be retained. In echoing the comments of Mr Buchanan, Mr Elsmore also stated that the proposed development was at too high a density and that the poor access onto Main Road was particularly important, as most vehicles exceeded the speed limit. Mr Elsmore concluded that, if the application was approved, there should be an additional Condition to retain all construction traffic and storage on site.

Councillor Jackson (a Ward Member) spoke in opposition to the application. In summary, she stated that the proposals were an overdevelopment of the site and that it did not accord with the Village Design Statement. The development also proposed the removal of mature evergreen trees, which would reduce screening between the four bedroom dwelling and 31a Main Road and would take many years to replace. Councillor Jackson also reiterated the points made by the Parish Council that the highways access onto Main Road was inadequate.

Mr Haywood (the applicant's agent) spoke in support of the application. In summary, he explained that the application had originally proposed a single dwelling on the site, but, as this contravened the guidance from PPG3, an amended application had been submitted with an increased density. Mr Haywood stated that the access onto Main

Road had not been objected to by the City Council's Highways Engineer. He did not consider there to be an issue of overlooking and added that the bungalows would be set into the ground which would reduce their height and impact on neighbouring properties. With regard to the driveway, he explained that this would be constructed with a quietening material, again, to reduce the impact of the development on neighbouring properties. Mr Haywood asked the Sub-Committee to endorse the officers' recommendation to approve the application as the development was in accordance with planning policies.

In response to Members' question, Mrs Lee explained that there was sufficient room for refuse bins to be kept and moved from the rear of the bungalows to the access point onto Main Road, where a temporary storage area would be provided for their collection by refuse vehicles. It was not proposed that refuse vehicles would access the site.

Mrs Lee also explained that drainage issues had been considered by the Environment Agency and that these had been included in the proposed conditions.

The Sub-Committee discussed the access onto Main Road. Mr Culhane explained that this would be widened to 5.5 metres to allow vehicles to pass each other at the access point. Visibility from the access was similar to other access points onto Main Road and the Valley Road junction and Mr Culhane stated that this would be improved by the removal of 1 metre of the steep grass bank within the applicant's ownership. Several Members raised concerns regarding the loss of part of the bank which they considered to be important to the character of the area.

In considering the impact of the proposed buildings, Mrs Lee stated that the single storey bungalows had been proposed at the rear of the site because of their reduced height and relative proximity to neighbouring properties. By contrast, the location of two storey detached dwelling was considered by officers to be acceptable because it was further away from neighbouring properties and better screened by the boundary hedge.

In considering the bungalows and in particular the potential for putting accommodation in their roofs, Mrs Lee confirmed that the conditions removed permitted development rights from the occupiers to prevent development of the roof spaces, without submission of a further planning application.

The Sub-Committee were concerned about the possible loss of light that might result to 4 Valley Road from the two storey dwelling and Mrs Lee explained that there would be no overshadowing as the proposed dwelling was to the north. She added that whilst the roof of the proposed building (at 8 metres high to the ridge) would be visible from 4 Valley Road above the 3 metre high, evergreen boundary hedge, this was unlikely to be overbearing, as it was off set from the main rear aspect of number 4.

Following debate, the majority of the Sub-Committee were concerned that the development was contrary to DP3 ii) and vii) of the Local Plan as it did not respond positively to the character of the area and because it had an adverse effect on neighbouring properties. They concluded that the massing of the four bedroom dwelling would have an overbearing effect on surrounding properties. The effect of this was worsened by the proposal to remove the mature evergreen trees between the site and 31a Main Road.

They also considered that proposals were an overdevelopment of the site and that, with reference to DP3 viii), there was insufficient amenity space provided for the four

bedroom dwelling. The Committee therefore agreed to refuse the application for the reasons stated below.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- i) The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site that would result in a cramped form of development, which is out of the character with the surrounding area;
- ii) There is insufficient amenity space;
- iii) The detrimental effect of massing and that it would be overbearing to neighbouring properties;
- iv) The application does not confirm to Policies DP3 ii), vii) and viii) of the Local Plan.

3. **LAND AT WICKHAM HOLT, WINCHESTER ROAD, WICKHAM**
ERECTION OF 2 NO. FIVE BEDROOM AND 2 NO. TWO BEDROOM DETACHED
DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED GARAGES/PARKING, LANDSCAPE AND
ACCESS (RE-SUBMISSION)
CASE NUMBER 06/03188/FUL
 (Report PDC664 refers)

The Sub-Committee met at Wickham Community Centre where the Chairman welcomed to the meeting the applicant and 20 members of the public.

Mr Mackintosh explained that the Committee had deferred the application from its previous meeting, held on 21 December 2006, so that details of the garage serving Plot 3 could be reconsidered to reduce its size and to retain more of the trees on site.

The applicant had subsequently submitted amended plans which addressed the Committee's previous concerns in reducing the size of the garage to a double garage at a height of 5.25 metres. This allowed for the retention of two Portuguese Laurel bushes which provided additional screening between Plot 3 and Lower Wickham Lodge. As the bushes could not be protected through Tree Preservation Orders, it was decided to protect these bushes during development and maintain them at a minimum height of 5 metres. Mr Mackintosh also explained that in the revised plans, a dormer window which faced Lower Wickham Lodge had been removed from the side of Plot 3.

These amendments were considered by the Planning Development Control Committee at its meeting held on 11 January 2007. At this meeting, Members agreed that the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee should visit the site to assess the change in gradient across the site, overlooking issues, and the screening provided by the trees and bushes. The Committee also requested that the plots of the proposed buildings be marked out on site. The Sub-Committee were delegated authority to determine the application.

Immediately prior to the Sub-Committee, Members visited the application site and noted differences in levels, the position of the trees and proposed plots, its access and relationship with neighbouring properties. With the permission of the owners, Members assessed the likely impact of the development from Wickham Holt, Lower Wickham Lodge, The Glen House in Holt Close and from 6 Cold Harbour Close.

Mr Mackintosh outlined the application to the Sub-Committee.

During the public participation part of the meeting, Mr McGarry (a resident of Lower Wickham Lodge) spoke in opposition to the application. In summary, he stated that the proposed five bedroom dwellings would be overbearing to existing properties, that there was a likelihood of overlooking (especially with regard to Wickham Holt), and that the proposals were an overdevelopment of the site with plots too close together. Mr McGarry also raised issues regarding the access road and the trees on site.

Councillor Clohosey spoke as a Ward Member against the application. In summary, he raised concerns regarding overlooking, the preservation of the laurel bushes and potential damage to trees during construction and that the plot sites were too close to existing neighbouring properties.

Mr Harris (the applicant's agent) spoke in support of the application. In summary, he highlighted the amendments that had been made as a result of Members' comments at the previous meeting. He asked the Sub-Committee to endorse the officers' recommendation to approve the application as the development was in accordance with planning policies.

A Member raised concerns about the viability of the trees on site as, it was suggested, the location of the plots and access road were too close to the trees. Mr Cloud reiterated that the proposed conditions were satisfactory to protect the trees (all of which carried Tree Preservation Orders). The Portuguese Laurel bushes between one of the five bedroom dwellings and Lower Wickham Lodge were to be protected by Condition. This Condition protected the bushes during construction and stipulated that they should be maintained at a minimum height of 5 metres or, if damaged, replaced in accordance with advice from the Director of Development. Mr Cloud also explained that the access road would be constructed using honeycomb material to minimise its impact around the roots of a nearby ash tree. Mr Cloud also suggested that, if agreed, an additional condition should be included to ensure arboricultural supervision throughout the construction period.

In response to a comment, Mr Mackintosh agreed that construction traffic parking and storage should be contained within the site, to ensure that the turning head of Holt Close remained free and to minimise disruption to neighbours.

With regard to comments about the overdevelopment of the site, Mr Mackintosh explained that the density of 10 dwellings per hectare was already very low and that the positioning of the plots was largely determined by the location of the preserved trees.

The Sub-Committee also noted the additional plan that had been submitted by the applicant, which set out the difference in heights between the proposed two-bedroom dwellings and the Glen House. From this, the Sub-Committee raised concerns regarding the proposed differing roof design for the 2 two-bedroom dwellings (the taller one of which was nearest to and thus dominated the single storey Wickham Holt) and agreed that these should both be the same, i.e. both with hipped ends.

Members discussed the potential effect of overlooking onto Wickham Holt and noted that an end elevation window on Wickham Holt would be bricked up to prevent overlooking between it and the proposed five bedroom dwellings. Mr Finch added that the flint yard of Wickham Holt, which would be overlooked by the proposed properties, was likely to continue to be used predominately for car parking and that there was a secluded, private amenity area serving the property at the rear.

Members were concerned that space between the two proposed five bedroom buildings was too small and Mr Mackintosh explained that this would only be visible

from inside the site and that the mass of the building was broken up by its articulated frontage. With regard to the proposed 2 two-bedroom dwellings, Mr Mackintosh stated that the gap between these properties was less than one metre, but that an acceptable amount of amenity space had been proposed at the rear of these properties.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the majority of the Sub-Committee agreed that, provided that amended plans were received addressing the roof design of Plots 1 and 2, planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in Report PDC664, with additional conditions regarding the protection of the laurel bushes, an additional arboricultural condition, and the removal of permitted development rights.

The Sub-Committee also agreed to add an Informative to prevent construction traffic and storage outside of the site. Mr Lynds explained that it was not possible to impose this as a condition as it concerned an area outside the ownership of the applicant.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

01 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three 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 (as amended).

02 No development or site preparation prior to operations which has any effect on disturbing or altering the level or composition of the land, shall take place within the site until the applicant or their agents or successors in title has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation to be submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

02 Reason: To ensure that the archaeological interest of the site is properly safeguarded and recorded.

03 No development, or works of site preparation or clearance, shall take place until details, including plans and cross sections of the existing and proposed ground levels of the development and the boundaries of the site and the height of the ground floor slab and damp proof course in relation thereto, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

03 Reason: To ensure a satisfactory relationship between the new development and adjacent buildings, amenity areas and trees.

04 Details of the design of building foundations and the layout, with positions, dimensions and levels of service trenches, ditches, drains and other excavations on site, insofar as they affect trees and hedgerows on or adjoining the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any works on the site are commenced.

04 To ensure the protection of trees and hedgerows to be retained and in particular to avoid unnecessary damage to their root system.

05 All works on site shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement, reference 6144-AIA2-BD, unless otherwise agreed, in writing with the Local Planning Authority and:

- a. Protective measures, to include, where specified, fencing, ground protection and special surfacing, shall be installed, prior to any vehicle movement, demolition, construction or groundwork commencing on the site,
- b. Installation of protective measures shall be supervised by a person suitably qualified in arboriculture, who shall liaise with the Local Planning Authority Arboricultural Officer, (Telephone 01962 848317) to ensure that the protective measures are in compliance with the approved method statement, prior to the commencement of any vehicle movement, demolition or groundwork,
- c. The Arboricultural Officer shall be informed once protective measures have been installed so that they can be inspected and deemed appropriate and in accordance with the Method Statement,
- d. The Arboricultural Officer shall be informed prior to the commencement of construction of special surfacing under tree canopies so that a pre-commencement site visit can be carried out and to ensure that surfacing conforms to the illustrative specification submitted,
- e. No arboricultural works shall be carried out to trees other than those specified and in accordance with the Method Statement, and;
- f. Any deviation from works prescribed or methods agreed in accordance with the Method Statement shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

05 Reason: To ensure the protection and long term viability of retained trees and to minimise the impact of construction activity in the interests of the amenities of the area.

06 No development, or site preparation prior to operations which has any effect on compacting, disturbing or altering the levels of the site, shall take place until a person suitably qualified in arboriculture, and approved as suitable by the Local Planning Authority, has been appointed to supervise construction activity occurring on the site. The arboricultural supervisor will be responsible for the implementation of protective measures, special surfacing and all works deemed necessary by the approved arboricultural method statement. Where ground measures are deemed necessary to protect root protection areas, the arboricultural supervisor shall ensure that these are installed prior to any vehicle movement, earth moving or construction activity occurring on the site and that all such measures to protect trees are inspected by the Local Planning Authority Arboricultural Officer prior to commencement of development work.

06 Reason: To ensure the protection and long term viability of retained trees and to minimise the impact of construction activity in the interests of the amenities of the area.

07 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.

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

08 The shrubs marked 15, 16, 58 and 59 on the approved plans shall be retained and protected during building works by an extension of the protective barrier to be erected in accordance with Condition 05 of this permission. They shall subsequently be maintained at a minimum height of 5 metres above ground level. Nevertheless, if any of these shrubs are removed or become seriously diseased or die they shall be replaced in accordance with details to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

08 Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the neighbouring property.

09 No development shall take place until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the buildings hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

09 Reason: To ensure that the development presents a satisfactory appearance in the interests of the amenities of the area.

10 Details of measures to be taken to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site during construction works being deposited on the public highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and fully implemented before development commences. Such measures shall be retained for the duration of the construction period. No lorry shall leave the site unless its wheels have been cleaned sufficiently to prevent mud being carried onto the highway.

10 Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

11 The proposed access and drive, including shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with specifications to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

NOTE: A licence is required from Hampshire Highways Winchester, Central Depot, Bar End Road, Winchester, SO23 9NP prior to the commencement of access works.

11 Reason: To ensure satisfactory means of access.

12 Before the development hereby approved is first brought into use, a turning space shall be provided within the site to enable vehicles using the site to enter and leave in a forward gear. The turning space shall be retained and kept available for such purposes at all times.

12 Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

13 Before the development hereby approved is first brought into use the car parking spaces shown on approved drawing LTD(61)33B, shall be provided and thereafter maintained and kept available.

13 Reason: To ensure adequate car parking provision within the site in accordance with the standards of the Local Planning Authority.

14 A residential sprinkler system, in accordance with BS9251:2005 shall be installed in each of the dwellings hereby approved and shall be fully operational before each unit is occupied.

14 Reasons: In the interests of the safety of the occupiers.

15 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Classes A, B, C, D and E of Part One of Schedule 2 of the Order, shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

15 Reason: To protect the amenities of the locality and to maintain a good quality environment.

Informatives:

1. 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.

2. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-
Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: H1, H5, H7, UB1, UB3, E8, E14, E16, T4, T6, R2
Winchester District Local Plan Review: H3, H7, DP1, DP3, DP5, HE4, HE16, T2, T4, RT3

3. The detailed plans to be submitted in respect of Condition 07 above should include proposals for the planting of trees and shrubs on the eastern and western boundaries of the site.

4. All loading, unloading, storage and contractors parking associated with the development of the site should take place within the site and not in Holt Close.

The meeting commenced at 10.45am, adjourned at 12.30pm, recommenced at 3.10pm and concluded at 4.20pm

Chairman