

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

8 March 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 Higgins, Mather, Rees, Pines, Stallard and Wright

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Busher.

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

1. That the minutes of the previous meetings of the Committee held 21 December 2006 and 11 January 2007 be approved and adopted.

2. That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held 1 February 2007 be approved and adopted subject to a correction, as shown in bold below, to Minute 775 (referring to Item 1: Downlands Estate Development, Downlands Way, South Wonston – Case Number: 06/02159/OUT):

‘Councillor Wright (a Ward Member) spoke against the application. In summary, he raised concerns about the use of Lower Road/**Ox Drove** as an access to the site, which was currently used by cyclists and walkers as a rural link to Farley Wood.’

3. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**

(Report PDC672 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 Sutton declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of Items 3 and 4 as the applicant was known to her and she left the room during consideration of these items.

Councillor Lipscomb declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Item 5, as he was the Council's representative on the South Downs Joint Committee which had commented on the application, although he had taken no part in that process. He therefore spoke and voted thereon.

By way of personal explanation, Councillors Beveridge, Bennetts, de Peyer and Saunders drew attention to Item 5, where their level of prior involvement with the proposal as members of the Winchester Town Forum may have risked the perception of predetermination. However, they considered that they had not formed an opinion on the planning application, and they spoke and voted thereon.

By way of personal explanation, Councillor Evans drew attention to Item 5, where her level of prior involvement with the proposal as previous Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport may have risked the perception of predetermination. Councillor Evans had chaired the initial meetings with regard to the proposal, but had not formed an opinion on the planning application, and she spoke and voted thereon.

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

Item 1: East Stratton Village Hall, Church Bank Road, East Stratton - Case Number: 06/03471/FUL

Mr Winters spoke in opposition to the application and Mr Hilling, Mr Botham (representing Micheldever Parish Council) and Councillor Wright (a Ward Member) spoke in support.

In summary, Councillor Wright stated that the local community used the existing Village Hall frequently, but it was now unfit for purpose. The proposal for a larger hall was a response to an increased local population and would also encourage further community use. He referred to the support given by residents of the village in raising funds for the scheme. Councillor Wright was concerned that some of the conditions to be applied to any subsequent planning permission (in particular, Conditions 7 and 12) were onerous. He reminded Members that the existing hall had generated no complaints from residents regarding noise and disturbance and that improved sound acoustics would provide additional remediation. He suggested that this issue would be better dealt with by appropriate Licensing legislation.

The Director of Development advised that since publication of the Report, the following corrections and clarification should be made:

The footprint of the proposed building is 200 square metres, excluding the verandah. The maximum ridge height of the existing hall is 5.5 metres above ground level, not 4.4 metres as specified in the report. The existing lower outshot, to the east elevation, has a maximum ridge height of 4.4 metres.

The Director also reported that since publication of the Report, the amended parking, bin and cycle store layout had been assessed by the Highway Engineer and had submitted the following comments:

'In accordance with HCC standards, the hall generates a requirement for 12 spaces. The proposal includes 17, which is in excess of the requirement, with the undercover cycle store details to be submitted under conditions. No objection subject to conditions.

The submitted acoustic report provides a survey of existing noise levels and confirmation of a noise control strategy for the new hall, specifying the standards for construction, glazing, ventilation and sound insulation and the installation of a proprietary sound level limiter system, in order to minimize noise disturbance to neighbouring residential properties, particularly during evening hours'.

The Director also advised that, since publication of the Report, the applicant's acoustic report had been assessed by the Environmental Health Officer who made the following comments:

'I am satisfied that the conclusions will adequately address the issues identified. The proposed structure of the hall with glazing, appropriate sound insulation properties, an attenuated mechanical extract ventilation system and supply grills, ceiling insulation, and lobbied main entrance will provide sufficient attenuation of entertainment noise provided doors and windows are kept closed and a sound level limiter system installed to operate a level of Leq(5 min) of 90 dB(A) with appropriate control of bass frequencies inside the building. Conditions and informatives recommended'.

The Director also reported that additional and amended conditions and informatives had been drafted further to responses to the consultations detailed above. In summary, these included additional conditions 12 -16 with regard to noise and disturbance and also disruption during the construction period. Subsequent to the addition of these conditions, a letter from the applicant had been received with concerns that the conditions with regard to noise would be an unreasonable burden on the management of the facility.

During discussion, the Director explained that concerns raised by residents of loss of amenity due to noise disturbance from the new hall, had been balanced by the addition of Conditions to restrict its hours of use. Such conditions were typical of those for similar facilities and, by protecting residents from the possibility of regular events creating a disturbance, were a response to material planning considerations of loss of amenity.

The Director confirmed that Conditions 7, 8, 11, 12 and 13 had been drafted in consultation with the Environmental Health officer, further to the applicant's acoustics report. Following questions, it was acknowledged that the Conditions were similar to those which would be imposed by licensing legislation, but that they provided additional control, because licensing legislation would not necessarily cover all events held at the proposed hall. It was confirmed that the operator would be required to provide a schedule of planned events which involved amplified entertainment outside the village hall and/or outside the specified hours to the Director of Development for written approval, in consultation with Environmental Health. This would be in addition to any Licensing obligations.

Following further debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the Report, and detailed above.

Item 2: Plot 6 Danebury Homes Development, Airlie Road, Winchester – Case Number: 06/03740/FUL

Mrs Drydon and Councillor Mather (a Ward Member) spoke against the application and in support of the officer's recommendations to refuse.

In summary, Councillor Mather advised that the application would exacerbate existing traffic problems in the area, notably at the nearby dangerous bend on Airlie Road. She also stated that the proposal was a considerable overdevelopment of the site and was detrimental to the local environment and to the amenity of neighbours, in particular by overlooking 3 Wentworth Grange. In addition, as the size of the dwelling had increased, the previously approved landscaping scheme could not be implemented. Whilst acknowledging that the site was outside the Sleepers Hill Local Area Design area, Councillor Mather also suggested that the application would have a negative impact on its aims.

The Director of Development apologised that the incorrect site plans had been included within the Report and the correct ones were presented to the Committee.

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: Yew Tree Service Station, Romsey Road, Pitt, Winchester – Case Number: 06/03680/OUT

Mr Easter (applicant) spoke in support of the application.

The Director of Development advised that, since publication of the Report, the applicant's agent has advised that an environmental consultant has been instructed to resolve the Environment Agency's objection to the scheme, with regard to remediation of the site. However, as yet no information has been received from the Environment Agency. The Director also confirmed that, since publication of the Report, a contribution towards public recreational open space had been received by the Council. Therefore, Reason for Refusal 4 in the Report should be deleted.

During discussion, the Director explained that an exception to policies in this case could set a precedent for similar applications for the residential redevelopment of redundant sites in the countryside. Although policies did allow for change of use in certain circumstances, it was acknowledged that this site's isolated and unsustainable countryside location, together with its existing infrastructure as a petrol filling station, would make this difficult.

In referring to a similar proposal at Twyford Moors that had been won on appeal, the Director reported that although this site was also in countryside, the Inspector had made a distinction that its location was not isolated. Furthermore, that site was adjacent to homes and its previous use as a garage had been un-neighbourly.

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

Item 4: Yew Tree Service Station, Romsey Road, Pitt, Winchester (change of use from shop to residential and relief of condition tying existing dwelling to service station) – Case Number: 07/00006/FUL

Mr Jezeph (applicant's agent) spoke in support of the application.

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

Item 5: Bar End Playing Fields, Milland Road, Winchester – Case Number: 06/03721/FUL

Mr Doyle spoke against the application. Mr Geddes (for the applicant) and Councillors Pines and Higgins (Ward Members), Rees (a neighbouring Ward Member and Chairman of the Winchester Town Forum) and Stallard (Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport) all spoke in support.

In summary, Councillor Pines reiterated his broad support for the proposals, but suggested that there should be ongoing engagement and consultation with local residents, to address their concerns as detailed in the Report. The points to be addressed related to community access to the facilities, concerns over noise, disturbance and light pollution. Furthermore, the proposals should not exacerbate existing traffic and parking issues in the vicinity, especially Milland Road and neighbouring roads, where he suggested that a 20 mile per hour zone be formally implemented.

Councillor Higgins also spoke in broad support of the proposals. He also referred to the applicant's intention not to increase parking provision on site (by utilising the nearby Park and Ride facility) and of their assessment that traffic generation to the site would be minimal. He suggested that additional traffic in the area was inevitable. He requested that a 20 mile per hour zone be implemented in the area. Councillor Higgins also requested that drainage of the site should be further investigated, as occurrences of standing water at the site after heavy rain could be exacerbated and potentially flood adjacent gardens at Chilcomb Lane. In summary, Councillor Higgins stated that there should be ongoing engagement and consultation with local residents, with regard to the future management of the site and of the attenuation of any concerns.

Councillor Rees applauded the applicant's responsible and conscientious approach, including extensive consultation, in drafting the application. In support of the proposals, he stated that the scheme would present significant benefits for the local community and for the district. He also considered that the detailed conditions addressed most potential problems.

Councillor Stallard, as Portfolio Holder Culture, Heritage and Sport, reiterated her strong support for the application. The proposed facilities would be of huge benefit to the University and for residents. Support for the scheme would also allow for a bid to go forward for the facility to be a pre 2012 Olympic training camp, with greater economic and social benefits.

The Director of Development advised that since publication of the Report the following response had been received from the Sites and Monuments officer:-

“Consultation of records indicates that this development may have archaeological implications. During the recent construction of the existing sports pavilion and new access from Milland Road, an archaeological watching brief was maintained. Several palaeo-channels (former watercourses) were identified, the fills of which contained flint artefacts, probably of Bronze Age date. Furthermore, evidence from previous

observations and reports of finds in the Highcliffe / Bar End area suggests that this was a focus for Roman activity and occupation.

The proposed development may impact on further palaeo-channels in this area, which are likely to contain important environmental and artefactual data, which can provide information on the past landscape history and on early human activity in this area. The proposed development may also impact on Roman remains, particularly as Bar End Road follows the alignment of a Roman road.

If this application is to be recommended for approval, the following condition should be attached in accordance with the principles of PPG16 and Policy HE.1 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review:

A010: No development, or site preparation prior to development 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 and implemented 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.”

The Director also reported that two additional letters of representation had been received from residents. One letter reiterated reasons for objection as already highlighted in the Report. The other letter did not object to the proposals, but raised concern about the floodlighting being excessive. He also reported on an error in condition 13 in the Report which should have the additional words in bold added:

Before the development hereby permitted is commenced, a scheme indicating the provision to be made for disabled people to gain access **to the site** shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

During discussion, the Hampshire County Council Highways Officer reported that the applicant's Travel Plan for the proposals had identified a need for highway improvements to facilitate safe pedestrian routes. It was confirmed that this would be progressed at additional cost to the applicant, to be secured under a section 278 Agreement. He reiterated that it was not intended to increase parking provision on site or in adjacent streets, as the Park and Ride facilities had been identified to accommodate this. The Committee requested that, as part of any subsequent approval of the application, the applicant's Travel Plan must be complied with, so as to ensure that the existing traffic and parking problems were not exacerbated.

Members noted the general satisfaction demonstrated by the consultant appointed by the applicant and of the Hampshire County Council Lighting Engineer with regard to installation and calibration of the floodlighting. In order to ensure that the floodlighting continued to have minimal impact in the vicinity and wider area, it was agreed that an additional condition be imposed, specifying that by way of a regular inspection and maintenance regime, the applicant demonstrate that any subsequent issues that may become apparent would be promptly addressed.

Following further debate, the Committee unanimously supported the application, subject to conditions as set out in the Report and detailed above, including an additional condition with regard to the future maintenance of floodlighting (with detailed wording to be agreed by the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman).

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, planning permission be granted subject to conditions and that authority be delegated to the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman, to agree an additional condition with regard to the future maintenance of floodlighting.

5. **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE HELD ON 19 FEBRUARY 2007**
(Report PDC674 refers)

The above item had not been notified for inclusion on the agenda within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept the item onto the agenda, as a matter requiring urgent consideration, so that the Committee were aware of the information without delay.

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 19 February 2007 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes) which related to an application at Downlands Way, South Wonston.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 19 February 2007 be received.

4. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

RESOLVED:

1. That in all the circumstances, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

2. That the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business because it is likely that, if members of the public were present, there would be disclosure to them of 'exempt information' as defined by Section 100I and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

<u>Minute Number</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Description of Exempt Information</u>
#	Land at Leander House (formerly Plot 4600) Solent Business Park, Whiteley – Planning Obligation	Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings (Para 5 to Schedule 12A refers).

5. **LAND AT LEANDER HOUSE (FORMERLY PLOT 4600) SOLENT BUSINESS PARK, WHITELEY – PLANNING OBLIGATION**

(Report PDC675 refers)

The Committee discussed a Report which set out proposals to authorise the release of an obligation, under a legal agreement, in respect of development at Leander House, Solent Business Park, Whiteley (detail in exempt minutes).

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 2.15pm.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**19 February 2007**Attendance

Councillors:

Jeffs (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)

Bennetts

Beveridge (P)

Busher (P)

de Peyer (P)

Evans

Huxstep (P)

Johnston (P)

Lipscomb (P)

Read (P)

Ruffell

Saunders (P)

Sutton (P)

Deputy Members:

Councillor Pearson (Standing Deputy for Councillor Ruffell)

Councillor Pearce (Standing Deputy for Councillor Bennetts)

Others in Attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Godfrey and Wright

Officers in attendance:

Mr J Hearn (Planning Team Manager, East)

Mr T Patchell (Senior Planner)

Mr N Culhane (Engineering Assistant)

Mr S Dunbar-Dempsey (Landscape Architect)

Ms F Sutherland (Planning and Information Solicitor)

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Bennetts, Evans and Ruffell.

2. **DOWNLANDS ESTATE DEVELOPMENT, DOWNLANDS WAY, SOUTH WONSTON****40 NO DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS AND PARKING (OUTLINE)****CASE REFERENCE: 06/02159/OUT**

(Report PDC668 refers)

The Sub-Committee met at South Wonston Village Hall where the Chairman welcomed to the meeting the applicant's agent (Mr Rees), Mr Selby (South Wonston Parish Council) and approximately 80 members of the public.

The application had been considered by the Planning Development Control Committee at its meeting held on 1 February 2007. At that meeting, Members had convened the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee to assess the relationship between the proposal and the surrounding properties.

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, the gradient of the site, and the position and importance of existing trees.

Mr Patchell introduced the application to the Sub-Committee. The proposal was an outline application of the erection of 40 dwellings and associated access and parking. As the application was an outline application, the Sub-Committee were asked to determine only the siting and access arrangements as, if approved; detailed matters would be considered in a later application. However, he highlighted that given the size of the site (1.07 hectares), 40 dwellings could only be accommodated if some of the buildings were three storeys. Therefore, the applicant had indicated that the site would include a mixture of 2, 2 ½ and 3 storey buildings and that the majority of the taller buildings would be located in the centre of the site. Vehicular access would be provided via Downlands Way from the west, Downlands from the east and Lower Road to the south (serving only three properties at the south of the site). However, there would be no east-west through road linking the two halves of the development, except for pedestrian, cycle and emergency access.

Mr Patchell illustrated to the Sub-Committee photographs of the application site from long distance views, including Teg Down, Magdalene Hill, Cheesefoot Head and from locations to the south of the site. From these, he suggested that the proposed development would have a minimal impact. The Sub-Committee also noted photographs which had been submitted by the owners of Farthings, Lower Road at the south of the site, which illustrated the view from the rear first floor looking over the site and from the garden.

During the public participation part of the meeting Mr Guy (a local resident) spoke against the application. In summary, he stated that the proposed density of the development was too high and would lead to a development which would be out of character with the surrounding area. He also spoke against the principle of three storey buildings which, he suggested, would be accentuated by the raising slope of the site, and potential overlooking issues.

Mr Guy also raised highway concerns with regard to the development and highlighted the high number of vehicles that already used the Downs Road junction, traffic generated by a nursery near the site and the number of young children that used the existing, currently quiet, cul de sacs.

Mr Selby (South Wonston Parish Council) also spoke against the application. In summary, he explained that the proposals had been opposed by a large number of local residents. He also stated that the taller, town house style developments would be out of character with the surrounding buildings, that it would set a poor precedent for future development and that there was an over supply of new housing in the district. In addition to echoing the highways concerns raised by Mr Guy, Mr Selby added that the development may not have vehicular access rights from Lower Road. He also questioned the need for the proposed play area, which formed part of the application, and how the transport contribution would be spent.

Mr Selby concluded that whilst the majority of local people did not oppose the development of the site in principle, the regrettable lack of prior consultation from the applicant with local residents had resulted in an unacceptable application.

Councillor Wright spoke as a Ward Councillor against the application. In summary, he raised concerns similar to those above and highlighted the need to protect Lower Road which was well used by walkers and pedestrians as a link between Farley Mount and Micheldever Woods.

Councillor Godfrey also spoke as a Ward Councillor against the application. In summary, he reiterated the concerns regarding the proposed density of the development. He explained that the October 2001 Urban Capacity Study had identified the site as suitable for the development of 25 dwellings and that the density of the surrounding area was 28 dwellings per hectare. The proposed development had a density of 42 dwellings per hectare if an area of trees to be retained was excluded – the density of the entire site was 37 dwellings per hectare.

Councillor Godfrey also commented that three storey buildings in the proposal would be visible from long distances, that it would affect the character of the village, that it was the wrong development for the site, and that there were no other three storey dwellings in the village. He explained the proposed dwellings were too close together, dominated surrounding buildings and could lead to overlooking. He also added that there was insufficient parking and that the access road was too narrow.

In concluding, Councillor Godfrey requested the Sub-Committee to reject the application as it did not comply with Policy DP3 of the Local Plan (in that it did not respond positively to the character of the area) and Policy DP4 (which sought to preserve important views and trees).

Mr Rees (the applicant's agent) spoke in support of the application. In summary, he explained that the application was the result of a long period of negotiation with officers. He stated that the three storey buildings would only be 1 metre taller than the ridge height of two existing buildings onto Lower Road and that none of the statutory consultees had raised any objections to the application.

In response to concerns raised by the objectors and Members, Mr Culhane explained that the access road would not be adopted by the Highways Authority, so that it did not incur future maintenance costs. As such, the road was not required to meet highways standards. Members also noted that in raising no objection, the County Council had also considered the application's effect on the surrounding road network.

Mr Culhane added that the applicant had negotiated a one-off contribution payment of £94,000 to improve the existing bus stop and to enhance evening and weekend bus services to the village.

In relation to access issues from Lower Road, Mr Culhane confirmed that the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 had restricted the use of public rights of way by vehicles in certain circumstances. Members noted that as it was proposed that Lower Road would only be used to serve an additional three dwellings, it was unlikely that the Rights of Way Officer would object. However, Ms Sutherland reminded the Sub-Committee that rights of access to a site was ultimately an issue for the applicant to resolve.

With regard to density, Mr Hearn explained that the Urban Capacity Study was not an accurate assessment of the number of dwellings that would fit on any site and that what was important was to maximise the capacity of the site without harming character or amenity.

Mr Hearn also commented that there were examples in other villages in the district of three storey buildings surrounded by predominately two storey dwellings which had worked well. He added that the effect of these taller buildings in this proposal would be limited as they were positioned in the centre of the development and from longer distances would be viewed against a backdrop of taller trees. Issues regarding the detailed character of the application (such as use of materials) would be considered in a later, detailed application.

In response to a question, Mr Hearn explained that the buildings would be slightly cut into the land to partially mitigate against the slope across the site.

Members noted the importance of the trees to the site and agreed that, if approved, the trees near the boundary with Farthings and Kentsbray should be preserved and enhanced.

Mr Dunbar-Dempsey explained that the proposed play area was the usual requirement sought on developments of this scale and, notwithstanding the existence of a larger play area for older children elsewhere in the village, it would provide a door-step facility for families with very young children.

During debate, Members raised concerns regarding north/south pedestrian routes through the site. Mr Hearn explained that although these were desirable, they had not been included in the application.

The Sub-Committee discussed the sustainability of the site and Mr Hearn explained that, as a designated H2 policy settlement area, in policy terms the site could be developed; so long as it did not adversely affect the character of the surrounding area.

At the conclusion of debate, the majority of the Sub-Committee agreed not to grant permission for the development, against officers' advice. Members discussed possible reasons for refusal and then agreed to refuse permission for the following reasons: the proposed development was too dense for the site and had resulted in buildings of a height that was out of character with the surrounding area. Members further agreed that the three storey buildings at the south of the site near Farthings and Kentsbray would be overbearing on these properties. The Sub-Committee also agreed to the standard reasons of refusal relating to the provision of open space and affordable housing. Members also expressed concern (albeit not a reason for refusal) that there had been insufficient consultation from the developer with local people, which, although it had not been endorsed at the time the application was submitted, contravened the Statement of Community Involvement.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused for the following reasons:

Detailed reasons for refusal:

Reason 1

The applicant has shown on the submitted plans that in order to accommodate 40 dwellings on the site, in the positions shown, it is necessary to include some 3 storey development. It is considered that 3 storey development would be incongruous with the height generally of existing surrounding development and would have an adverse visual affect on the character of the area. The development is therefore contrary to UB3 of Hampshire County Structure Plan Review and DP3 (ii) of Winchester District Local Plan Review.

Reason 2

The proposed development by reason of its height would have an undesirable overbearing affect on the amenity of the occupants of number 84 Downlands Way and Kentsbray and Farthings, Lower Road. The development is therefore contrary to DP (vii) of Winchester District Local Plan Review.

Reason 3

The proposal is contrary to policy R2 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review and RT4 of the Winchester District Local Plan in that it fails to make adequate provision for public recreational open space to the required standard, and would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the area.

Reason 4

The proposed development is contrary to policy H8 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review), and policy H5 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that it fails to make provision for affordable housing. The proposal would therefore conflict with the housing strategies of these Plans.(Affordable Housing)

The meeting commenced at 11.00am and concluded at 1.35pm

Chairman