

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – SPECIAL MEETING

25 May 2007

Attendance:

Councillors:

Jeffs (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
Busher (P)
Evans (P)
Huxstep (P)
Lipscomb

Johnston (P)
Pearce (P)
Ruffell
Saunders (P)
Sutton (P)

Deputy Members

Councillors Read and Tait (Standing Deputies for Councillors Lipscomb and Ruffell)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Bell and Nelmes

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Lipscomb and Ruffell.

2. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**
(Report PDC688 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 Huxstep declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Item 6, as he had, as a Ward Member, been made aware through the Parish Council of concerns about the site when enforcement action had been initiated. He spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Evans declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of Item 8, as it was a personal application and she therefore left the room during consideration of this item.

Councillors Busher, Johnston, Pearce and Sutton declared personal (but not prejudicial) interests in respect of Item 8 as they were acquainted with the applicant, and they spoke and voted thereon.

By way of personal explanation, Councillor Busher drew attention to Item 2, where her involvement as a Ward Councillor (in that she had spoken with both the applicant and the objector) may have risked the perception of predetermination. Councillor Busher had also requested that the item be referred to the Committee. She therefore

sat apart from the Committee on this item and spoke as a Ward Member only and did not vote thereon.

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

Item 1: Greenmead Cottage, Fairfield Road, Shawford, Winchester - Case Number: 07/00249/FUL

Dr Skipper (South Downs Residents' Association) spoke against the application and Mr Tice (applicant's agent) spoke in support.

The Head of Planning advised that the following corrections to approximate distances to other dwellings from the site should be made on page 6 of the Report:

From Birches – 56 metres
From Westbrook – 35 metres
Mariners – 42 metres

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

Item 2: 6 Godfrey Pink Way, Bishops Waltham – Case Number: 07/00637/FUL

Mr Campbell spoke against the application and Ms Baber-Taylor spoke in support.

Councillor Busher addressed the Committee as a Ward Member. In summary, she was concerned that the design and scale of the proposal would be too prominent in the estate and this was further exacerbated by a rise in ground levels at the site. Furthermore, the proposed monopitch roof was out of character and that the distances to the boundary with the neighbour were too close.

The Head of Planning advised that, since publication of the Report, a statement had been received from the applicant's agent commenting that the design and shape of the proposals contributed positively to the existing built environment, and confirming that the extension was not to be utilised to run a business. The applicant also confirmed that the future growth of the protected tree to the front of the house would not be impeded by the extension.

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

Item 4: 12 Attwoods Drove, Compton, Winchester – Case Number: 07/00450/FUL

Mr Rickaby (applicant) spoke in support of the application and Councillor Bell (a Ward Member) spoke in opposition.

In summary, Councillor Bell reported that the application would result in a loss of amenity to local residents and exacerbate existing severe parking problems. She advised that parking was already extremely limited towards the east of Attwoods Drove and that this lane was the main access to nearby farms. In addition to the possibility of obstructing access for deliveries and tractors etc, she was concerned that emergency vehicles may have their access compromised. Furthermore, she reported that the local bus service (that some residents of Compton were dependent on) had, in the past, been unable to turn due to obstruction of parked vehicles.

Finally, Councillor Bell requested that should the Committee be minded to approve the proposal, it should consider restricting further subdivision of front gardens and properties in the area.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the Report.

Item 5: 3 Dell Cottage, Winchester Road, Shedfield – Case Number: 07/00293/FUL

Mr Clark spoke against the application.

Following debate, the Committee agreed that the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub Committee should visit the site to assess the curtilage of the residential dwelling and the visual impact the proposal may have in the vicinity.

It was agreed that the Sub-Committee would meet, on-site at 9.30am, Monday 18 June 2007 (for Members only to familiarise themselves with the site) and then at 11am at St John the Baptist Church's Study Centre, Church Road, Shedfield to debate and determine the application.

Item 6: Land abutting St Margarets, Maybush Lane, Soberton – Case Number: 07/00293/FUL

Mr Erskine and Mr Turton (Soberton Parish Council) spoke in opposition to the application and Mr Wheeler (on behalf of the applicant) spoke in support.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to support the officer's recommendation to grant planning permission for the reasons set out in the Report, with additional conditions to control outdoor lighting, the submission of details of any access track on the site and for the demolition of an existing prefabricated shed on the site.

Demolition of Former Royal Observer Corps Headquarters Building, Abbots Road, Winchester – Case Number: 06/02251/LIS/W18729/06LB
(Report PDC0689 refers)

Mr Maasz and Mr Cullingford spoke against the application and Mr Holmes, Mr Bruty and Councillor Nelmes (a Ward Member) spoke in support.

In summary, Councillor Nelmes stated that, on balance, the application should be supported. She reported that the present poor condition of the building was not necessarily due to neglect, but rather from problems inherent in its structure from flaws in construction methods. She advised that previous site visits had ascertained that conversion may require substantial replacement of its structure and that this was likely to lead to subsequent delisting. This view was now supported by English Heritage in their latest representation. In addition to this, Councillor Nelmes advised that her constituents generally supported the building's demolition, as it was an eyesore and its retention may require residential redevelopment right up to the site boundary with adjacent homes.

The Head of Planning reported that the valuation of the site as obtained by the Council and as referred to in the report, had subsequently not been accepted by the applicant. The applicant had not agreed with the methodology used by the valuer and did not concur with the valuation placed on the site.

The Head of Planning also reported that, subsequent to the latest consultation response received from English Heritage as referred to in the Update, their final response had now been received. This was circulated to the Committee and placed within the case file. In summary, English Heritage was supportive of the recommendation for demolition of the building.

During discussion, the Head of Planning reported on the latest information with regard to the structural condition of the building and of the views taken by the Council's consultant, and of English Heritage. He reported that in addition to the poor condition of the walls, it was now apparent that extensive replacement of the roof would also be required. This would further diminish the ability to convert the building and retain its conservation value. Furthermore, as the whole building had originally been given listable status, to retain only the central brick built plotting room could not be supported, nor did it have any aesthetic value in its own right.

In granting planning permission, the Committee agreed that a further condition be imposed to specify that a record of the historic importance of the building be retained by both the Council and the National Historic Buildings Record. It was also requested that, if possible, appropriate commemoration of the historical legacy of the building and of its work be included within the eventual redevelopment of the site.

Male Public Conveniences, Abbey Gardens, Winchester – Case Number: 07/00542/FUL
(Report PDC689 refers)

Mr Holder spoke against the proposal and Mr Boardman (on behalf of the Head of Environment, Winchester City Council) spoke in support.

The Committee noted that the proposal required the removal of the three Laurel trees fronting the existing toilet facilities and the adjacent Abbey House. Although their removal would impact on the immediate street scene, this was likely to be compensated for, and further enhanced, by the proposed landscaping scheme.

Following further debate, the Committee resolved to grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out.

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

Item 3: Langton Road, Bishops Waltham, Wickham – Case Number: 07/00677/FUL

The Head of Planning explained that, since publication of the Report, Condition 6 (which related to landscaping) had been revised. Members noted that this allowed the applicant to replace the conifer/leylandii hedge with a native species of hedge, whilst ensuring that the boundary treatment remained a natural feature.

Following debate, the Committee approved the application, subject to conditions as set out in the Report, and as amended above.

Item 7: Swanmore Park Farmhouse, Park Lane, Upper Swanmore – Case Number: 07/00525/FUL

The Head of Planning advised that the above item was deferred for consideration at a future Committee.

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, the application be determined by a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee on Monday 18 June 2007.

3. That in respect of Item 6, planning permission be granted subject to conditions as set out in the schedule which forms an appendix to the minutes and that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman, to agree additional conditions with regard to the control of outdoor lighting, the submission of details of access to the building and for the demolition of an existing prefabricated shed on the site.

4. That in respect of Item 7, the application be deferred for consideration at a future Planning Development Control Committee.

5. That in respect of Demolition of Former Royal Observer Corps Headquarters Building, Abbots Road, Winchester – Case Number: 06/02251/LIS/W18729/06LB, subject to the Secretary of State not requiring the application to be referred to himself for determination, planning permission be granted subject to conditions as set out in the schedule which forms an appendix to the minutes and that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning, for the imposition of an additional condition with regard to national recording of the building.

6. That in respect of the Male Public Conveniences, Abbey Gardens, Winchester – Case Number: 07/00542/FUL, planning permission be granted subject to conditions as set out in the schedule which forms an appendix to the minutes.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned at 1.10pm, recommenced at 2pm and concluded at 3pm.

Chairman