

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

16 February 2010

Attendance:

Councillors:

Jeffs (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
Bell (P)
Busher (P)
Evans (P)
Fall

Huxstep (P)
Johnston (P)
Lipscomb
Ruffell (P)
Tait (P)

Deputy Member:

Councillor Berry (Standing Deputy for Councillor Lipscomb)
Councillor Pearce (Standing Deputy for Councillor Fall)

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Beckett

1. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SCHEDULE**
([Report PDC843 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.

By way of a personal statement, Councillor Bell explained that she had pre-determined Item 4 and as such, would withdraw from the Committee for that item and, having made representations as a Ward Member during public participation, retired to the public gallery, taking no further part in that item.

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

Item 4: The Lynchets, Hurdle Way, Compton Down – Case Number 09/01410/FUL

The Head of Planning Management explained that, subsequent to the publication of the Report, a further representation had been received from Compton and Shawford Parish Council. In summary, this referred the Committee to paragraph L3 of the Compton Down Local Area Design Statement regarding the proposed frontage.

Mr Bell (Compton and Shawford Parish Council) and Councillor Bell (a Ward Member) spoke against the application.

In summary, Councillor Bell reiterated the importance of the Parish Council's Local Area Design Statement, which she considered this application to contravene in terms of scale of development, architectural treatment, the specific constraints on Hurdle Way and the treatment of frontage areas and entrances.

Councillor Bell also commented on the setting of the application site; explaining that it was on single track lane where the only opportunities to pass or turn around were at the entrances of individual properties.

Councillor Bell added that the existing building, which the applicant proposed to demolish, was an attractive house in a beautiful setting, which could only be glimpsed from the lane; a description she considered could not be applied to the proposed building. She explained that the previous application to re-develop the site had been refused because of its mass and scale and the incongruousness of the proposed walls, pillars and gates. However, she considered that the current application had made only had minor concessions to these criticisms. The height and width of the proposed building was only marginally less than the refused application and the incongruous pillars and gates remained, resulting in the loss of the open frontage.

In conclusion, Councillor Bell recommended that the Committee refuse the application as it dominated, rather than embraced, its surroundings and also as it reinforced a trend for gated mansions in the area.

Following discussion, the Committee agreed that the application should be determined by a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee, to be held on Tuesday 2 March 2010. This was because Members did not consider it possible to determine the application without first visiting the site to assess the proposed size and design of the application in the context of its setting and the neighbouring properties. The Committee also requested that the footprint of the proposed building be pegged out to assist the Sub-Committee on site.

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 4 (The Lynchets, Hurdle Way, Compton Down) planning permission be referred to the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee for determination at its meeting to be held on 2 March 2010.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 2.10pm.

Chairman