

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE

2 March 2010

Attendance:

Councillors:

Jeffs (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
Berry (P)
Busher (P)
Evans (P)

Huxstep
Johnston (P)
Pearce (P)
Ruffell (P)
Tait (P)

Others in Attendance:

Councillor Bell

Officers in Attendance:

Mr S Avery (Senior Planning Officer)
Mr D Dimon (Team Manager, Planning)
Mr B Lynds (Planning Barrister)

1. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT**

The Sub-Committee met at Winchester Guildhall, where the Chairman welcomed to the meeting three members of the public.

2. **THE LYNCHETS, HURDLE WAY, COMPTON DOWN – CASE NUMBER 09/01410/FUL**
[\(Report PDC843 Item 4 refers\)](#)

The Chairman reminded the Sub-Committee that the application had been considered by the Planning Development Control Committee at its meeting held on 16 February 2010. At that meeting, Members had agreed that the application should be determined by the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee, following a site visit. The Committee had agreed that it was unable 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.

Therefore, immediately prior to the public meeting in the Guildhall, Winchester, the Sub-Committee visited the site.

The Chairman stated that, although it had been requested by the Committee, the applicant had not pegged out the site. However, at the site visit, Members

were shown the position of the new dwellings by Mr Avery, with the assistance of the applicant's architect. At the site visit, Members had also noted the proposed dwelling's relationship with neighbouring properties, including its scale and the height, and viewed a number of neighbouring properties from Hurdle Way.

At the public meeting, Mr Avery reminded Members of the main issues regarding the application as set out in the Report.

In summary, the application proposed a large replacement dwelling of two and a half storeys (8.5 metres high) with a single storey element to the rear and side of the main building. In total, the width of the combined building was 28.2 metres, with a depth of 30 metres. The proposed dwelling would contain six bedrooms, basement accommodation, and a swimming pool and fitness room within the single storey section. The application also proposed the erection of a new, separate triple garage to be located to the front of the house, with first floor storage space above.

To facilitate the new building, the application proposed the demolition of the existing one and half storey, rendered chalet style dwelling with clay roof tiles and garage, in addition to the loss of four trees and various small shrubs.

In response to a Member's question, Mr Avery explained the amendments between the current and previous application for the site and that both schemes had received objections from the Parish Council. However, the current application was considered acceptable by officers, as it removed the proposed boundary fencing, preserved both yew trees at the entrance, reduced the overall impact of the design in the immediate area and re-oriented the single storey extension.

A Member commented that the Report should have made greater reference to the Compton Local Area Design Statement (LADS). In response, Mr Avery explained that the Parish Council had considered that the application contravened the development guidelines of the LADS, but that this was not a view shared by officers.

The Sub-Committee discussed the relatively open frontages of neighbouring properties, which afforded views of the dwellings from Hurdle Way, and noted that the application sought to close these off with additional landscaping and a gate. Following discussion, the Sub-Committee agreed that the gate should not be close-boarded and that this should be conditioned as part of approval of the detailed plans.

From their site visit, Members had noted that the neighbouring properties had areas of open grass between their boundary landscaping and the road. They therefore considered that the applicant's proposal to bring forward the boundary treatment towards the edge of the road, although still within the applicant's ownership, would be detrimental to the character of the area. The Sub-Committee therefore agreed to delegate to the Head of Planning

Management authority to address the Sub-Committee's concerns regarding the boundary landscaping within the landscaping conditions.

In response to a Member's question, Mr Avery explained that 60% of the spoil (primarily from the extraction of soil for the basement and swimming pool areas) would be removed and that the remaining 40% would be spread across the site, raising the garden level by approximately an even 10cm. He added that these details had been submitted as part of the method statement.

The Sub-Committee also discussed the heating system for the swimming pool and the potential for noise from the proposed heat pumps to disturb neighbours. Members therefore agreed an additional condition that the applicant be required to submit details of this equipment to the satisfaction of the Head of Environmental Protection.

During debate, Mr Avery stated that, although the proposed building was large, it was within a plot of adequate size to sustain the building and still provide adequate space around the dwelling. However, Members raised concerns regarding the size and bulk of the proposed building, especially in relation to the neighbouring properties, and the detrimental effect this would have on the character of the area. In response to questions, Mr Avery explained that the gross floor-area would increase from the existing 207 square metres to over 1,000 square metres (which included the basement and pool area).

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee did not support the recommendation set out in the report (and as amended above by virtue of additional conditions regulating boundary treatment, the gate and the heating equipment for the swimming pool) and instead agreed to refuse planning permission. Members considered that the application was contrary to Policy DP3 of the Local Plan in that the scale, height and massing of the dwelling and the extent of the built form proposed on the plot would be over-dominant in the street scene and that it would erode the open character of the area; that it failed to respond positively to the character of the area, and the objectives of the Local Area Design Statement.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be refused for the following reason:

The proposal is contrary to Policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 in that, by reason of the scale, height and massing of the dwelling and the extent of built form being proposed, the development would be over-dominant, eroding the spatial characteristics of the site within the street scene and consequently failing to respond positively to the character, appearance and variety of the local environment or the objectives promoted in the Compton Downs Local Area Design Statement.

The meeting commenced at 11.00am and concluded at 12.05pm.

Chairman