

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

28 October 2010

Attendance:

Councillors:

Johnston (Chairman) (P)

Evans (P)
Fall
Huxstep
Jeffs (P)

Lipscomb (P)
Mitchell (P)
Pearce (P)
Tait (P)

Deputy Members

Councillor Berry (Standing Deputy for Councillor Huxstep)
Councillor Bell (Standing Deputy for Councillor Fall)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Collin, Cook, Mather, Verney and Wood

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Hutchison

1. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SCHEDULE**
[\(Report PDC870 refers\)](#)

The schedule of development control decisions arising from consideration of the above Report is circulated separately and forms an appendix to the minutes.

Councillor Lipscomb declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Items 1, 2 and 10 as he was a member of the Council of the City of Winchester Trust which had commented on these applications. However, he had taken no part in their consideration of these applications and therefore spoke and voted thereon.

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

Item 1: Chestnut Mead, Kingsgate Road, Winchester – Case Number 10/00253/FUL

The Head of Planning Management advised that, since publication of the Report, a letter of support for the application had been removed, the landscape officer had confirmed that the layout of the scheme was acceptable

in landscape terms and the reasons for refusal for each of the previous applications were set out in the update sheet.

Mr Marley and Councillor Mather (a Ward Member) spoke against the application and Mr Waite (representative of the applicant) and Mr Thomas (architect) spoke in support.

In summary, Councillor Mather explained that, along with many of the neighbours, she had no objection to the proposals to renovate Chestnut Mead itself, but did object to the proposed new dwellings to the rear of the property. She stated that recent Government changes to planning guidance should mean that there was greater protection against back garden development; that the development failed to preserve or enhance the special and organic character of the area (as recognised by the Appeals Inspector); that English Heritage had raised concerns about the prospect of this application setting a precedent for rear garden development in the area; and that the application was not an enabling development to restore Chestnut Mead.

Councillor Mather also stated that the latest application was not significantly different to previous applications, which had been refused, and that the proposed new dwellings were not sufficiently subservient to Chestnut Mead.

In response, the Head of Planning Management explained that officers had had regard to the representation from English Heritage, which was summarised within the Report and was available in full on the Council's website.

At the conclusion of the presentation, the Head of Planning Management explained that, due to prior commitments, the Head of the Historic Environment Team was not able to attend this meeting. Following debate, the Committee agreed that it would not be able to determine the application without the attendance of this officer or viewing the site, given the impact of the scheme on the Conservation Area and the proposed renovation of the historic Chestnut Mead. Members therefore agreed to defer the application a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee, to be held on Thursday 18 November, with a site-visit (for the Committee only) the previous day. The Committee also agreed that the public participation element of the meeting and officers' presentation would not be repeated at the next meeting.

RESOLVED:

1. That, in respect of Item 1 (Chestnut Mead, Kingsgate Road, Winchester) planning permission be deferred to the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee to be held on 18 November 2010.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned for lunch between 1.35pm and 2.15pm and concluded at 6.30pm

Chairman