

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**17 February 2011**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Johnston (Chairman) (P)

Evans (P)

Hutchison (P)

Huxstep (P)

Jefferies (P)

Lipscomb

Mitchell (P)

Pearce (P)

Tait (P)

Deputy Members:

Councillor Read (Standing Deputy for Councillor Lipscomb)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Cook, Hiscock and Verney

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Bell

---

1. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SCHEDULE**

[\(Report PDC883 refers\)](#)

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 Hutchison declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Items 1, 4 and 5 as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on these applications. However, he had taken no part in the Trust's consideration of these items and he spoke and voted thereon.

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

**Item 4: Lang House, 27 Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester – Case Number 10/00338/FUL**

The Head of Planning Management explained that, subsequent to the publication of the Report, a final copy of amended plans had been received, which omitted roof terraces, and it was recommended that an amendment be included to Condition 8 regarding sustainability. Furthermore, it was explained

that the Report should make reference to South East Plan policy NRM11, as a relevant planning policy.

Professor Whitehouse (a local resident) and Mr Pybus (a representative of Royal Winchester Golf Club) spoke against the application and Mr Thomas (on behalf the applicant) spoke in support.

The Committee agreed that, to better appreciate the potential impact of the development on the character of the area, this item should be determined by a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee to be held on 10 March 2011, following a site visit.

Item 5: 45 Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester – Case Number 10/00764/FUL

The Head of Planning Management explained that, subsequent to the publication of the Report, it was recommended that an amendment to Condition 7 regarding sustainability be included. Furthermore it was explained that the Report should make reference to South East Plan policy NRM11, as a relevant planning policy.

Mrs Diedrichsen (a local resident) spoke against the application and Mr Thomas (on behalf the applicant) spoke in support.

The Committee agreed that, to better appreciate the potential impact of the development on the character of the area, on the wooded nature of this part of Chilbolton Avenue and how the application responded to the requirements of the Local Area Design Statement, this item should be determined by a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee to be held on 10 March 2011, following a site visit.

Items 8 and 9: Bramdean Manor, Church Lane, Bramdean – Case Numbers 10/03174/FUL and 10/03175/LIS

The Committee considered these items together, including the public participation.

The Head of Planning Management explained that, subsequent to the publication of the Report, a consultation response had been received by the South Downs National Park Authority. In summary, this stated that whilst they had objected to the previous application, they had subsequently visited the site and raised no objection in terms of its impact on the wider landscape of the National Park. However, they referred to the Conservation Officer's comments with regard to the potential impact on the listed building. The National Park also suggested that, if granted, conditions should be placed regarding materials used and that significant trees should be protected during the construction phase.

The Head of Planning Management also reported that an additional letter in support of the application had been received from the Hampshire Gardens Trust, which duplicated their comments of support made on the previous application.

In addition to the above, the Conservation Officer reported that, subsequent to the publication of the Report, he recommended that the word “inappropriate” design be included in the proposed reason for refusal. He also explained that, from a visit to the Hampshire Records Office, he had discovered information relating to the previous ownership of the house and photographs taken in 1924 which proved that the parapets were built before this date. The same photographs illustrated the small side extension, which also appeared in a map dating from 1870. Maps from 1970 and 1975 illustrated the existence of an L-shaped building and that this building would have interrupted the view from the house to the nearby church. The Conservation Officer also reported that, as a consequence of his latest research, it now appeared unlikely that the property was used as a rectory.

Councillor Verney (a Ward Member) and Mr Fraser (on behalf of the applicant) spoke in support of the application.

In summary, Councillor Verney explained that excavations were minor and would have no archaeological impact because of the location of the cellar; that there had been no objection from the arboricultural officer or South Downs National Park Authority, and that the revised application had reduced the size of the garage by one-third. He also did not see the logic of assuming that the proposed garage and extension should be built on the site of a Victorian extension, as recommended by the Conservation Officer. Councillor Verney considered that this site would interrupt views to the church from the house and break the garden wall. He added that the site selected by the applicant would increase the security of their garden and, with the additional landscaping they proposed, would only be visible from the air. Councillor Verney also explained that the current garage dated from an era when the occupants would have used chauffeurs. However, the current occupants had no staff, did their own shopping and therefore, to keep the driveway in front of the house clear, needed a garage closer to the house. Finally, Councillor Verney recommended that, if the Committee were not minded to grant permission, they should visit the site to gain a better understanding of the application.

The Committee agreed that, to gain a better understanding of the applications this item should be determined by a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee, to be held on 10 March 2011 following a site visit.

RESOLVED:

1. That, in respect of Item 4 (Lang House, 27 Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester), the application be determined by a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee, to be held 10 March 2011.
2. That, in respect of Item 5 (45 Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester), the application be determined by a meeting of the

Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee, to be held 10 March 2011.

3. That, in respect of Items 8 and 9 (Bramdean Manor), the application be determined by a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee to be held 10 March 2011.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned for lunch between 1.15pm and 2.00pm and concluded at 4.45pm

Chairman