

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE

28 March 2012

Attendance:

Councillors :

Ruffell (Chairman) (P)

Berry (P)

Clear (P)

Evans (P)

Izard (P)

Johnston (P)

Laming (P)

Pearce (P)

Read (P)

Ruffell (P)

Rutter (P)

Tait (P)

Others in Attendance:

Councillor Hutchison (a Ward Member for St Paul)

Officers in Attendance:

Mr A Rushmer – Planning Officer

Mr B Lynds – Planning and Projects Barrister

Mrs J Pinnock – Development Management Manager

Mr D Ingram – Head of Environmental Protection

1. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT**

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

2. **1 SINGLE STORY BUILDING CONTAINING TWO CLASSROOMS AND WC FACILITIES TO REPLACE EXISTING SINGLE STOREY ARMOURY BUILDING TO THE SOUTH – PETER SYMONDS COLLEGE, OWENS ROAD, WINCHESTER – CASE NUMBER 11/03052/FUL**
[\(Report PDC926 Item 4 refers\)](#)

Councillor Evans declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as she had previously taught at the College during the 1980s. Councillor Rutter also declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as her daughter was a student at the College. They both spoke and voted thereon.

The above application had been referred to the Sub-Committee for determination by the Planning Development Control Committee, at its meeting held on 8 March 2012. The Committee had agreed that it was unable to determine the application without first visiting the site, to assess its proximity to neighbouring properties and to better understand how the new building would

relate to existing dwellings, in terms of its design and scale and the potential for noise generation and disturbance.

Therefore, prior to this meeting, the Sub-Committee had visited the site in the company of officers. The site was located in Hatherley Road, Winchester adjacent to the main campus, on the opposite side of the playing fields. Representatives of the applicant and their architect were also available to answer questions. Councillor Hutchison was also present.

At the site visit, the Sub-Committee had observed the following to assist in its consideration of the application:

- Although larger than the existing building, the footprint of the replacement building was further away from the adjacent neighbouring residential property (3 metres, compared to 2.6 metres). It was reported that the overall floor space was to be increased by approximately 50%.
- The increased height of the proposal compared to the existing building, including where the mono-pitched roof increased to its highest point of 4 metres.
- The trees adjacent to the existing building, which it was confirmed were all to be retained and their roots protected.
- The retained soil embankments around the side and to the rear of the building which was to be re-graded.
- The overall position of the new building (to face the car park) and its potential to impact on the overall street scene in this part of Hatherley Road. There was to be one window proposed to the side elevation of the new building which would face houses on the opposite side of Hatherley Road.

A full presentation had been given at the Planning Development Control Committee meeting on 8 March 2012, where the Committee had also heard public participation. Therefore, in accordance with procedure, the presentation at the Sub-Committee was limited to a summary of the key issues and there was no repeat of the public participation period.

Mr Rushmer reminded the Sub-Committee of the proposal as outlined in the Report. This was for a single storey building, containing two classrooms and wc facilities to replace the existing single storey armoury building. The Sub-Committee was also reminded of the main objections to the application which they had duly noted during the site visit. These included concerns over the design and scale of the new building and the potential for noise generation and disturbance in this predominately residential area.

Mr Rushmer drew the Sub-Committee's attention to the Update Sheet, which set out details of the previous day's release by the Government of new National Planning Policy guidance. In summary, Mr Rushmer explained that the new national policy superseded the existing policy references given within the Report. Members were also reminded that the adopted Winchester District Local Plan still generally remained the foremost policy consideration.

Mr Rushmer also drew attention to proposed amendments to Conditions 3 and

8 (not Condition 4, as set out in the Update Sheet) which had been re worded in response to suggestions proposed previously by Councillor Hutchison. These conditions would restrict the use of the classrooms to uses that were unlikely to disturb the occupiers of nearby dwellings and also that the classrooms should not be used after 1700 Monday to Friday, or at weekends or public holidays. These amendments to the conditions in the report were acceptable to officers and were noted by Members.

During questions, Mr Rushmer clarified that it was considered that the application accorded with policies RT1 and RT2, as the proposal did not undermine the character and appearance of the green spaces of the Peter Symonds campus, nor the street scene of Hatherley Road. Mr Rushmer also pointed out that the application was for a replacement building, which was seen as potentially less harmful to an alternative proposal that may be sited on a vacant plot elsewhere on campus. Officers were satisfied that the proposal would replace an unsightly and dilapidated building and would be an improvement within its overall setting. In addition, its modern design was acceptable within the more varied street scene of this part of Hatherley Road.

Mr Rushmer also clarified that the existing armoury building was ancillary to the wider Peter Symond's campus. Therefore, it could potentially be utilised for teaching purposes without planning permission at any time, if it was in better condition. He also clarified that the application was probably an indication of a desire by the College to make better use of its facilities and was not necessarily an indication that it was proposing to increase its student numbers.

During further discussion, Members referred to some temporary classrooms located close to the application site further. It was reported that these were permitted under temporary planning permission, and the college's future intentions with regard to these was unknown at this time. Any replacement proposed would eventually be subject to planning permission.

The Sub-Committee discussed the relative proximity of the building to residential buildings. A window proposed to be located in the side elevation facing Hatherley Road was unlikely to cause potential for overlooking of houses on the opposite side of the road. It was further away than houses opposite each other further down the road. In addition, the taller building would not create any material change to overshadowing and was also located further way from its immediate neighbour (compared to the existing armoury building) and was situated to the north of the properties opposite.

With regard to the contemporary design of the proposal, Mr Rushmer advised that he understood that the increase in height and sloping roof was largely to do with the aesthetics of the building's design. Its entrance was in the middle of the building due to the need to make best use of its footprint to accommodate two classrooms.

The Sub-Committee noted that no additional landscaping was formerly proposed by the applicant. Members agreed that it was unnecessary to compel the applicant to introduce a landscaping schedule which may not be

acceptable with immediate neighbours. It was considered that the sedum roof would be a visual enhancement compared to the existing flat roof.

At the conclusion of debate, the Sub-Committee agreed to grant planning permission for the reasons (and subject to the conditions) as set out in the Report, with conditions 3 and 8 amended as described above and set out below.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted, subject to the Conditions as set out in the Report, with the 3 and 8 amended as described above and set out below:

3 The building hereby permitted shall only be used between the hours of 08:30 - 17:00 Monday to Friday, and shall not be used at any time on Saturday or Sunday or recognised Public Holidays.

8 The two classrooms hereby permitted shall be used as general teaching accommodation and not for any performances, music, science experiments or any uses that cause demonstrable undue disturbance to the amenities of occupiers of nearby dwellings.

The meeting commenced at 11.00am and concluded at 12.10pm.

Chairman