

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**  
**(LOWER HOUSE, WICKHAM) SUB-COMMITTEE**

**23 February 2005**

**Attendance:**

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)  
Bennetts (P)  
Clohosey (P)  
de Peyer (P)

Evans (P)  
Jeffs (P)  
Mitchell (P)  
Pearson (P)

**Officers in Attendance**

Mrs S Proudlock (Planning Team Manager)  
Mrs E Patterson (Planning Officer)

---

1. **LOWER HOUSE, WINCHESTER ROAD, WICKHAM**  
(Report PDC513 refers)

The Sub-Committee visited the site prior to commencement of the meeting to familiarise themselves with the detail of the application. Representatives of the architect and applicant were available to answer questions.

The Sub-Committee met at Wickham Community Centre and the Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately 35 local residents. Also present was Mr Moreton, (Chairman of Wickham Parish Council) Mr Carter (also a Wickham Parish Councillor and Chairman of The Wickham Society) together with representatives of the applicant and architect, Mr Henry Evans and Mr Guy Goodman (HGP Architects), Mr John Bell (John Bell and Partners) and Mr Steve Bolton (Try Homes).

In introducing the proposals to the Sub-Committee, Mrs Patterson reminded Members that this was a second revised application for the site, the first application in September 2004 having been withdrawn. The current application sought planning permission for the erection of 20 dwellings and conversion of the Grade II listed 'Lower House' building into two dwellings. Mrs Patterson updated the Sub-Committee on the details of the proposals and any revisions or requests following consultation with Council Officers.

**Update on the Proposals**

- (i) A revised Landscape Plan was circulated although results of consultation with the Conservation Officer regarding the landscape scheme and from the Highways Engineer regarding the provision of cycle storage on site was awaited. It was reported that it had been requested that the brick pillars at the existing entrance onto Winchester Road should be removed.

- (ii) A revised Method Statement was to be produced regarding the impact from the construction of the access road/'driveway' on the Sycamore and Birch trees to the rear of Lower House that were both under Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs).
- (iii) Details of the proposed communal play-area were also awaited. A programme of archaeological recording in mitigation of the development was also required by condition.
- (iv) The Housing Enabling Officer had requested that the affordable units include the ground and first floor flats in Block F and one of the three bedroom terrace houses, Swaythling Housing Association (as the registered social landlord) was satisfied that the transfer of the 7 units in Block F, without a lift, would deliver 32% affordable housing on site.
- (v) Any contaminants on-site would need to be addressed by impact assessments and remedial recovery, subject to condition, should planning permission be granted. The applicant was submitting a contamination assessment for consultation with the Environmental Health officers.
- (vi) A draft Section 106 Agreement had been submitted. This would facilitate the repair of the listed 'Lower House' building, affordable housing provision and the provision and management of open space. This draft would require further internal consultation within the Council.
- (viii) Mrs Patterson confirmed that service agencies had been consulted and would report back to the Planning Development Control Committee regarding service provision for the site.

#### Presentation from HGP Architects

Mr Cooper, representing HGP Architects, detailed his client's proposals for the site and introduced some of its integral schemes such as 'home-zoning' (regarding the access road/driveway), the provision of car parking and bicycle storage and location of refuse storage. Reference to the Wickham Village Design Statement had been taken into consideration during design.

Mr Cooper introduced to the Sub-Committee the detail of the individual buildings including their forms, internal layouts and elevations. He explained that many of the new buildings were of varying themes and heights and that the terracing was mainly staggered along its length. He reported that the existing 'Lower House' was of seventeenth century construction with nineteenth century additions and that the fabric of the building was of considerable disrepair, with severe damp problems. It was proposed to repair this building and to divide it into two separate dwellings.

Mr Cooper detailed landscaping proposals for the site. It was explained that the access road/driveway was to be gravelled, with clearly defined parking areas and conservation paving installed round 'Lower House'. Communal and private lawns were to be integrated within the development and a 1.8 metre brick wall was to be constructed at the rear of the site that backed onto the properties called 'Meonpool', 'The Jays' and numbers 1 and 3, Tanfield Park.

In conclusion, Mr Cooper advised that the revised application was proposing a scheme that had embraced a number of elements. These included those of

sustainability, density issues and architectural influences from Wickham Village, as well as working within the constraints of the site, that included the shared access with Upper House Court, the two large TPO trees and the existing listed building.

#### Overlooking and bulk

Following questions regarding the proximity of Block F to 'The Jays', Mr Cooper confirmed that by reducing its originally proposed elevation towards the site boundary and by the construction of a 1.8 metre boundary wall, it was considered that there would not be considerable overlooking.

Following further discussion of the potential of overlooking of 'Meonpool' from Block F and the new terrace, Mrs Patterson advised that the nearest corner of 'Meonpool' was approximately 12 metres to the boundary and approximately 20 metres to Block F. It was confirmed that the windows to the rear of Block F backing onto the site boundary and 'The Jays' were comprised of living rooms and bedrooms on both the first, second and ground floors. The Sub-Committee was reminded that the second floor was, in fact, set back into the roof with dormer windows. Mr Cooper advised that he would provide drawings (inclusive of the 1.8 metre high wall) indicating visibility lines to 'The Jays'. He advised that should the top floor of block F be removed from the proposals, two affordable housing units would be lost from the scheme. Further to comments regarding the height and massing of block F within the Conservation Area, Mr Cooper advised that Block F was effectively two storeys with windows in the roof. Mrs Patterson advised that there were other buildings of this height on Winchester Road.

Reference was made to the bulk of Block F in relation to the existing Upper House Court fronting Winchester Road. Several residents considered that a three storey block was not appropriate in a Conservation Area. It was requested that the plans for Block F should not be shown in isolation to the neighbouring buildings and that revised plans detailing this should be provided.

A local resident and owner of the property 'The Jays' referred to the Wickham Village Design Statement and advised that he considered that this development was not appropriate. He advised that his property would be overlooked and that the development, especially Block F was out of sympathy with other development in the area.

Mr Morton (Chairman of Wickham Parish Council) stated that the Parish Council considered that the proposals represented over-development of the site.

Mr Cooper confirmed that the existing beech hedge on 'The Jays' side of the site boundary would be protected from root damage during construction of the new brick wall

#### Site Contamination

Responding to a question, Mr Bolton (Try Homes) advised that the diesel tank in situ beneath the site had been drained and that the surrounding soil had been tested for contaminants. This had proved negative. However, there would be a condition of remediation of any contamination as part of any planning agreement.

### Parking and Traffic issues

Following discussion of the provision of parking spaces, reference was made to current planning guidelines that promoted sustainability of all new schemes. However, comments made regarding parking constraints at Wickham Square (resulting in it not being an acceptable alternative for visitor parking) were acknowledged.

Several residents from Upper House Court were present and expressed concern at the access and egress of traffic to and from the site from the shared access to Winchester Road, particularly its narrowness. They also referred to the parking provision adjacent to Lower House fronting Winchester Road and that this would be hazardous. The Chairman of Upper House Court Residents' Association commented that the proposed parking provision would inevitably result in parking on the access road/driveway.

Mr Carter suggested that parking provision for the site must be increased to two parking spaces per dwelling, as the majority of residents did not work in Wickham and were required to drive.

Mr Morton (Chairman of Wickham Parish Council) stated that the Parish Council was concerned with the access and egress to Winchester Road.

### Affordable Housing

A Member was concerned at the lack of integration of the affordable housing with the rest of the development. In reply, Mr Cooper stated that Block F was positioned due to the constraints of the site and the desirability to maximise provision. He added that registered social landlords generally preferred units separated to assist with their management.

### Lower House

Mr Cooper stated that it was originally intended for the 'Lower House' to be divided into four units. However, the Council's Conservation Officer had asked this to be reduced.

### Neighbouring Sites

A number of residents and representatives of the Parish Council referred to future proposals for the neighbouring laboratories site. There was concern over the inevitability of additional traffic movement through the Lower House site to the second site and the pressures of access and egress onto Winchester Road. It was suggested that the application under consideration today could not be determined in isolation to any future proposals for the neighbouring site.

Responding, Mrs Proudlock reported that there were no current applications for the laboratories site and explained that the local authority was obliged to determine the proposals for the Lower House site in isolation.

Mr Morton (Chairman of Wickham Parish Council) requested that there should be no right of access/egress at this point for any second site development of the laboratory site. Furthermore, it was requested that as the road/driveway through the site currently stopped at the south-east corner by the boundary to the laboratories, a turning circle be provided to clearly show that this was the end of this development.

### Conclusions

At the conclusion of the debate, the Sub-Committee acknowledged the concerns raised by members of the public, representatives of the Parish Council and Wickham Society.

Members expressed concern regarding the massing and potential of overlooking from Block F. A Member requested that Block F be reduced to two storeys. The Sub-Committee also requested that highway issues be revisited by officers, especially the access and egress to and from Winchester Road. Concern was also expressed at parking issues and a Member requested that parking provision on site should be increased. Some Members were also concerned at the massing and bulk of the terraced houses and the maintenance of the un-adopted driveway/road.

The Sub-Committee also acknowledged the comments made regarding the neighbouring laboratory site and the impact that any future development of this would have upon this site.

#### RESOLVED:

That the comments and issues as detailed above be forward to Planning Development Control Committee for consideration.

The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and concluded at 7.10 pm.

Chairman