

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

26 May 2005

PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT

Contact Officer: Sian Proudlock Tel No: 01962 848271

RECENT REFERENCES:

Report PS 56 to Principal Scrutiny Committee - Performance Report Concerning Planning Appeals (9.12.02)

Report EN 8 to Environment Performance Improvement Committee - planning appeals analysis of decisions. (12.03.03)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This report provides a summary of appeal decisions received during April 2005, as requested by members at the Environment Performance Improvement Committee meeting in March 2003. Copies of each appeal decision are available in the Members' Room if required.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1 That the report be noted.

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

26 MAY 2005

PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

DETAIL:

A summary of appeal decisions received during April 2005 for sites within Development Control Area West is set out below:

1.1 April 2005 Appeal Decisions for Development Control Area West

Date	Site	Decision	Proposal	Issues
05/04/05	W03577/04: Land Adjacent To Pitt View Enmill Lane Pitt	Dismissed	Four bedroom house and garage	This site, within the countryside, has a lawful use for the storage of builders materials. The proposed dwelling would be a noticeably more intrusive feature in the landscape than this present use. The potential for a more intensive storage use of the site, which may or may not arise, would not be a sound reason for allowing a development which would be contrary to policy. DEL IH
05/04/05	W12896/05: Racquets Lankhills Road Winchester	Dismissed	Demolition of existing dwelling and replace with a three storey block of 4 no. three bedroom dwellings, 2 no. two bedroom dwellings and 2 no. one bedroom ground floor flats with associated garages	The scale and width of the development in Appeal A would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would leave insufficient space for adequate planting to allow the development to be assimilated into the wider context without harm. Extensive hard surfacing would compound this impact. The development in Appeal B provides for greater separation from the boundaries and therefore increased space for setting and landscaping, which would allow the block to be accommodated into, and complement the area. The design of the building, the
	W12896/06: Racquets Lankhills Road Winchester	Allowed	Demolition of existing dwelling and replacement	

			with three storey block of 3 no three bedroom, 2 no two bedroom dwellings and 2 no one bedroom ground floor flats with associated garages, parking and new access	separation, site levels and intervening planting, would prevent any unacceptable harm through overlooking in relation to surrounding dwellings and their gardens. There is adequate parking provided in this sustainable location and the proposed parking and turning area would not cause demonstrable harm through noise and disturbance. The change in outlook for neighbouring properties would also not cause unacceptable harm. Therefore Appeal A is dismissed and Appeal B allowed. Applications for costs against the Council for both appeals failed. CTTE IH
05/04/05	W19070: Oakwood Mayhill Lane Swanmore	Dismissed	Ground and first floor extension to an existing bungalow	The proposals would increase the depth and height of the roof and would make it appear overbalanced. Overall, the width and height of the extended building would appear cramped within the site and it would contrast inappropriately with the adjacent chalet bungalow. Therefore it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The development would also be harmful to the living conditions of the adjacent bungalow through its unacceptable visual impact and through loss of light. DEL WR
08/04/05	W04414/03: Kiln Farm Winchester Road Upham	Allowed	Erection of detached workshop for vehicle service and mechanical repair (retrospective)	The workshop has the appearance of an agricultural building. It is within a farmyard setting, is not particularly apparent in the wider landscape and is not inappropriate in appearance in the countryside. There is only one work bay, so the extent of activity would be limited and, subject to a condition restricting external

				<p>storage, the development would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside. In a small way the workshop would help to sustain the rural economy and this outweighs the conflict with Policy C2. The development would also not be harmful to highway safety.</p> <p>DEL WR</p>
11/04/05	W12833/08: St Johns Ambulance Hall Little Shore Lane Bishops Waltham	Dismissed	Extension to provide a first floor training hall and an extension to the rear elevation of the existing premises	<p>The proposals would significantly increase the bulk of the building in a largely featureless and unattractive way and the unbroken brickwork wall which would face into the Conservation Area would appear incongruous and rather obtrusive. The extension would also appear intrusive and oppressive when viewed from the garden area and rear windows of the neighbouring dwelling and would cause an increase in loss of light. The proposed parking and access for the development is unsatisfactory and would have an adverse impact on the safety and convenience of users of the adjacent highway and visitors to the appeal site.</p> <p>DEL WR</p>
11/04/05	W19165: The Stables Brickyard Road Swanmore	Dismissed	Erection of a detached two bedroom dwelling	<p>There is no justification for a new dwelling in the countryside. The proposal would be noticeably larger than the existing barn and would be clearly visible, introducing a suburban feel to this very rural location. It would also result in an overall increase in traffic, which would give rise to highway safety concerns due to the poor visibility at the nearby junction and the insufficient width of the access lane.</p> <p>DEL WR</p>

12/04/05	W17446/03: Old Forge Cottage Heathen Street Durley	Dismissed	Detached triple garage	<p>The height, scale and overall appearance of the proposed garage would make it an intrusive new feature that would be out of keeping with the rural surroundings. It would be located some 14 metres away from the main dwelling and the overall size of the proposed building is such that it would represent a significant encroachment of development into the countryside.</p> <p>DEL WR</p>
14/04/05	W19036: Mimosa Cottage Wintershill Durley	Dismissed	Two storey side extension	<p>This property is a prominent, detached dwelling in the countryside, visible in open views to the east. The scale, layout, design and siting of the proposed extension are such that it would be out of keeping with the existing building and would detract from its essentially simple character and appearance. Moreover, by seeking to extend the dwelling to the east the proposal would represent a significant intrusion of development into the countryside.</p> <p>DEL WR</p>
14/04/05	W17932/01: The Lainston Dairy Woodman Lane Sparsholt	Dismissed	Conversion of outbuilding to ancillary living accommodation and office for estate	<p>The proposal relates to an agricultural building originally used as stabling for calves, but now in storage use. It lies within the grounds of a former Dairy, now in residential use. The external appearance of the building would not change materially as a result of the proposals and the use of part of the building as an estate office or similar commercial use would be acceptable. However, the inclusion of ancillary accommodation would represent non-essential development which, although not a separate dwelling, would be likely to result in the spread of domestic</p>

				<p>paraphernalia which would have an impact on the rural character of the area. No justification has been provided for this additional residential unit and there would be the possibility in the future that a separate residential curtilage could be established.</p> <p>DEL WR</p>
27/04/05	W18780/01: Oakwood Curdridge Lane Curdridge	Dismissed	Change of use, conversion of first floor of barn to art studio with 3 No. skylights to front and 3 No. dormers to rear, French doors leading to decking at first floor level	<p>The existing barn is a modest, simple agricultural building, appropriate to its rural surroundings and the proposed gable constructions to the rear would have a significant impact upon its character while the addition of French doors would introduce an inappropriate suburban feature. The proposed flat roofed single storey addition, by virtue of its shape and substantial mass, would be unsympathetic to the character of the rural surroundings.</p> <p>DEL WR</p>
27/04/05	W17301/02: 4 Vernon Close Bishops Waltham	Dismissed	New access	<p>The proposed sight lines would be an improvement on the present access available to the users of the appeal property and would benefit traffic emerging from the adjacent Close. In the context of the other frontage treatment to residential development along the western side of this lane, the proposals would not be unacceptable if accompanied by sensitive landscaping. However, the cutting back of the bank to provide the visibility splay would have an adverse impact on the mature Copper Beech tree which makes an important contribution to the local scene.</p> <p>DEL WR</p>

28/04/05	W09932/01: 40 Pine Road Bishops Waltham	Dismissed	Change of use of amenity strip to residential garden with new boundary fence	The proposed fence along one side of most of the length of an access road would be an intrusive and dominant feature to the detriment of the street scene and the general open character of the area. DEL WR
----------	---	-----------	--	---

DEL Delegated decision
CTTE Committee decision

WR Written representations
IH Informal hearing
PI Public inquiry

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

2 CORPORATE STRATEGY (RELEVANCE TO):

- 2.2 Success on appeal is a measure of quality. It demonstrates that the policies of the development plan and the decisions reached by officers and members can be successfully defended.

3 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 3.1 The number of appeals received and the success of appeals has an impact on staff time and legal costs.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

None

APPENDICES:

None