

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

Item No: 6
Case No: 09/01753/FUL / W10131/02
Proposal Description: Modifications and extension to existing rear terrace (part retrospective) (amended plans received 17.11.2009 showing 1.8 metre close boarded fence running along the side of the terrace).
Address: Wimborne Uplands Road Denmead Waterlooville Hampshire
Parish, or Ward if within Winchester City: Denmead
Applicants Name: Mr Adrian Clements
Case Officer: Mr Andrew Rushmer
Date Valid: 28 August 2009
Site Factors:

Recommendation: Application Permitted

General Comments

This application is reported to Committee at the request of Councillor Stallard and Denmead Parish Council, whose request is appended in full to this report.

Site Description

The area generally consists of large detached houses within spacious gardens, where the landscaping, trees and openness contribute to the local character.

The levels in the area slope down to the north, and there is a public footpath to the side and rear of the site although, due to the tall fencing and foliage running along the footpath and boundaries, the terrace is not visible from the footpath.

The size of the terrace was checked on site and is 1.27m from the boundary with Guelder Cottage, and the terrace is approximately 1 metre above ground level at its end point.

The neighbouring property has a single storey garage located on the boundary, and this runs next to the terrace for approximately 3.3 metres.

There is some foliage along the boundary (which is fairly thin and is approximately 2m tall) and some bamboo pots are currently situated on the boundary.

Proposal

The proposal is part retrospective, with the terrace largely completed, and the proposal is to finish the construction of the terrace (including glazing screens) and erect a fence on the eastern side of the terrace, which would be 1.8m tall (in terms of its height above the terrace) and will run along the entire length of the terrace (approximately 9.2 metres).

At its tallest point, the fence will be approximately 3 metres above ground level although, as the land rises towards the host dwelling, the terrace becomes progressively lower, and hence the height of the fence is reduced in line with the reduction in height of the terrace.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

Relevant Planning History

87/01960/OLD - W10131: Conservatory - Permitted - 16/09/1987.

89/01390/OLD - W10131/01 - First floor side extension, pitched roof and garage - Permitted - 27/12/1989.

Consultations

Environmental Health:

The Council's Environmental Protection Officer registered no objection to the proposal, but did recommend a condition requiring details of the treatment plant (Condition 4).

Building Control:

Registered no comment.

Representations:

Denmead Parish Council:

Objected (for the reasons outlined below) and requested that the application be heard by the Committee, should there be a conflict between the views of the Parish Council and the Head of Planning Management:

- In terms of design, scale and layout, the proposal would not respond positively to the character, appearance and variety of the local environment and is therefore contrary to Policy DP3 (ii) of the adopted WDLP;
- The proposal would have an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining land, uses or property, contrary to Policy DP3 (vii) of the adopted WDLP;

In response to the amended plans the Parish Council made the following representations:

It was RESOLVED that a STRONG OBJECTION be raised citing the reasons given for the full application which were:

- In terms of design, scale and layout the proposal would not respond positively to the character, appearance and variety of the local environment and is therefore contrary to policy DP3 (ii) of the adopted WDLP.
- the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining land, uses or property contrary to Policy DP3 (vii) of the adopted WDLP.
- Members considered that the amended plans would only exacerbate the proposals and not improve them.

2 letters of objection received (more than 2 letters have been received, but only 2 separate households have objected), stating the following reasons for objection:

- This proposed fence on the terrace would, in effect, make the fence between 3m and 3.2m in height and extending 9.2 metres into the garden. The permitted development right for the height of a fence is only 2m;
- This significant structure would completely alter the character and nature of the rear of the properties;
- The development, due to its size, height and nature, is overbearing and visually

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

intrusive to neighbouring properties;

- Loss of privacy at the neighbouring property, in relation to the house, conservatory, patio and garden area (*this objection refers to the terrace prior to the proposal to incorporate a fence*);
- The privacy measures originally proposed (*i.e. the glazed screens*) will only benefit the applicant, and will not improve the situation for neighbouring properties (*this also relates to the original proposal, i.e. without the fence*);
- Use of the spa inflicts noise disturbance on the neighbouring property;
- The height of this raised platform is four times the recommended height as outlined in Planning Regulations under permitted development (*permitted development allows for a raised terrace or decked area of up to 300mm*);
- Permitting the proposal would set a dangerous precedent;
- The application details refer to mature boundary screening, but the objector considers that the planting is neither dense nor evergreen and will not offer effective screening;
- The objector disputes the applicant's assertion that a raised terrace previously existed in the location of the present terrace. They assert that the previous terrace was at ground level;
- The information submitted does not accurately represent the increase in size and impact of the terrace;
- There is no space for mature planting on the boundary due to the pathway built in between the terrace and the boundary;
- The height of the decking is not shown clearly on the plans;
- The plans do not provide sufficient information in order to be able to confidently assess the proposal;
- There was no consultation with the neighbouring property;
- The objector questions whether the local planning authority would have been inclined to accept the proposal were it not retrospective.
- If the development is to be permitted then the objector has called for a covenant to be employed in order to ensure that their privacy is maintained and that the means of screening has a satisfactory visual impact. Furthermore, they have requested that a landscape condition be imposed in order to ensure that robust landscaping screening is provided along the boundary.

Relevant Planning Policy:

South East Plan 2009:
BE1

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006
DP3

Supplementary Planning Guidance:
Denmead Village Design Statement

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The site of the proposed development is located within the defined settlement boundary of Denmead, in which the principle of extensions to residential properties is acceptable,

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

subject to compliance with the detailed provisions of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

Provision for retrospective applications is made by Section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and it is a well-established principle that retrospective applications must be assessed on the same basis as all other planning applications, with the retrospective nature of the application neither counting for or against the proposal. It is on this basis that the application has been considered by officers.

Design/layout

It is considered that, in terms of design and scale, the proposal is in accordance with the requirements of Policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

The terrace is finished with stone paving slabs, and is proposed to have timber decking around the swim-spa, and its design is not considered to be objectionable. The fence is proposed to be a standard timber fence, and is consistent with those in the area in terms of appearance.

Furthermore, whilst the scale of the terrace is considerable, it should be considered in relation to the size of the rear garden and the existing property. The scale of the structure is not considered to be out of proportion to the size of the garden.

In terms of impact on the character of the area, the site is not readily visible from the public realm and the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

It is considered that the only relevant guideline in the Denmead Village Design Statement is No. 3, which calls for space to be retained around buildings, and which is achieved by this proposal as it involves no extension to the side, and the terraced area is open in character, only being enclosed by a fence and balustrading.

Impact on neighbouring properties

It is considered that, in terms of impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, the proposal will be in accordance with the requirements of Policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

Turning first to the impact on Guelder Cottage (to the east) it is considered that the impact on this property is adequately overcome by a condition requiring the retention of the fence on the eastern boundary. The fence would block out virtually all views from the terrace towards Guelder Cottage. Furthermore, the height of the timber decking can also be controlled by means of a condition requiring that it be no more than 10cm above the existing terrace (which is the figure quoted in the applicant's design and access statement) and, as such, the decking will not result in a level of harm to the amenity of the occupants of Guelder Cottage such as to warrant refusal.

With regard to the potential for the fence to cause an overbearing impact on Guelder Cottage, it is considered that three metres tall is not a sufficient height to constitute an overbearing impact in this case. There is also a degree of separation between the fence and the main lawn and patio area of Guelder Cottage (provided by the garage and pathway running along the boundary). The length of the fence is considerable and could appear stark, were no landscaping to be proposed. However, given that there are

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

extensive open views afforded to the north, which will not be affected by the proposal, it is considered that the overall enjoyment of the garden is not going to be compromised to an unacceptable degree by the proposed fence.

In terms of the impact on Highfield (to the west), a glazed screen (as opposed to a fence) is proposed on this boundary, and therefore, rather than an overbearing impact, the issue is more one of loss of privacy in relation to this property. The terrace is situated considerably forward of the rear elevation of Highfield and this, coupled with the existing single storey extensions of Wimborne, prevents views of the rear patio area of Highfield. The terrace does not afford extensive views into the neighbouring garden, and this, combined with the proposed glazed screen and existing boundary screening, along with a break between the two dwellings where a footpath exists, is considered to limit the impact on Highfield to an acceptable level.

It is considered that the proposed retention of the terrace and erection of the fence is not of a sufficient scale to impact to any significant extent on properties further away than the two neighbouring properties.

Noise and disturbance

It is considered that the terrace is unlikely to give rise to a level of activity which would result in a materially harmful degree of noise and disturbance to neighbouring properties (see the comments of the Council's Environmental Health Officer, above). However, this conclusion is subject to the imposition of a condition concerning details of any treatment plant, in order to ensure that the noise any such equipment emanates is within acceptable parameters.

Other Matters

Precedent

It is considered that there is no evidence to suggest that there would be a glut of similar applications were this application to be permitted, nor would it necessarily be harmful even if this were to be the case, provided suitable privacy measures were incorporated. A refusal on the grounds of precedent would be very difficult to sustain in such circumstances.

Quality of the information submitted

Various concerns have been raised with regard to the level and accuracy of the information submitted.

It is considered that the information submitted is adequate in order to assess the impact of the proposal on the neighbouring properties.

Reference to the previous terrace is made in the applicant's design and access statement. Officers have no means of assessing the extent and impact of the previous terrace, and indications from aerial photos appear to suggest that the terrace was somewhat smaller in terms of scale than that currently proposed for retention in this application. The fact that a terrace/patio previously existed is accorded little weight as a material consideration. However, the terrace, as proposed, is considered to be acceptable, for the reasons explained above.

As has been referred to above, the lack of information included on the plans concerning

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

the height of the decking can be adequately dealt with by a condition (Condition 3).

The applicant has offered to plant climbing plants on the side of the fence facing the neighbouring property (Guelder Cottage), but these are not considered to be essential to ensure the acceptability of the proposal, and hence no condition has been imposed requiring their planting and retention.

Recommendation

Application Permitted, subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. Within three months of the date of this decision, the fence and glazing screens hereby approved shall be erected and thereafter retained in perpetuity in a sound and effective condition, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure that permitting the proposal does not result in an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring property, as required by Policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006

2. The glazing screens hereby approved shall be obscure glazed, and retained as such in perpetuity, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure that permitting the proposal does not result in an unacceptable impact being inflicted on the neighbouring property, as required by Policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006

3. The decking hereby approved shall not to be more than 10cm higher than the level of the terrace, and thereafter retained at that height, or less, in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to ensure that permitting the proposal does not result in an unacceptable impact being inflicted on the neighbouring property, as required by Policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006

4. Before any spa/pool plant equipment is installed and operated on the premises, a full acoustic report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The equipment, including any sound attenuation measures, shall be installed and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties, as required by Policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

5. No lighting, whether free standing or affixed to any existing structure, shall be provided on the site at any time, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure that permitting the proposal does not result in an unacceptable impact being inflicted on the neighbouring property, as required by Policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

Informatives

1. This permission is granted for the following reason:

The development is in accordance with the policies and proposals of the Development Plans set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

2. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following Development Plan policies and proposals:-

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP3

South East Plan 2009: BE1

Denmead Village Design Statement

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

Item No: 6
Case No: 09/01753/FUL / W10131/02
Proposal Description: Modifications and extension to existing rear terrace (part retrospective) (amended plans received 17.11.2009 showing 1.8 metre close boarded fence running along the side of the terrace).
Address: Wimborne Uplands Road Denmead Waterlooville Hampshire
Parish, or Ward if within Winchester City: Denmead
Applicants Name: Mr Adrian Clements
Case Officer: Mr Andrew Rushmer
Date Valid: 28 August 2009
Site Factors:

Recommendation: Application Permitted

General Comments

This application is reported to Committee at the request of Councillor Stallard and Denmead Parish Council, whose request is appended in full to this report.

Site Description

The area generally consists of large detached houses within spacious gardens, where the landscaping, trees and openness contribute to the local character.

The levels in the area slope down to the north, and there is a public footpath to the side and rear of the site although, due to the tall fencing and foliage running along the footpath and boundaries, the terrace is not visible from the footpath.

The size of the terrace was checked on site and is 1.27m from the boundary with Guelder Cottage, and the terrace is approximately 1 metre above ground level at its end point.

The neighbouring property has a single storey garage located on the boundary, and this runs next to the terrace for approximately 3.3 metres.

There is some foliage along the boundary (which is fairly thin and is approximately 2m tall) and some bamboo pots are currently situated on the boundary.

Proposal

The proposal is part retrospective, with the terrace largely completed, and the proposal is to finish the construction of the terrace (including glazing screens) and erect a fence on the eastern side of the terrace, which would be 1.8m tall (in terms of its height above the terrace) and will run along the entire length of the terrace (approximately 9.2 metres).

At its tallest point, the fence will be approximately 3 metres above ground level although, as the land rises towards the host dwelling, the terrace becomes progressively lower, and hence the height of the fence is reduced in line with the reduction in height of the terrace.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

Relevant Planning History

87/01960/OLD - W10131: Conservatory - Permitted - 16/09/1987.

89/01390/OLD - W10131/01 - First floor side extension, pitched roof and garage - Permitted - 27/12/1989.

Consultations

Environmental Health:

The Council's Environmental Protection Officer registered no objection to the proposal, but did recommend a condition requiring details of the treatment plant (Condition 4).

Building Control:

Registered no comment.

Representations:

Denmead Parish Council:

Objected (for the reasons outlined below) and requested that the application be heard by the Committee, should there be a conflict between the views of the Parish Council and the Head of Planning Management:

- In terms of design, scale and layout, the proposal would not respond positively to the character, appearance and variety of the local environment and is therefore contrary to Policy DP3 (ii) of the adopted WDLP;
- The proposal would have an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining land, uses or property, contrary to Policy DP3 (vii) of the adopted WDLP;

In response to the amended plans the Parish Council made the following representations:

It was RESOLVED that a STRONG OBJECTION be raised citing the reasons given for the full application which were:

- In terms of design, scale and layout the proposal would not respond positively to the character, appearance and variety of the local environment and is therefore contrary to policy DP3 (ii) of the adopted WDLP.
- the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining land, uses or property contrary to Policy DP3 (vii) of the adopted WDLP.
- Members considered that the amended plans would only exacerbate the proposals and not improve them.

2 letters of objection received (more than 2 letters have been received, but only 2 separate households have objected), stating the following reasons for objection:

- This proposed fence on the terrace would, in effect, make the fence between 3m and 3.2m in height and extending 9.2 metres into the garden. The permitted development right for the height of a fence is only 2m;
- This significant structure would completely alter the character and nature of the rear of the properties;
- The development, due to its size, height and nature, is overbearing and visually

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

intrusive to neighbouring properties;

- Loss of privacy at the neighbouring property, in relation to the house, conservatory, patio and garden area (*this objection refers to the terrace prior to the proposal to incorporate a fence*);
- The privacy measures originally proposed (*i.e. the glazed screens*) will only benefit the applicant, and will not improve the situation for neighbouring properties (*this also relates to the original proposal, i.e. without the fence*);
- Use of the spa inflicts noise disturbance on the neighbouring property;
- The height of this raised platform is four times the recommended height as outlined in Planning Regulations under permitted development (*permitted development allows for a raised terrace or decked area of up to 300mm*);
- Permitting the proposal would set a dangerous precedent;
- The application details refer to mature boundary screening, but the objector considers that the planting is neither dense nor evergreen and will not offer effective screening;
- The objector disputes the applicant's assertion that a raised terrace previously existed in the location of the present terrace. They assert that the previous terrace was at ground level;
- The information submitted does not accurately represent the increase in size and impact of the terrace;
- There is no space for mature planting on the boundary due to the pathway built in between the terrace and the boundary;
- The height of the decking is not shown clearly on the plans;
- The plans do not provide sufficient information in order to be able to confidently assess the proposal;
- There was no consultation with the neighbouring property;
- The objector questions whether the local planning authority would have been inclined to accept the proposal were it not retrospective.
- If the development is to be permitted then the objector has called for a covenant to be employed in order to ensure that their privacy is maintained and that the means of screening has a satisfactory visual impact. Furthermore, they have requested that a landscape condition be imposed in order to ensure that robust landscaping screening is provided along the boundary.

Relevant Planning Policy:

South East Plan 2009:
BE1

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006
DP3

Supplementary Planning Guidance:
Denmead Village Design Statement

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The site of the proposed development is located within the defined settlement boundary of Denmead, in which the principle of extensions to residential properties is acceptable,

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

subject to compliance with the detailed provisions of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

Provision for retrospective applications is made by Section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and it is a well-established principle that retrospective applications must be assessed on the same basis as all other planning applications, with the retrospective nature of the application neither counting for or against the proposal. It is on this basis that the application has been considered by officers.

Design/layout

It is considered that, in terms of design and scale, the proposal is in accordance with the requirements of Policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

The terrace is finished with stone paving slabs, and is proposed to have timber decking around the swim-spa, and its design is not considered to be objectionable. The fence is proposed to be a standard timber fence, and is consistent with those in the area in terms of appearance.

Furthermore, whilst the scale of the terrace is considerable, it should be considered in relation to the size of the rear garden and the existing property. The scale of the structure is not considered to be out of proportion to the size of the garden.

In terms of impact on the character of the area, the site is not readily visible from the public realm and the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

It is considered that the only relevant guideline in the Denmead Village Design Statement is No. 3, which calls for space to be retained around buildings, and which is achieved by this proposal as it involves no extension to the side, and the terraced area is open in character, only being enclosed by a fence and balustrading.

Impact on neighbouring properties

It is considered that, in terms of impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, the proposal will be in accordance with the requirements of Policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

Turning first to the impact on Guelder Cottage (to the east) it is considered that the impact on this property is adequately overcome by a condition requiring the retention of the fence on the eastern boundary. The fence would block out virtually all views from the terrace towards Guelder Cottage. Furthermore, the height of the timber decking can also be controlled by means of a condition requiring that it be no more than 10cm above the existing terrace (which is the figure quoted in the applicant's design and access statement) and, as such, the decking will not result in a level of harm to the amenity of the occupants of Guelder Cottage such as to warrant refusal.

With regard to the potential for the fence to cause an overbearing impact on Guelder Cottage, it is considered that three metres tall is not a sufficient height to constitute an overbearing impact in this case. There is also a degree of separation between the fence and the main lawn and patio area of Guelder Cottage (provided by the garage and pathway running along the boundary). The length of the fence is considerable and could appear stark, were no landscaping to be proposed. However, given that there are

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

extensive open views afforded to the north, which will not be affected by the proposal, it is considered that the overall enjoyment of the garden is not going to be compromised to an unacceptable degree by the proposed fence.

In terms of the impact on Highfield (to the west), a glazed screen (as opposed to a fence) is proposed on this boundary, and therefore, rather than an overbearing impact, the issue is more one of loss of privacy in relation to this property. The terrace is situated considerably forward of the rear elevation of Highfield and this, coupled with the existing single storey extensions of Wimborne, prevents views of the rear patio area of Highfield. The terrace does not afford extensive views into the neighbouring garden, and this, combined with the proposed glazed screen and existing boundary screening, along with a break between the two dwellings where a footpath exists, is considered to limit the impact on Highfield to an acceptable level.

It is considered that the proposed retention of the terrace and erection of the fence is not of a sufficient scale to impact to any significant extent on properties further away than the two neighbouring properties.

Noise and disturbance

It is considered that the terrace is unlikely to give rise to a level of activity which would result in a materially harmful degree of noise and disturbance to neighbouring properties (see the comments of the Council's Environmental Health Officer, above). However, this conclusion is subject to the imposition of a condition concerning details of any treatment plant, in order to ensure that the noise any such equipment emanates is within acceptable parameters.

Other Matters

Precedent

It is considered that there is no evidence to suggest that there would be a glut of similar applications were this application to be permitted, nor would it necessarily be harmful even if this were to be the case, provided suitable privacy measures were incorporated. A refusal on the grounds of precedent would be very difficult to sustain in such circumstances.

Quality of the information submitted

Various concerns have been raised with regard to the level and accuracy of the information submitted.

It is considered that the information submitted is adequate in order to assess the impact of the proposal on the neighbouring properties.

Reference to the previous terrace is made in the applicant's design and access statement. Officers have no means of assessing the extent and impact of the previous terrace, and indications from aerial photos appear to suggest that the terrace was somewhat smaller in terms of scale than that currently proposed for retention in this application. The fact that a terrace/patio previously existed is accorded little weight as a material consideration. However, the terrace, as proposed, is considered to be acceptable, for the reasons explained above.

As has been referred to above, the lack of information included on the plans concerning

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

the height of the decking can be adequately dealt with by a condition (Condition 3).

The applicant has offered to plant climbing plants on the side of the fence facing the neighbouring property (Guelder Cottage), but these are not considered to be essential to ensure the acceptability of the proposal, and hence no condition has been imposed requiring their planting and retention.

Recommendation

Application Permitted, subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. Within three months of the date of this decision, the fence and glazing screens hereby approved shall be erected and thereafter retained in perpetuity in a sound and effective condition, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure that permitting the proposal does not result in an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring property, as required by Policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006

2. The glazing screens hereby approved shall be obscure glazed, and retained as such in perpetuity, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure that permitting the proposal does not result in an unacceptable impact being inflicted on the neighbouring property, as required by Policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006

3. The decking hereby approved shall not to be more than 10cm higher than the level of the terrace, and thereafter retained at that height, or less, in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to ensure that permitting the proposal does not result in an unacceptable impact being inflicted on the neighbouring property, as required by Policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006

4. Before any spa/pool plant equipment is installed and operated on the premises, a full acoustic report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The equipment, including any sound attenuation measures, shall be installed and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties, as required by Policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

5. No lighting, whether free standing or affixed to any existing structure, shall be provided on the site at any time, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure that permitting the proposal does not result in an unacceptable impact being inflicted on the neighbouring property, as required by Policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

Informatives

1. This permission is granted for the following reason:

The development is in accordance with the policies and proposals of the Development Plans set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

2. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following Development Plan policies and proposals:-

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP3

South East Plan 2009: BE1

Denmead Village Design Statement

Andrew Rushmer

From: PGSTALLARD@aol.com

Sent: 25 September 2009 13:47

To: Andrew Rushmer

Subject: Wimborne, Uplands Road, Denmead

Andrew

Case No. 09/01753/FUL

Wimborne, Uplands Road, Denmead

The above is a retrospective planning application as work on the project is already well underway.

I understand that neighbours and the Denmead Parish Council have raised strong objections to the proposed extension which, I believe, is designed to accommodate a spa/bath. I wish to add my voice to those concerns and request a DPC meeting to discuss, based on the following material grounds -

- Policy DP3 (ii) the building most certainly is not in keeping, in terms of design, scale and layout - or appearance and variety of the local environment - with dwellings nearby.
- Policy DP3 (vii) the proposed building would definitely have an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining property and would detract from their quiet enjoyment of their amenities.

I also understand that the building work has quadrupled the height of the terrace to 1.2m around the swim spa area and is four times over the permitted development rights for a raised terrace, which requires it to be a maximum of 300mm.

Patricia Stallard
Ward Councillor for Denmead

[Click here to report this email as spam.](#)

05/02/2010

Please return this form to the Case Officer: Mr Andrew Rushmer

From: Denmead Parish Council

Case No: 09/01753/FUL

Closing Date for Comments: 1.10.09

Location: **Wimborne, Uplands Road, Denmead, PO7 6HF**
Proposal: **Modifications and extension to existing rear terrace (RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION)**

Comments:

The Parish Council of Denmead raised an OBJECTION to this proposal, and cited the following reasons:

(a) In terms of design, scale and layout the proposal would not respond positively to the character, appearance and variety of the local environment and is therefore contrary to policy DP3 (ii) of the adopted WDLP. (b) the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining land, uses or property contrary to Policy DP3 (vii) of the adopted WDLP.

Request for application to be considered by Committee:

(NB: Case Officer to forward form to Head of Planning Control if this section completed)

Should there be a conflict of views between Members comments and the Case Officer, Members would wish for this matter to go to the Development Control Committee.

Signed: *K W Andrews*

Date: 1 October 2009