### PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

#### 21 April 2011

Attendance:

Councillors:

Johnston (Chairman) (P)

Evans (P) Hutchison (P) Huxstep (P) (for Item 1 only) Jeffs (P) Pearce (P) Lipscomb (P) Mitchell (P) Tait (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Bell, Godfrey, Learney and Wright

### 1. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 31 March 2011 be approved and adopted.

### 2. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SCHEDULE**

(Report PDC890 refers)

The schedule of development control decisions arising from consideration of the above Report is circulated separately and forms an appendix to the minutes.

Councillor Lipscomb declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of Item 2 due to the proximity of the application to his property and that his property may be affected by the highways consequences of any consent. Therefore for this item, having addressed the Committee as a member of the public during public participation, he then left the room.

Councillor Lipscomb also declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Item 1 as an ordinary member of the Camping and Caravan Club, which traded in association with the applicant, Forest Holidays, but he had had no involvement with the Club on this matter. Councillor Lipscomb was also an ordinary member of the Dever Society, who had commented on the application, but he held no office in the Society and had taken no part in their deliberations on the application. Therefore, Councillor Lipscomb spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Mitchell declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Item 2 due to his friendship with one of the objectors. However, by way of a

personal statement, Councillor Mitchell declared that it was likely that there was a perception of pre-determination, he therefore withdrew from the Committee and sat in the public gallery during this item.

Councillor Hutchison declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of Item 8 as he was an associate of the householder and he therefore left the room during the Committee's consideration of that item.

# <u>Applications determined outside the area of the South Downs National</u> Park:

The following items had speakers during public participation:

### Item 1: Black Wood, Bradley, Basingstoke Road, Micheldever 10/03109/FUL

The Head of Planning Management explained that, subsequent to the publication of the Report, letters had been received requesting that the item be deferred in order to clarify a number of discrepancies within the submitted Planning Obligation Legal Agreement. The Head of Legal Services advised that, although it was a matter for the Committee to decide, there was no reason to defer the item as Legal Agreements were routinely finalised after the Committee's decision, reflecting Members' wishes. Furthermore, planning permission was only issued once the legal obligation has been concluded. Following debate, the Committee agreed to proceed.

The Head of Planning Management also reported that, following the publication of the Report, the applicant had agreed to extend the period that they intended to run the shuttle bus from three to five years.

It was also explained that four additional letters of objection had been received and an additional condition (Condition 20) was recommended relating to the restoration of the site, should the business cease. This was later agreed by the Committee.

Ms Robertson (Dever Society), Ms Hawksworth, and Councillors Godfrey and Wright (as Ward Members) spoke against the application and Mr Taylor (representing the applicant) spoke in support.

In summary, Councillor Godfrey stated that the application represented and set an unwelcome precedent for the permanent destruction of the countryside and ancient woodland through the impact of the proposed buildings and from the impact of visitors and employees. He stated that the employees were unlikely to be drawn from the local area and the proposed development was therefore unsustainable. He considered that, as the visitors would have nothing to do on site, they would be forced to use their cars to visit tourist attractions and that there were practical problems with the proposed mini-bus service. He added that the immediate road network was unsuitable to walkers and cyclists, due to the number of large lorries. Although he considered that the applicant had failed to demonstrate an over-riding reason to develop in the countryside, Councillor Godfrey stated that if the Committee were minded to permit the application, he would request a number of amendments to the

proposed conditions. These were that the restoration of the site (Condition 20) should be 18 months after the failure of the business (rather than the proposed 3 years) to be secured by a bond; that the mini-bus service should be provided for as long as the business was operational and that reasonable public access to the site should be secured.

Councillor Wright also spoke against the application. In summary, he underlined that the application had no benefits to the local community, as it provided no housing or jobs; that its green tourism credentials were misleading; that it was likely that the number of chalets would increase; that there were more suitable sites elsewhere; that it would restrict public enjoyment of the site with restrictions on dog walkers and horseriders and, referring to the Localism Bill, that a clear majority of the local community were opposed the application. However, he stated that if the Committee were minded to approve the application, he recommended an additional condition be included regarding fencing to protect the privacy of neighbouring properties.

In response, the Head of Planning Management explained that the above issues had been considered in the Report.

The Head of Legal advised that, at its meeting on 8 November 2010, the Committee had refused a previous application for 98 cabins at the site principally because of its scale and the impact on the landscape setting of the wood. Therefore, if the Committee were minded to refuse the current, smaller application for 60 cabins for any additional reasons, this would require very sound evidence and should focus on the difference between the current and previous schemes. The Corporate Director (Operations) drew Member's attention to the Government's recent publication "Planning for Growth." This set out the expectation that Local Planning Authorities would approve sustainable development which created new employment and economic activity unless it was clearly against other policy considerations. He added that the emerging Localism Bill did not establish that the existence of a large number of objections, regardless of their planning merits, would be a material consideration in its own right.

During debate, the Committee agreed to include an additional informative reminding the applicant that, within their travel plan, they should incorporate management measures to stagger guest arrival/departure times to minimise the traffic impact and similarly consider minimising disruption to local residents from lorries servicing the site, by advising against peak time or early morning or night time deliveries /collections. The Committee also agreed to increase the time period for the requirement to operate the shuttle bus to ten years, which would be secured through the Section 106 Legal Obligation.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission for the reasons (and subject to the conditions) as set out in the Report, subject to the additional Condition 20, Informative and extension in time of shuttle bus operation to ten years, as referred to above.

#### Item 2: 109 Harestock Road, Winchester – Case Number 10/03250/FUL

Subsequent to the publication of the Report, the Head of Planning Management recommended an additional condition (Condition 14) regarding visibility splays which enabled the retention of the front hedge, as long as it was properly maintained.

Councillor Lipscomb (speaking as a local resident), Mr Elsmore (Littleton and Harestock Parish Council) and Councillor Learney (as a Ward Member) all spoke against the application and Mr Salter (applicant) spoke in support.

In summary, Councillor Learney explained that the application would be detrimental to the character of the area by virtue of its scale, massing, design and materials; that it was likely to create parking problems at the narrowed entrance to Lovett Walk and that the shared street space was well-used by pedestrians; that there were overlooking concerns and she reminded the Committee of the recent refusal for nearby proposals. She also commented that, if the Committee were minded to approve the application, Condition 6 regarding construction traffic required strengthening.

In response, the Head of Planning Management explained the differences between this application and the recently refused application at 97 Harestock Road. With regard to overlooking, he explained that the nearest dwelling was approximately 17 metres away.

During debate, Members raised concerns regarding the affect the application would have on the character of the area due to its scale and that it was an overdevelopment of the site.

Therefore, at conclusion of debate, the Committee did not support the recommendation set out in the Report and instead agreed to refuse planning permission. The Committee agreed that the proposed development was contrary to Policy DP3ii of the Local Plan because by virtue of its scale and massing, it would give rise to a congested appearance and represent an overdevelopment of the site, which would appear cramped in the street and that it failed to respond positively to the character and environment of the area. The Committee also agreed to add to the reasons for refusal the applicant's failure to provide adequate open space and highways contributions to mitigate the effect of the development.

# <u>Item 3: Land adjacent to Beechcroft, Vicarage Lane, Curdridge – Case Number 10/02991/FUL</u>

Mr Tutton (representing the applicant) spoke in support of the application.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the Report.

# <u>Item 4: Land at Grovelands, Copse Farley, Mount Road, Hursley – Case Number 10/01990/FUL</u>

The Head of Planning Management reported that, following the publication of the Report, a further representation had been received from Hursley Parish Council, which expressed its concern at the delay in reaching a decision and reiterated its support for the application.

Councillor Bell (a Ward Member and as a representative of Hursley Parish Council) and Mr Russell (one of the applicants) spoke in support of the application.

In summary, Councillor Bell explained the interdependency of all three applications from the applicant (including permission for a cattle shed which had been granted by officers under delegated authority) and the need for the dwelling as accommodation for a skilled worker, his family and an office. Councillor Bell also highlighted the work of the Council's Informal Scrutiny Group considering Planning and the Rural Economy. She also explained that, over time, the site had been separated through various sales, to the point that Down Farm now had no significant dwellings.

During debate, the Committee agreed that the applicant had demonstrated exceptional circumstances which warranted a departure from the Council's policies. The Committee noted that, although the proposed business was new to the District, the applicant was a fifth generation farmer who wished to relocate his successful cattle business from its present Somerset location to Hursley, as the land had been inherited by one of the applicants and offered the opportunity for the creation of a larger farm. Therefore the Committee considered that the viability test had been shown to be met by the applicants' established farm. The Committee also agreed with the County Land Agent that the proposed stockman's house was essential to the business in the location proposed.

Therefore, at conclusion of debate, the Committee did not support the recommendation set out in the Report and instead agreed to grant planning permission for reasons set out above. The Committee agreed to delegate to the Head of Planning Management authority to set appropriate conditions (in consultation with the Chairman) and indicated that these should include, amongst others, time limits, agricultural occupancy, details on materials, landscaping, and access. In addition to these, the Committee required a personal condition tying the new dwelling to the benefit of the applicant or his immediate family. Furthermore, in the event that the business failed and the use ceased and no other suitable use could be found within 12 months of cessation, the dwelling should be demolished.

### <u>Item 5: Land south of Butchers Plantation, Main Road, Hursley – Case</u> Number 10/01990/FUL

Councillor Bell (a Ward Member and as a representative of Hursley Parish Council) and Mr Russell (one of the applicants) spoke in support of the application.

In summary, Councillor Bell explained that, through previous sales, the land no longer had a large farm house and that the existing Down Farmhouse was inadequate. She added that the proposed dwelling would not be visible from the public realm, was in an ideal location in the centre of the farm. She reminded the Committee that the County Land Agent had agreed that the business justified two agricultural dwellings. Councillor Bell added that the applicant had been advised by the Council to erect a temporary dwelling on site, but had rejected this option as he had lived in temporary accommodation 30 years ago in Somerset when he was establishing his business. The applicant also advised Members of the significant number of cattle likely to be on site once the farm was relocated; of the need for two experienced people to be on hand to manage the stock, which included dangerous large bulls; and that his business traded high-value beasts internationally, so it was necessary to have customer accommodation provision within the farmhouse as clients required to see the operation at first hand.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the Report.

### <u>Item 6: 12 Mornington Drive, Winchester – Case Number 10/03143/FUL</u>

Mr Eatwell (one of the applicants) spoke in support of the application.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the Report.

# Applications within the area of the South Downs National Park determined on behalf of the National Park Authority:

### Item 1: The Crest, Garrison Hill, Droxford - Case Number 11/00175/FUL

Mr French (a local resident) spoke against the application and Mr Cook (applicant's agent) spoke in support.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission for the reasons (and subject to the conditions) set out in the Report.

#### RESOLVED:

- 1. That the decisions taken on the Development Control Applications, as set out in the Schedule which forms an appendix to the minutes, be agreed.
  - i) That, in respect of Item 1 (Black Wood, Micheldever) planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the Report and an additional Condition 20 (regarding restoration of the site), an Informative (regarding the travel plan), and extension of the minibus service to 10 years through the Section 106 Legal Obligation.

- ii) That, in respect of Item 2 (109 Harestock Road, Winchester) planning permission be refused as the proposed development was contrary to Policy DP3ii of the Local Plan, because, by virtue of its scale and massing, it would give rise to a congested appearance and represent an overdevelopment of the site, which would appear cramped in the street and that it failed to respond positively to the character and environment of the area. The Committee also agreed to add to the reasons for refusal failure to make adequate open space and highways contributions to mitigate the effect of the development.
- iii) That, in respect of Item 4 (Land at Grovelands, Copse Farley, Mount Road, Hursley) planning permission be granted and that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Management to set appropriate conditions (in consultation with the Chairman) to include, amongst others, provision of open space contribution, time limits, agricultural occupancy, details on materials, landscaping, and access. In addition to these, a personal condition be required tying the new dwelling to the benefit of the applicant or his immediate family. Furthermore, in the event that the business failed and the use ceased and no other suitable use could be found within 12 months of cessation, the dwelling should be demolished.

### 3. <u>CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2025 – 16</u> BEREWEEKE WAY, WINCHESTER

(Report PDC895 refers)

**RESOLVED:** 

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 2025 be confirmed.

# 4. CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2022 – THE SPINNEY, GRANGE ROAD, WONSTON

(Report PDC896 refers)

Dr Owen (one of the landowners) spoke in objection to the confirmation.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to confirm the Tree Preservation Order as set out.

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 2022 be confirmed.

# 5. CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2024 – COPPERFIELD, LANHAM LANE, WINCHESTER

(Report PDC887 refers)

The Head of Planning Management explained that, subsequent to the publication of the Report a further representation had been received from the landowner and that this was placed on the case file.

#### RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 2024 be confirmed.

### 6. **VOTE OF THANKS**

As this was last meeting of the 2010/11 Municipal Year, the Committee recorded its unanimous thanks to its Chairman, Councillor Johnston, for his chairmanship and work throughout the year and Councillor Johnston reciprocated accordingly.

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and adjourned between 1.30pm and 2.15pm and concluded at 6.30pm

Chairman

### WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE: DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MEETING

**DECISIONS** 

21.04.2011

PART II DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS

AND DECISIONS THEREON

Page 1 Delegatedv1

#### Micheldever Ward Wonston And Micheldever

01 Conservation

(WC

Area:

Case No: 10/03109/FUL Ref No: W21368/06

**Date Valid:** 8 December 2010 **Grid Ref:** 453642 143105

Team: EAST Case Officer: Nick Parker

**Applicant:** Forest Holidays

**Proposal:** Resubmission of an application for improved public access

including new vehicular entrance and 20 space public car park, 60 wooden holiday cabins (38% and 54% less than previously refused schemes), a facilities building (comprising

reception, shop, cafe, WCs, forest experience room, managers accommodation, cycle hire, back office and

storage), maintenance yard, boiler room, sewerage plant and electricity sub-station, access tracks, walking and cycling routes, cycle stands and car parking, and enhanced

woodland management plan.

**Location:** Black Wood, Bradley, Basingstoke Road, Micheldever,

Hampshire

**Officer** PER

Recommendation

.

#### **Committee Decision:**

APPROVE SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

That, subject to the applicant agreeing to enter into an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act to secure the following matters to the satisfaction of the Head of Legal Services:

#### Conditions/Reasons

1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2 The proposed accommodation shall not be used other than for holiday purposes and shall not be used for any individual's main or sole residential dwelling. The holiday accommodation shall not be occupied for a period exceeding 4 weeks for

Page 2 Delegatedv1

any single letting, shall not be occupied for more than 3 times per year by the same occupier, and there shall be no return within 4 weeks by the same occupier. A register of all occupiers, detailing dates, names and usual addresses, shall be maintained by the owner and shall be kept up to date and available for inspection at all reasonable hours by officers of the Council.

Reason: The site is located within an area where permission for permanent residential accommodation would not normally be granted and therefore the Local Planning Authority wishes to retain control over the use of the site.

3 No more than 60 holiday units shall be on site at any one time. The site shall not be used for any camping or caravanning whatsoever.

Reason: In order to prevent the establishing of additional tourist accommodation, this may have an additional impact on the environmental interests of the site.

4 The occupation of the manager's apartment hereby permitted shall be limited to a person solely or mainly working in connection with the holiday park and any resident partner or dependant.

Reason: The site is located within an area where permission for independent residential accommodation would not normally be granted and therefore the Local Planning Authority wishes to retain control over the use of the approved residential accommodation

5 No development shall take place until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the cabins, central facilities building, wood chip boiler building, maintenance yard buildings, electricity substation hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development presents a satisfactory appearance, in the interests of the amenities of the area.

- 6 No development shall take place until details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include the following, as relevant:
- existing and proposed finished levels or contours;
- means of enclosure;
- car parking layout;
- other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas;
- hardsurfacing materials;
- minor artefacts and structures (eg. street furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc);
- proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage,

Page 3 Delegatedv1

#### power,

communications cables, pipelines etc, including lines, manholes, supports etc.);

- retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration.

Soft landscape details shall include the following, as relevant:

- planting plans;
- written specification (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and

grass establishment;

- schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where
  - appropriate;
- retained areas of grassland cover, scrub, hedgerow and woodland;
- manner and treatment of watercourses, ditches and banks;
- implementation programme.

Reason: To improve the appearance of the site, in the interests of visual amenity.

7 All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out before the use hereby permitted is commenced and prior to the completion of the development, or in accordance with the programme agreed with the Local Planning Authority. If, within a period of five years after planting, any tree or plant is removed, dies or becomes, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged, defective or diseased, another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally approved shall be planted at the same place, within the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscape, in accordance with the approved designs.

8 A landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for Black Wood, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the development or any phase of the development, whichever is the sooner, for its permitted use. The landscape management plan shall be carried out in accordance with the details hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure that due regard is paid to the continuing enhancement and maintenance of amenity afforded by landscape features of communal, public, nature conservation and historic significance.

9 Prior to the commencement of development details of all signage and interpretation, site furniture and features, and play area shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These works shall be implemented in full before the site is brought into formal public use by either the occupation of the first holiday unit or the opening of the public car park (whichever the sooner)

Page 4 Delegatedv1

Reason: To achieve an acceptable balance between the provision of necessary apparatus to serve the site, whilst limiting the proliferation of unnecessary clutter within this sensitive woodland.

10 All construction and pre-construction preparation works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan produced by Holder Mathias Architects dated November 2010 ref. PL(90)118 and the approved Black Wood Management Plan, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the protection of the ecological and landscape interests of the site.

11 No noisy activities associated with construction shall take place outside the following hours, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

Monday – Friday 08:00 -18:00

Saturday 08:00 - 13:00

No work shall take place on Sundays or public holidays

Reason: To protect the amenity of the area.

12 Development shall cease on site if, during any stage of the works, unexpected ground conditions or materials which suggest potential contamination are encountered, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Works shall not recommence before a site assessment has been undertaken and details of the findings along with details of any remedial action required (including timing provision for implementation), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be completed other than in accordance with the approved details. NB - potentially contaminated ground conditions include infilled ground, visual evidence of contamination or materials with an unusual odour or appearance.

Reason: In order to secure satisfactory development and in the interests of the safety and amenity of future occupants.

13 No development shall commence until a plan of the improved access to the site with Larkwhistle Farm Road has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety

14 No development shall commence until the improved access to the site with Larkwhistle Farm Road has been constructed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and in accordance with the approved plans.

Page 5 Delegatedv1

Reason: In the interests of highway safety

15 No development, or site preparation prior to development which has any effect on disturbing or altering the level or composition of the land, shall take place within the site until the applicant (or their agents or successors in title) has secured and implemented a programme of archaeological work, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation to be submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the archaeological interest of the site is properly safeguarded and recorded.

16 Development shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall also include details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed after completion. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, improve habitat and amenity, and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system.

17 The development hereby permitted shall be built, implemented and operated in accordance with the approved Sustainability Design Document compiled by Arup and dated 21st April 2010, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to provide a development that minimises energy and water consumption, in the interests of the environment.

18 Prior to the commencement of development (including any site preparation works) details of the nature, location and phasing of tree protection barriers shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved tree protection barriers shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed phasing. The Arboricultural Officer shall be informed once protective measures have been installed so that the Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) can be inspected and deemed appropriate. Telephone 01962 848317.

Reason: To ensure the protection and long term viability of retained trees and to minimise the impact of construction activity

19 Prior to the commencement of development a lighting management strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved lighting management strategy, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Page 6 Delegatedv1

Reason: To protect the landscape and ecological interests of the site.

20 In the event that the use of the site for holiday accommodation ceases the local planning authority shall be informed in writing of the date that the use ceased. Should the use of the site for holiday accommodation cease for a period of more than 3 years, then all buildings and associated development hereby permitted shall be removed from the site and the land shall be returned to an acceptable condition, details of which shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The restoration works agreed shall be competed within a period of 5 years from the date the holiday use of the site ceased unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To avoid the buildings falling into a state of disrepair over time which would have a negative visual impact on the amenity of the area and to prevent the buildings being used for alternative purposes that would not be appropriate in this countryside location.

#### **Informatives**

1. This permission is granted for the following reason:

The development is in accordance with the policies and proposals of the Development Plan 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:

South East Plan 2009:

Policies – CC.1 (sustainable development), C.4 (landscape and countryside management), NRM.11 (energy efficiency/renewables), TSR.2 (rural tourism), TSR.5 (tourist accommodation)

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Policies relating to countryside recreation RT.17 and RT.18, countryside protection policies CE.5, CE.9, CE.11 and CE.28, archaeological policy HE.1, design policies DP.3, DP.4, DP.5, DP.9 and DP.10 and transportation policies T.1, T.2, T.3, T.4 and T5

3. The applicant is requested to include as part of the Management Plan / Travel Plan provision for management of arrival / departure times of guests which shall be clearly stated within the issued booking confirmation and provide for staggered arrival /departure times to avoid, so far as possible, concentrations of vehicles entering or leaving the site at similar times.

Page 7 Delegatedv1

4. The Management Plan / Travel Plan shall similarly incorporate advisory information to provided to all service providers to the holiday facility to limit, so far as possible, all deliveries / collections from the site to daytime periods that avoid peak times and not at any time between 20.00 hrs and 07.00 hrs on any day unless in an emergency.

#### Littleton And Harestock

Ward

**Littleton And Harestock** 

02 Conservation (WC Area: C)

**Case No:** 10/03250/FUL **Ref No:** W22085

**Date Valid:** 23 December 2010 **Grid Ref:** 446188 131331

Team: EAST Case Officer: Mr Nick Fisher

**Applicant:** Mr Andy Salter

**Proposal:** 1 no. Semi detached building consisting of 1 no. four

bedroom and 1 no. two bedroom dwelling with associated

parking to the rear of 109 Harestock Road

**Location:** 109 Harestock Road, Winchester, Hampshire, SO22 6NY

Officer PER

Recommendation

:

#### **Committee Decision:**

REFUSED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING REFUSAL REASON(S):-

#### Conditions/Reasons

- 1 The proposed development is contrary to Policy DP3 (ii) of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 in that, having regard to the established character and spatial quality of the existing development in Lovett Walk, it would by reason of its scale and massing give rise to a congested appearance that would not respond positively to the character appearance and variety of the local environment and would consequently appear as overdevelopment of the site to the detrimental of local amenity.
- 2 The proposal is contrary to Policy RT4 of the Winchester District Local Plan Revised 2006 in that it fails to make adequate provision for public recreational open space to the required standard, and would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the area

Page 8 Delegatedv1

3 The proposal is contrary to Policy DP.9 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that it fails to make adequate provision for improvements to transport and the highway network in accordance with Hampshire County Council's Transport Contributions Policy 2007, such provision being required in order to mitigate for the additional transport needs and burden imposed on the existing network arising from this development.

#### **Informatives**

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

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP1, DP3, DP4, DP6, DP9, DP10, DP11, DP13, H3, H7, T2, T4, RT4.

Curdridge Ward Owslebury And Curdridge

03 Conservation

(WC Area:

C)

 Case No:
 11/00030/OUT

 Ref No:
 W21996/01

 Date Valid:
 19 January 2011

 Grid Ref:
 452420 113543

Team: WEST Case Officer: Mr James Jenkison

**Applicant:** Mr Richard Puddle

**Proposal:** Proposed erection of 2 no. detached dwellings; 1 no. three

bedroom and 1 no. two bedroom (OUTLINE) (AMENDED

DESCRIPTION)

**Location:** Land Adjacent Beechcroft, Vicarage Lane, Curdridge,

Hampshire

Officer REF

Recommendation

:

#### **Committee Decision:**

REFUSED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING REFUSAL REASON(S):-

#### Conditions/Reasons

1 The proposal is contrary to policies H3 and SH.6 of the South East Plan and Policy H.5 (iii) of the Adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 in that it fails to make adequate provision for affordable housing and would therefore be detrimental to the objectives of the Development Plan and PPS3 to ensure that

Page 9 Delegatedv1

appropriate provision of affordable housing is achieved within relevant residential developments.

- 2 The development comprises new residential dwellings in the countryside for which there is no over-riding justification contrary to PPS7 and is detrimental to the locality because it would suburbanise the countryside here and be visually injurious to its rural character contrary to PPS7 and policies DP3, DP4, CE5 and H4 of the Adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006, supplementary planning document 'Implementation of Infilling Policy' and Policy CC6 of the South East Plan 2009.
- 3 The proposal is contrary to Policy RT4 of the Adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 in that it fails to make adequate provision for public recreational open space to the required standard, and would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the area.
- 4 The proposal is contrary to Policy DP.9 of the Adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 in that it fails to make adequate provision for improvements to transport and the highway network, in accordance with Hampshire County Council's Transport Contributions Policy 2007, such provision being required in order to mitigate for the additional transport needs and burden imposed on the existing network arising from this development.
- 5 The proposed development is contrary to policy H7 of the Adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 in that it fails to include a range of dwelling types and sizes, with at least 50% of the properties provided as small 1 or 2 bedroom units of less than 75 square metres.

#### **Informatives**

The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: CC6, H3, SH6 Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP3, DP4, DP9, CE5, H5, H7, RT4.

Page 10 Delegatedv1

Hursley Ward Compton And Otterbourne

04(W Conservation

CC) Area:

 Case No:
 10/01550/FUL

 Ref No:
 W21886

 Date Valid:
 18 June 2010

 Grid Ref:
 442757 127683

Team: WEST Case Officer: Mr Neil Mackintosh

**Applicant:** Mr And Mrs N B Russell

**Proposal:** Erection of three bedroom agricultural workers dwelling with

hay barn/bull pen, access track and associated works

**Location:** Land At Grovelands Copse, Farley Mount Road, Hursley,

Hampshire

Officer PER

Recommendation

:

#### **Committee Decision:**

Overturned:

APPROVE SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

#### Conditions/Reasons

1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2 The occupation of the dwelling shall be limited to a person solely or mainly working, or last working, in the locality in agriculture or in forestry or a widow or widower of such a person, and to any resident dependants.

Reason: The site is in an area where new dwellings are not normally permitted except where there is an overriding need in the interests of agriculture or forestry.

3 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 as amended by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2008 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Classes A, B, C, D and E of Part 1 of the Order shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Page 11 Delegatedv1

Reason: In order to limit the size of the agricultural worker's dwelling and to protect the amenities of the locality.

4 No development shall take place until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwelling and hay barn/bull pen hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development presents a satisfactory appearance in the interests of the amenities of the area.

5 A detailed scheme for landscaping, tree and/or shrub planting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The scheme shall specify species, density, planting, size and layout. The scheme approved shall be carried out in the first planting season following the occupation of the building or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. If within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, any trees, shrubs or plants die, are removed or, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or defective, others of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, in the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To improve the appearance of the site in the interests of visual amenity.

6 All works, including tree protection, shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement prepared by Ecourban under reference 1071-AIA-Grovelands.

Reason: To ensure the protection and long term viability of retained trees and to minimise the impact of construction activity.

7 Details of any external lighting shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before it is installed. The lighting shall be maintained in accordance with the details, as approved.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance and biodiversity of the area.

8 The proposed access and drive shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with specifications to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

NOTE: A licence is required from Hampshire Highways Winchester, Central Depot, Bar End Road, Winchester, SO23 9NP prior to the commencement of access works.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory means of access.

Page 12 Delegatedv1

9 The gradient of the drive shall not exceed 8% within 6 metres of the edge of the adjoining carriageway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety

10 Before the development hereby approved is first brought into use, the access shall be constructed with a non-migratory surfacing material for a minimum distance of 10 metres from the highway boundary.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

11 Before the development hereby approved is first brought into use, visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 43 metres shall be provided at the junction of the access and public highway. The splays shall be kept free of obstacles at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

The dwelling hereby permitted shall be for the benefit of the applicants Mr and Mrs N B Russell and their immediate family involved with running the farm and shall not enure for the benefit of the land.

Reason: Planning Permission is granted on the basis of the applicants special needs to relocate his established holding from Somerset and since the need on this site has yet to be established the provision of the dwelling is at this stage to meet the personal business requirements of the applicant rather than the needs of the holding.

13 If the dwelling ceases to be occupied for the purposes of running the cattle business on the holding by the applicants (or their immediate dependents) the house shall be demolished, all resultant materials cleared from the site to the satisfaction of the LPA and the land returned to its former condition within 12 months of the cessation of such use unless planning permission is first obtained for an alternative agricultural enterprise that necessitates the retention of the dwelling.

Reason: Planning permission is granted only on the basis of the applicants intended relocation of his holding from Somerset and if the enterprise does not materialise as predicted and the cattle business ceases, the retention of such a dwelling in the countryside would not be warranted unless an alternative essential need could be demonstrated

#### **Informatives**

1. The development is not in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below but there are other material considerations which indicate that the determination should be made other than in accordance with Development Plan as set out in Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Page 13 Delegatedv1

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

South East Plan: None

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: CE10, CE13, CE19, CE20, RT4, T1, T4

Hursley Ward Compton And Otterbourne

05 (WC Conservation

Area:

C)

 Case No:
 10/01990/FUL

 Ref No:
 W21885

 Date Valid:
 30 July 2010

 Grid Ref:
 443068 126373

Team: WEST Case Officer: Mr Neil Mackintosh

**Applicant:** Mr And Mrs N B Russell

**Proposal:** Erection of principal farm house, garaging/implement store

and associated works

**Location:** Land South Of Butchers Plantation, Main Road, Hursley,

Hampshire

Officer REF

Recommendation

:

#### **Committee Decision:**

REFUSED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING REFUSAL REASON(S):-

#### Conditions/Reasons

- 1 Development as proposed is contrary to Policy CE20 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review and the guidance set out in PPS7 'Sustainable Development in Rural Areas' in that:
- a) the farming activity, and therefore functional need, for the proposed principal farmhouse has not been established on the land and
- b) notwithstanding (a) the proposed dwelling is considered to be larger than reasonably necessary for the functional requirements of the proposed agricultural enterprise and its proposed siting is not well related to the supervisory needs of the proposed livestock operation.

As such, permission would represent the provision of a house in the countryside for which there is no special justification and set an undesirable precedent in respect of future applications for agricultural worker's dwellings, making it difficult for the Council to refuse other, similar applications. Furthermore the size of the dwelling may make it difficult to refuse a future application to remove an agricultural

Page 14 Delegatedv1

occupancy condition because the house is too large for an agricultural worker or manager's needs and their ability to sustain.

2 The proposal is contrary to Policy RT4 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review Revised 2006 in that it fails to make adequate provision for public recreational open space to the required standard, and would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the area.

#### **Informatives**

1. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

South East Plan: None

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: CE10, CE13, CE19, CE20, RT4, T1, T4

Winchester Town Ward St Barnabas

06 Conservation

(WC

Area:

 Case No:
 10/03143/FUL

 Ref No:
 W20449/04

 Date Valid:
 5 January 2011

 Grid Ref:
 446069 130698

Team: EAST Case Officer: Mrs Anna Hebard

**Applicant:** Mr & Mrs Robert Eatwell

**Proposal:** (HOUSEHOLDER) Extension of driveway onto area of soft

landscaping (RETROSPECTIVE)

**Location:** 12 Mornington Drive, Winchester, Hampshire, SO22 5LR

Officer REF

Recommendation

:

#### **Committee Decision:**

REFUSED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING REFUSAL REASON(S):-

#### Conditions/Reasons

1 The construction of a parking bay in this location leading to the loss of soft landscaping is contrary to the original design objectives of the development of Mornington Drive as it does not enhance visual amenity or biodiversity value, and is contrary to Local Plan policies DP3 and DP4.

Page 15 Delegatedv1

2 The construction of this parking bay has been carried out in the Root Protection area of a mature Beech and semi mature Yew which has caused root damage and disturbance to these trees. Continued use of the area for parking of cars will damge these trees further, contrary to Policy DP4 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

#### **Informatives**

1. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP3 DP4 T4

#### SDNP APPLICATIONS

Droxford Ward Droxford, Soberton And Hambledon

01 Conservation

(SDNP

Area:

 Case No:
 11/00175/FUL

 Ref No:
 W08434/01

 Date Valid:
 27 January 2011

Grid Ref: 27 January 2011 460816 118774

Team: WEST Case Officer: Mr Andrew Rushmer

**Applicant:** Ms Joanne Studer

**Proposal:** (HOUSEHOLDER) Two storey extension; detached timber

framed double garage with log store (amended plans

received 17.03.2011 showing removal of conifer tree adjacent

to the house and three replacement trees along the

boundary).

**Location:** The Crest, Garrison Hill, Droxford, Southampton, Hampshire,

SO32 3QL

Officer PER

Recommendation

:

#### **Committee Decision:**

APPROVE SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

#### Conditions/Reasons

1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Page 16 Delegatedv1

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2 Prior to the commencement of development, the specific details of the materials and finishes to be used on the external elevations of the building (including window frames, glazing, extraction ducting and type of solar panel/tiles) are to be agreed in writing by the local planning authority, and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposal responds positively to the character of the area, as required by policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

3 An Arboricultural Method Statement, in accordance with BS5837:2005 shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, prior to any demolition, construction or groundwork commencing on the site. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Method Statement.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area, as required by policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

4 The Arboricultural Officer shall be informed as soon as the construction exclusion zone has been fenced so that it can be inspected and deemed appropriate and in accordance with the approved Method Statement. Telephone 01962 848317.

The Arboricultural Officer shall be informed prior to the commencement of construction of special surfacing under tree canopies so that a pre commencement site visit can be carried out. Telephone 01962 848317.

No arboricultural works shall be carried out to trees other than those specified and in accordance with Method Statement

Any deviation from works prescribed or methods agreed in accordance with the Method Statement shall be agreed in writing to the Local Planning Authority.

A person (Arboricultural Supervisor) who is suitably qualified and experienced in Arboriculture and who has a sound knowledge of BS 5837 (2005) shall be employed to write the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Work method statement and tree protection plan. The appointed Arboricultural supervisor shall supervise the installation of the tree protection measures.

Reason: - to ensure protection and long term viability of retained trees and to minimise impact of construction activity.

5 Following the removal of the tree adjacent to the proposed extension, two Standard Holm Oak trees shall be planted adjacent to the western boundary and within a period of 9 months or such other species, size location or period as may be agreed in writing by the LPA

Page 17 Delegatedv1

If, within a period of 2 years from the date of planting, either tree (or any other trees planted in replacement for them) is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies, another tree of the same size and species shall be planted at the same place, or in accordance with any variation for which the local planning authority give their written consent.

Reason - To maintain the tree cover and the contribution that trees make to the character and amenity of the area.

#### **Informatives**

- 1. This permission is granted for the following reasons:
  The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the
  Development Plan 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, DP4, CE23 Planning Policy Statement 1 Planning Policy Statement 7

- 3. All works, including demolition and construction, should only be carried out between the hours of 0800 and 1800hrs Monday to Friday and 0800 and 1300hrs Saturday and at no time on Sunday or Bank Holidays. Where allegations of noise from such works are substantiated by the Health and Housing Service, a Notice limiting the hours of operation under The Control of Pollution Act 1974 may be served.
- 4. Notwithstanding any details shown on the application forms, plans or within the design and access statement submitted with this application the details of materials are not hereby permitted and further details shall be submitted for approval in accordance with the above conditions in the interests of ensuring that the appearance of the development responds as sympathetically as possible to the character of this sensitive site within the South Downs National Park.
- 5. A Standard is defined as having 10-12cm girth at planting and having a height between 3 and 3.5metres at planting. Replacement of trees is enforceable in law and failure to comply with the condition could result in the issue of a tree replacement notice and prosecution if the local planning authority believes that the criteria of the condition has not been met.

Trees make an important contribution to the character of the conservation area creating a green environment which we all enjoy. Winchester City Council

Page 18 Delegatedv1

encourages the planting of new trees to replace any that are felled in order to maintain the positive benefits that trees provide.

P	D	C
89	96	3

Conservation

Area:

Case No: TPO 2022

Ref No: Date Valid: Grid Ref:

Team: Case Officer: Andrew Giles

Applicant: Proposal:

**Location:** The Spinney, Grange Road, Wonston

Officer Confirm TPO

Recommendation

:

No Change TPO CONFIRMED as shown in report PDC890.

### PDC 895

Conservation

Area:

Case No: TPO 2025

Ref No: Date Valid: Grid Ref:

Team: Case Officer: Andrew Giles

Applicant: Proposal:

**Location:** 14 Bereweeke Way, Winchester

Officer Confirm TPO

Recommendation

:

No Change TPO CONFIRMED as shown in report PDC890.

Page 19 Delegatedv1

PDC 897

Conservation

Area:

Case No: TPO 2024

Ref No: Date Valid: Grid Ref:

Team: Case Officer: Andrew Giles

Applicant: Proposal:

**Location:** Land at Copperfield, Lanham Lane, Winchester

Officer Confirm TPO

Recommendation

:

No Change TPO CONFIRMED as shown in report PDC890.

Page 20 Delegatedv1