

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9 December 2014

Attendance:

Councillors:

Ruffell (Chairman) (P)

Evans
Izard (P) (for Items 1 - 3)
Jeffs (P)
Johnston (P)
McLean

Pearson (P)
Read (P)
Rutter (P)
Scott (P)

Deputy Members

Councillor Gottlieb (Standing Deputy for Councillor McLean) and Councillor Laming (Standing Deputy for Councillor Evans).

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee, held on 13 November 2014, be approved and adopted.

2. PLANNING APPLICATIONS SCHEDULE (Report PDC1009 and Update Sheet refers)

The schedule of planning application decisions arising from consideration of the above Report was circulated separately and forms an appendix to the minutes.

The Committee agreed to receive the Update Sheet as an addendum to Report PDC1009.

Councillor Rutter and Councillor Johnston declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Items 1 and 2 as Ward Members. However, both confirmed that they had not participated in the representation on these applications and therefore, they both spoke and voted thereon.

Applications outside the area of the South Downs National Park (WCC):

Item 1: Tudor Cottage, 22, Church Lane, Kings Worthy, Winchester - (HOUSEHOLDER) Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and outbuildings and erection of single and two storey rear extension with

detached garage (AFFECTS THE SETTING OF A LISTED BUILDING)
(RESUBMISSION)

Case number: 14/02255/FUL/W01929/07

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which included an additional reason for refusal from the Head of Historic Environment in that the proposal affected the listed building itself, not just the setting by virtue of its attachment and as such an additional reason for refusal was included as follows:- (i) The significance of the designated heritage asset is harmed by the proposed alterations which are considered to be disproportionately large, incongruous and visually dominant, and which affect the historic character of the cottage. In the absence of any mitigating public benefit, it is considered that the proposal is unacceptable and contrary to the advice given in the NPPF and Conservation Principles Policies and Guidance and Policy HE14 of the WDLPR 2006.

The Update Sheet also included comments that were received from the Agent, Huw Thomas, providing comments in relation to the Historic Environment Officer's consultation response. Furthermore, one letter of objection was received, providing a summary of objections raised from 11 households in the immediate vicinity to the application site, including properties in The Paddocks, The Woodlands and Church Lane, Kings Worthy.

During public participation, Brian Dunford and Ian Gordon (Chair of Planning and Highway Committee representing Kings Worthy Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Huw Thomas (Agent) spoke in support and each answered Members' questions thereon.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application for the reasons and informatives, as set out in the Report and the Update Sheet, as detailed above.

Item 2: Tudor Cottage, 22, Church Lane, Kings Worthy, Winchester
Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and outbuildings and
erection of single and two storey rear extension with detached garage
(AFFECTS THE SETTING OF A LISTED BUILDING) (RESUBMISSION).
Case number: 14/02256/LIS/W01929/08LB

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet as referred to in item 1 above.

During public participation, Dr Jeff Greenleaf spoke in objection to the application and Lucy Kelly (Applicant) spoke in support and each answered Members' questions thereon.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application for the reasons and informatives, as set out in the Report and the Update Sheet.

Item 3: Kanoni, 3B Oaklands, South Wonston
(HOUSEHOLDER) Demolition of existing single garage. Construction of a
single storey side extension to include new double garage. Erection of a new
garden/tool shed (RESUBMISSION)
Case number: 14/02194/FUL/W2384301

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which provided further information by the applicant in relation to the objection received and changes that had been made to address concerns from the initial application previously submitted.

During public participation, Carol Marshall spoke in objection to the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons (and subject to the conditions and informatives) as set out in the Report and as per the Update Sheet.

RESOLVED:

1. That the decisions taken on the Planning Applications in relation to those applications outside the area of the South Downs National Park be agreed as set out in the Schedule (appended to the minutes for information).

3. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2121: LAND AT THE RECREATION GROUND, WICKHAM**
 (Report PDC1011 refers)

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 2121 be confirmed.

4. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2119: LAND AT PALLET CLOSE, COLDEN COMMON**
 (Report PDC 1010 refers)

Councillor Izard declared a prejudicial interest on Item 4 in his capacity as Chairman of Colden Common Parish Council that had requested for a Tree Preservation Order to be placed on this woodland area and left the meeting for consideration of this Item, taking no part on the discussion or voting thereon.

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 2119 be confirmed.

The meeting commenced at 12.30pm and concluded at 2:10pm.

Chairman

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE : DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MEETING

DECISIONS

09.12.2014

PART II DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS
AND DECISIONS THEREON



Winchester
City Council

Working in Partnership



South Downs
National Park Authority

Kings Worthy

Ward

Kings Worthy

01 Conservation

Area:

Case No: 14/02255/FUL

Ref No: W01929/07

Date Valid: 8 October 2014

Grid Ref: 449184 132541

Team: 1_NTH

Case Officer: Richard Whittington

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Kelly

Proposal: (HOUSEHOLDER) Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and outbuildings and erection of single and two storey rear extension with detached garage(AFFECTS THE SETTING OF A LISTED BUILDING) (RESUBMISSION)

Location: Tudor Cottage, 22 Church Lane, Kings Worthy, Winchester, Hampshire, SO23 7QS

Officer REF

Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

REFUSED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING REASON(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

1 The proposed extension os harmful to the setting of the listed building by reason of design, size and choice of materials, contrary to Policy HE14 of the WDLPR2006 and CP20 of the LPP1.

2 The proposals are harmful to the setting, character and appearnce of the conservation area, contrary to Policies HE4 and HE5 of the WDLPR 2006.

3 The significance of the designated heritage asset is harmed by the proposed alterations which are considered to be disproportionately large, incongruous and visually dominant, and which affect the historic character of the cottage. In the absence of any mitigating public benefit, it is considered that the proposal is unacceptable and contrary to the advice given in the NPPF and Conservation Principles Policies and Guidance and Policy HE14 of the WDLPR 2006.

Informatives

1. In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the NPPF Winchester City Council (WCC) take a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. WCC work with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by;
- offering a pre-application advice service and,

- updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

In this instance the applicant was provided with pre-application advice.

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

Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy: CP20,
Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP3, DP4, HE4, HE5, HE14

	Kings Worthy	Ward	Kings Worthy
02	Conservation Area:	Kings Worthy Conservation Area	
	Case No:	14/02256/LIS	
	Ref No:	W01929/08LB	
	Date Valid:	8 October 2014	
	Grid Ref:	449184 132543	
	Team:	1_NTH	Case Officer: Richard Whittington
	Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Kelly	
	Proposal:	Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and outbuildings and erection of single and two storey rear extension with detached garage.(AFFECTS THE SETTING OF A LISTED BUILDING) (RESUBMISSION)	
	Location:	22 Church Lane, Kings Worthy, Winchester, SO23 7QS	
	Officer	REF	
	Recommendation:		

Committee Decision:

REFUSED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING REASON(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

- 1 The proposed extension is considered harmful to the setting of the listed building by reason of design, size and choice of materials, contrary to Policy HE14 of the WDLPR2006 and CP20 of the LPP1.
- 2 The proposals are harmful to the setting, character and appearance of the conservation area, contrary to Policies HE4 and HE5 of the WDLPR 2006.
- 3 The significance of the designated heritage asset is harmed by the proposed alterations which are considered to be disproportionately large, incongruous and

visually dominant, and which affect the historic character of the cottage. In the absence of any mitigating public benefit, it is considered that the proposal is unacceptable and contrary to the advice given in the NPPF and Conservation Principles Policies and Guidance and Policy HE14 of the WDLPR 2006.

Informatives

1. In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the NPPF Winchester City Council (WCC) take a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. WCC work with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by;

- offering a pre-application advice service and,
- updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

In this instance the applicant was provided with pre-application advice.

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

Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy: CP20,
Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP3, DP4, HE4, HE5, HE14

South Wonston

Ward

Wonston And Micheldever

03 Conservation

Area:

Case No: 14/02194/FUL

Ref No: W23843/01

Date Valid: 18 September 2014

Grid Ref: 446610 135760

Team: 1_NTH

Case Officer: Richard Whittington

Applicant: Mr Maninder Singh

Proposal: (HOUSEHOLDER) Demolition of existing single garage. Construction of a single storey side extension to include new double garage. Erection of a new garden/tool shed. (RESUBMISSION)

Location: Kanoni 3B Oaklands South Wonston Hampshire SO21 3HZ

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.

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

2 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual relationship between the new development and the existing.

3 No development shall take place until details of the boundary treatment to the south have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Details shall include the height and finish of the brick wall. The development shall be carried out in accordance with that approved detail.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual relationship between the new development and the existing.

Informatives

1. In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the NPPF Winchester City Council (WCC) take a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. WCC work with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by;

- offering a pre-application advice service and,
- updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

In this instance the applicant was provided with pre-application advice.

2. 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.

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

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP3, DP4,

4. All building works including demolition, construction and machinery or plant operation should only be carried out between the hours of 0800 and 1800 hrs Monday to Friday and 0800 and 1300 hrs Saturday and at no time on Sundays or recognised public holidays. Where allegations of noise from such works are substantiated by the Environmental Protection Team, a Notice limiting the hours of operation under The Control of Pollution Act 1974 may be served.

5. During Construction, no materials should be burnt on site. Where allegations of statutory nuisance are substantiated by the Environmental Protection Team, an Abatement Notice may be served under The Environmental Protection Act 1990. The applicant is reminded that the emission of dark smoke through the burning of materials is a direct offence under The Clean Air Act 1993.

PDC 1010

04 Conservation

Area:

Case No: TPO 2119

Ref No:

Date Valid:

Grid Ref:

Team:

Case Officer: Thomas Gregory

Applicant:

Proposal:

Location:

Officer PER

Recommendation:

Committee Decision: TPO 2119 confirmed

PDC 1011

05 Conservation

Area:

Case No: TPO 2121

Ref No:

Date Valid:

Grid Ref:

Team:

Case Officer: Thomas Gregory

Applicant:

Proposal:

Location:

Officer PER

Recommendation:

Committee Decision: TPO 2121 confirmed