

PLANNING (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE

26 September 2016

Attendance:

Councillors:

Ruffell (Chairman) (P)

Clear
Griffiths (P)
Izard

Jeffs P)
Tait (P)
Read (P)
Scott (P)

Officers in attendance:

Mrs J Pinnock – Head of Development Management
Ms L Hall – Legal Services Manager
Mr S Opacic – Head of Strategic Planning

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Clear and Izard.

2. **DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

There were no disclosures of interest.

3. **DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOUSE AND GARAGE AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW HOUSE AND GARAGE – THE ANCHORAGE, NORTHBROOK, MICHELDEVER**
CASE NO: 16/01218/FUL

(Extract from Report PDC1064 Item 4 and Update Sheet of 15 September 2016 refers).

At its meeting held on 15 September 2016, the Planning Committee agreed that determination of the above application be deferred to a meeting of the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee in order to allow Members to firstly visit the site to assess the relationship between the existing and proposed property in context with the surrounding area. Members would also consider the size of the existing dwelling.

Public participation had taken place at the aforementioned meeting of the Committee where Michael Neal and John Botham (Micheldever Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Charles Browning (applicant) spoke in support and all answered Members' questions. Ward Member Councillor Horrill also spoke against the proposal.

Therefore, immediately prior to the public meeting, the Viewing Sub-Committee visited the application site where Members gained an understanding of the habitable space of the existing dwelling and observed the concrete and timber outbuildings to the rear. Members also considered the visual impact of the proposals within the existing street scene. Ward Member Councillor Godfrey was also in attendance.

The Head of Development Management briefly re-familiarised Members with the proposals and also outlined the key relevant Local Plan development policies as previously referred to in discussion at the Planning Committee.

During discussion, it was further clarified that Policy CE23 referred to the retention of small dwellings in the countryside and Policy DM3 (of the emerging Local Plan 2) set out where a replacement dwelling may be appropriate. Existing dwellings of less than 120 metre square should not be replaced by a new house with a floor space greater than this by more than 25 per cent. Therefore, development may only be acceptable according to a calculation of the available existing habitable space.

The Head of Development Management therefore concluded that in assessing the proposals, weight had been given to Policy DM3 and a judgement had been made (in accordance with paragraph 6.2.17 of policy DM3) on the best available evidence. On this basis, the size of the proposed replacement dwelling was acceptable in policy terms.

During debate, and in response to questions, the Legal Services Manager confirmed that there was no definition of what was 'habitable' within the policies, although it was accepted that this was likely to include attached integral garages forming part of the useable living space. Therefore, it was a judgement for the committee as to the extent of the buildings that constitute habitable living space.

A Member referred to pre application advice given by officers. This had advised that the proposals would be acceptable in policy terms, having regard to the existing available habitable space and that this had included the outbuildings. In response, the Head of Planning Management reported that the advice had been given in response to details supplied by the applicant of the existing gross floor space which was provided on the agents particulars.

The Head of Strategic Planning clarified that the emerging Local Plan Part 2 was now at an advanced stage and the Inspector had raised no comments with regard to the wording of Policy DM3. Therefore, accordingly, substantial weight should be placed upon this policy when making planning decisions as it was likely to be adopted in its current form in the near future.

During further debate, it was agreed that the proposed new dwelling appeared to be well designed. However, Members questioned whether it would be acceptable within the existing streetscene due to its scale, mass and height. The Sub-Committee, having viewed the site, did not consider that the existing habitable floor space of The Anchorage included the associated outbuildings, which were single skin and erected over a concrete hardstanding, with no

DPC, insulation etc and was not therefore habitable/useable floor spaces and should not have been included in the calculation. As a consequence, the existing habitable space (as referred to in policy DM3) was likely to be closer to 90 metres square as opposed to the 170 metres square. Therefore, it was agreed that the existing house was more appropriate to be termed as a small dwelling in a countryside location and therefore, accordingly, the proposals to replace this with a larger house were contrary to Policy CE23 and emerging Policy DM3, as proposals had a floor space that was greater than 25 per cent of the habitable footprint of the existing house.

Therefore, at the conclusion of debate the Committee did not support the recommendation as set out in the Report to grant planning permission for the above reasons and instead agreed to refuse planning permission, with authority being delegated to the Head of Development Management to agree exact wording of the reasons for refusal in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused planning permission for the following reasons:

The proposed replacement of the existing dwelling is contrary to policies DP3 and CE23 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 and emerging policies DM3 and DM15 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 for the following reasons:-

a) The proposal would result in increased visual intrusion by reason of its scale, mass and height. The proposed dwelling would result in increased visual prominence when compared to its setting within single and two storey height dwellings, the proposal does not therefore respond positively to the character and appearance of the street scene.

b) The proposal results in the loss of a small dwelling within the countryside, which should be retained in the interests of maintaining a varied stock of housing, including smaller and more affordable housing.

The meeting commenced at 11.00am and concluded at 11.30am

Chairman