

PLANNING (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**9 January 2018**Attendance:

Councillors:

Ruffell (Chairman) (P)

Clear
Evans
Gottlieb (P)
Izard (P)Jeffs
Laming (P)
Read
Tait (P)Deputy Members:

Councillor Berry (Standing Deputy for Councillor Jeffs)

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Hutchison

Officers in attendance:Mrs J Pinnock – Head of Development Management
Ms F Sutherland – Planning and Information Solicitor
Mrs R Lister – Senior Planning Officer
Mrs R White - Historic Environment Team Leader**1. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

By way of personal statement, Councillor Tait stated that he knew Mrs Palmer (applicant) through his voluntary work, but this did not amount to a declarable interest.

2. DEMOLITION OF EXISTING REAR EXTENSION AND ADDITION OF NEW LOWER GROUND AND UPPER GROUND FLOOR REAR EXTENSION. INTERNAL ALTERATIONS, INCLUDING LOWERING OF LOWER GROUND FLOOR LEVEL. ADJUSTMENT OF WINDOW SIZE TO THE FIRST FLOOR ON THE REAR ELEVATION. ADDITION OF NEW BICYCLE STORE AND BAY WINDOW TO LOWER GROUND FLOOR TO THE FRONT OF THE PROPERTY - 30 CLIFTON ROAD, WINCHESTER
CASE NUMBER: 17/02004/HOU

(Extract from Report PDC1099 Item 4 and Update Sheet of 14 December 2017 refers).

At its meeting held on 14 December 2017, the Planning Committee agreed that the above application be referred to the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee for determination in order to allow Members to observe the site to gain a better appreciation of the proposal in the context of its setting and its relationship with neighbouring buildings.

Public participation had taken place at the aforementioned meeting of the Committee where James Mallinson spoke in objection to the application and John Hearn (Agent) spoke in support of the application.

Therefore, immediately prior to the public meeting, the Viewing Sub-Committee visited the application site where Members observed the site in order to gain a better appreciation of the proposal in the context of its setting and its relationship with neighbouring buildings.

The Head of Development Management presented the application to re-familiarise Members with the proposal and stated that the application had been taken to the Planning Committee for determination with a recommendation to refuse permission.

The Head of Development Management referred to the Update Sheet (14 December 2017) which stated that an additional letter of support from the applicant had been submitted since publication of the Report but that this had not raised new planning issues. In addition, on page 36 of the Report, in the penultimate paragraph there was a typing mistake in the last line which should read 'modern contrast' and not 'modern contract'. There was no further Update Sheet at the Viewing Sub Committee meeting.

At the conclusion of debate, the Sub-Committee agreed to refuse permission for the reasons and informatives set out in the Report and subject to a further reason for refusal that in accordance policy DM17 the proposal to the rear of the property was unacceptable due to the impact on neighbouring properties due its overbearing nature. The exact wording of the additional reason for refusal was delegated to the Head of Development Management, for finalisation in consultation with the Chairman.

RESOLVED:

That the application be Refused for the following reason(s):

The development is contrary to policies DM15, DM16, and DM27, of Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 (Adopted 2017); policy CP13 and CP20 of Winchester District Local Plan Part 1: Joint Core Strategy (Adopted 2013); and the High Quality Places SPD.

The design for the proposals fail to preserve or enhance the special character of the surrounding Conservation area and fail to relate to the overall character of the building in terms of style, introducing visually incongruous elements to the building. The proposals are also unacceptable by reason of the excessive alteration of the principal elevation which contributes to the architecture/historic interest of the building and the conservation area.

As a result the proposal is considered to result in a harmful impact on the visual amenities of the street scene to the detriment of the character of the area and the Conservation Area.

That in accordance policy DM17, the proposal to the rear of the property is unacceptable due to the impact on neighbouring properties due to its overbearing nature.

Informatives:

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

Local Plan Part 1 Joint Core Strategy: DS1, CP13, CP19, CP20

Local Plan Part 2: DM, DM15, DM16, DM17, DM 27 and DM28

2. 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 applications/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

The meeting commenced at 10.30am and concluded at 10.55am

Chairman