

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**

**26 January 2005**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)  
Darbyshire (P)

Read  
Pearson (P)

Others in attendance and did not address the meeting:

Councillor Coates

Officers in attendance

Mrs S Proudlock, Development Control Team Manager, West  
Mr G Allpress, Planning Officer  
Mrs V Fifield, Principal Landscape Architect  
Mr I Elvin, Highway Development Control Officer

---

1. **REPLACEMENT FOUR BEDROOMED DWELLING WITH ATTACHED DOUBLE GARAGE AND ACCESS DRIVE – KINGFISHER NURSERIES, SELWORTH LANE, SOBERTON, SOUTHAMPTON (REF NO W03815/13)**

Councillor Busher declared a personal, but not prejudicial interest, in this application as she was an acquaintance of Mr Stickland who had attended the meeting as a representative of Soberton Parish Council.

The Sub-Committee met on site and the Chairman welcomed the applicant (Mr Hawthorne), a representative from Soberton Parish Council (Mr Stickland), a representative from the East Hampshire Area of Natural Beauty (Mr Belderson), and approximately five local residents.

The application site was the former Kingfisher Nursery which comprised 1.55 hectares of land lying between Selworth Lane and a footpath which ran along the former railway embankment. To the east of the application site was a two storey detached dwelling called Kookaburra, which was subject to an agricultural occupancy restriction by condition. It was this 170 sq. metres detached dwelling which was proposed for demolition and replacement. The site contained a substantial number of derelict greenhouses as well as other ancillary structures.

Mr Allpress explained that the proposal was to replace Kookaburra with a two-storey four bedroom dwelling with an attached double garage. The total floor area of the new dwelling would be approximately 644 sq. metres and Members noted the approximate footprint of the building on the site. The proposals would also include the removal of the agricultural occupancy condition imposed on W03815/02 in 1979, when planning permission for Kookaburra was granted. There would be the

restoration of the site, meadow and paddock and provision for a dedicated alternative right of way to the bridleway which ran alongside the western boundary.

The Sub-Committee noted that a previous application for a similar proposal had been refused at a meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee on 28 June 2004 and that this refusal was currently under appeal by the applicant.

Mr Elvin commented on the proposed vehicular access which was proposed by the existing field access south of Hookers Dene. Although this provided less visibility than the present junction to Kookaburra, which would be closed off, land to the side of the proposed main access was in the ownership of the applicant and therefore sight lines could be improved. Taking into consideration the site's previous use as a nursery, Mr Elvin anticipated that the number of traffic movements would be less than the previous use and therefore no highway reason for refusal could be sustained.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Stickland raised concerns on behalf of Soberton Parish Council about the proposed access onto Selworth Lane. He advised that as Selworth Lane was narrow and dangerous, the access would be better located at the southern end of the plot near the corner of Horns Hill and Selworth Lane, which had the advantages of lower traffic speeds and greater visibility. During discussion, Mr Hawthorne and Mr Elvin raised no objection to this proposal.

The Sub-Committee considered the visual impact of the proposals on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and viewed the site from a number of locations along Horns Hill and Kookabura, which were both elevated above the site. The latter afforded views across to the other side of the valley and gave some impression of the visual impact that the proposed development may have from that direction. Members also considered the impact of the proposals from the footpath that ran along the disused railway track adjacent to the western boundary of the site and noted that the proposed landscaping between the proposed dwelling and track would be attached as a condition to any planning consent. Mr Hawthorne underlined the applicant's flexibility in accepting conditions and stated that the property would be, at its closest, approximately 30 metres from the path.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Belderson commented on the East Hampshire ANOB's objection to the proposal. Particular concern was raised as to its mass and the potential views of its roofs, particularly in such a prominent situation within a designated part of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Mr Belderson also commented that the scheme's position was out of character with other properties as it did not face onto a road. However, Mr Belderson stated that if Members were minded to approve the scheme, its proposed location in the north east of the site was preferable as this position minimised its visual impact on the valley and would be within the cluster of existing buildings.

Members noted the earthworks that were required to level the site of the proposed new dwelling and in response to comments Mr Hawthorne suggested that his clients would consider erecting the building at a lower base which would reduce the height of the ridgeline, in comparison with existing buildings, by 0.5 metres.

Members discussed the landscaping issues of the application and in response to questions Mr Hawthorne clarified that the substantial trees at the boundary of the site would remain as part of the proposal, but that a number of conifer trees would be lost within the plot. Mrs Fifield raised no objection to the scheme for re-planting and the proposed new hedgerow to divide the site was noted.

With regard to representation, Mr Stickland, on behalf of Soberton Parish Council, spoke in support of the proposals. His comments were echoed by the local residents who all spoke in support of the proposals and underlined the need to improve the site from its current dilapidated state and to clear it of the potentially dangerous remains of greenhouses. In response to Mr Stickland's comments concerning outstanding planning enforcement issues on the site, Mrs Proudlock agreed to investigate and report back to the next Planning Development Control Committee.

Mr Allpress stated that in assessing the application under the Council's planning policies, the principle of a replacement dwelling was considered acceptable on the site and that the applicant had provided supported evidence that the agricultural occupancy requirements of Policy C17 could now be relaxed. Mr Allpress also suggested that the proposed dwelling was considered not to be of a scale and mass which reflected properties found in the local area. Although Mr Hawthorne listed a number of other large properties in the area, Members noted significant differences between these (and their setting) and the proposed dwelling.

Mr Allpress recommended that the application proposed a replacement dwelling that would by virtue of its design, mass and scale, be significantly larger than the two storey dwelling it would replace, and result in a dwelling which was unsympathetic to the sensitive surroundings and would therefore appear visually incongruous. Mrs Proudlock recommended that the policy C19 (replacement dwellings in the countryside) should be interpreted in conjunction with policies EN.5 (criteria for new development) as part of Member's deliberations on this application. The building would also have a detrimental visual impact on an area of countryside designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the proposals made no effort to follow the contours of the land.

At the conclusion of the meeting, and after use of the Chairman's casting vote, the Sub-Committee recommended that the application be refused as the proposed dwelling represented too large a development in an area of countryside, was larger than the building it sought to replace and because of its visual intrusion on the former railway public footpath.

#### RECOMMENDED:

That the application be refused for the following reasons:

01 The proposed development does not accord with the requirements of policies C1, C2, UB3, E6, E7 and H10 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996-2011 (Review) and proposals C.1; C.2; C.7, C.19, EN.5, and EN.7 of the Winchester District Local Plan and proposals C.1, C.6, C.7, C.22, DP.1, DP.3 and DP.5 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review and Revised Deposit in that:-

- a) The application proposes a replacement dwelling that would by virtue of its design, mass and scale, be significantly larger than the two storey dwelling it would replace, and result in a dwelling which is unsympathetic to these sensitive surroundings and would appear visually incongruous.
- b) The proposal would by virtue of its siting, scale, mass and design result in a building that would have a detrimental visual impact in an area of countryside designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

c) The proposal would represent an undesirable form of development which will detract from the visual amenities of the site from long range view points to both the north west and south of the site, in an area that has been designated as countryside and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

02 The proposed development is contrary to Policy R2 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996-2001 (Review) and proposal RT3 of the Winchester District Local Plan 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. The proposal would also be likely to prejudice the emerging Winchester District Local Plan Review Deposit and Revised Deposit in that it would undermine those plan policies for recreational open space provision within the District.

### **Informatives**

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: C1, C2, E6, E7, H10, UB3

Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: C.1, C.2, C.7, C.17, C.19, EN.5, EN.7, T.9

Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: C.1, C.7, C.20, C.22, DP.3, DP.5, T.2, T.3, T.4

The meeting commenced at 9.30 am and concluded at 10.45 am.

Chairman