

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**9 November 2005**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)

Bennetts (P)

Beveridge (P)

Chapman (P)

Davies (P)

Evans (P)

Jeffs (P)

Johnston (P)

Mitchell (P)

Pearce (P)

Pearson (P)

Read (P)

Saunders (P)

Sutton (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Hiscock, Mather, Quar, Tait, and Verney

---

471. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meetings of the Committee held on 27 July , 28 July 7 September , 8 September , 5 October and 6 October 2005 be approved and adopted.

472. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**

(Report PDC596 refers)

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

Councillor Bennetts declared a personal interest in respect of item 13 as he knew one of the objectors and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 2, 11, 12, 13 and 16 as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust, who had commented on these applications, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Busher declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 15 as the Chairman of Exton Parish Meeting, which was objecting to the application, provided veterinary surgeon advice to her family business and she withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.

Councillor Chapman declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 1 as she was employed by the applicant and she withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 2, 4, 11, 12, 13 and 16 as he was a member of the Council of the City of Winchester Trust, who had commented on the application, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Jeffs declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 10, as he had been involved in prior discussions on the application and was known to the applicant. He addressed the Committee as a Ward Member and did not vote on this item. Councillor Jeffs also declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 5 as he was known to one of the principal objectors and he spoke and voted on this item.

Councillor Johnston addressed the Committee as a Ward Member in respect of item 7 and did not vote on this item.

Councillor Saunders declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of items 11 and 12 as her family business had an office next to the application site and she withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.

In the public participation part of the meeting the following items were discussed:

In respect of item 1 – Freeman's Yard, School Lane, Cheriton, Alresford, Mrs J Barrett, agent, spoke on behalf of local objectors and Cheriton Parish Council in objection to the application, and Mr O'Donovan, agent, spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Verney, the Ward Member, spoke on this item. In summary Councillor Verney stated that the proposed development was inappropriate for its setting between the Conservation Area and open countryside due to its high density; tight and cramped configuration; the potential for flooding due to over-development and surface run-off; traffic problems due to inadequate access (including a narrow access bridge); an inappropriate mix of employment uses where access would conflict with school drop-off times; the scheme was not supported by the architects' panel, with the tallest houses being on the highest land, and the site would not be screened by boundary planting. He asked that the Committee appoint a Viewing Sub-Committee to visit the application site.

In response to Members' questions, the Director of Development confirmed that a condition could be included that a land contamination survey be carried out. Following debate, the Committee agreed that a Viewing Sub-Committee should visit the site on Wednesday 23 November 2005 to commence at 8.30 am. Issues to be observed or clarified on site included details of the ecology study, provision of education facilities for children living in the new development, clarification of drainage issues and to observe points raised regarding traffic congestion, including those at school drop-off times.

In respect of item 2 – Fairlawn, 40 Hatherley Road, Winchester, Mr Knutson spoke in objection to the application and Mr Hoskins, applicant, spoke in support. Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission on the application as set out.

In respect of item 3 – The Estate Office, Stockbridge Road, Sutton Scotney, Mrs A Hamel spoke in support of the application and against the officers' recommendation for refusal. The Director of Development reported that Wonston Parish Council had written a letter of support received on 4 November 2005. However, the points raised did not override the highway objections and neighbour concerns and the policy objections to the application. Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse planning permission on this application for the reasons as set out.

In respect of item 4 – Enniskerry, Sleepers Hill, Winchester, Mr Smith spoke in objection to the application and Mr O'Donovan, agent, spoke in support. Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission on this application, subject to the inclusion of an additional condition for amended plans to be submitted to show the two additional car parking spaces as required by the revised scheme.

In respect of item 5 – land surrounding Sheildaig, Hill Crest, Heathfield House, Warnford Road, Corhampton, Mr Rowe spoke as a personal objector and also on behalf of Corhampton and Meonstoke Parish Council and Mr C Patrick, agent, spoke in support. The Director of Development reported that an additional objection had been received from the South Downs Committee, commenting on the high density of the development; that it was not sustainable; the loss of trees and vegetation, and that the development was inappropriate. The Director also commented that the policy reasons for refusal had been omitted from the report and that these should be taken into consideration by the Committee in making its decision. The Council's Drainage Engineer was present at the meeting and stated his concerns at the adequacy of the private sewer to function during times of flood, as it would be located within the flood plain. It was the Council's opinion that there was insufficient information on issues surrounding flooding to make an informed decision. Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application and delegated authority to the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman, to agree the detail of the wording for reasons of refusal in amplification of those set out in the report.

In respect of item 6 – land adjacent to Laburnum, Upper Crabbick Lane, Denmead, Mr Ward and a representative of Denmead Parish Council spoke in objection to the application, and Mr Reay, agent, spoke in support. The Director of Development stated that Councillor Allgood, a Ward Member, had been unable to attend the meeting but had submitted written representation in objection to the application. In summary, Councillor Allgood had stated that the development was out of character for the local area, that parking arrangements were unsatisfactory and there was an unacceptable impact on people living in Anthill Close. Councillor Allgood had added that if the Committee were minded to grant planning permission, then the amenity of residents at 34 Anthill Close should be protected. The Director of Development added that additional to the report there would now be provision for cycle storage on the site. Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission on this application as set out.

In respect of item 7 – Garage Court, Harwood Place, Kings Worthy, Councillor Johnston addressed the Committee as a Ward Member, speaking in support of the application, and Councillor Hiscock, Portfolio Holder for Housing, also spoke in support of the application. In summary, Councillors Johnston and Hiscock stated that the development was an appropriate use of a garage compound and would provide valuable properties for local needs housing for those on the Housing Waiting List. Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission on this application, subject to delegated authority being given to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to agree conditions relating to service vehicles turning on the site, landscaping, and that an informative be added on the comments submitted by the Environment Agency relating to the Water Resources Act.

In respect of item 9 – 8 Bercote Close, Littleton, Winchester, Mr Neilson and Mrs Elsmore spoke in objection to the application. Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission on this application as set out.

In respect of item 10 – The Swan Hotel, 11 West Street, Alresford, Mr Atkins spoke on behalf of New Alresford Town Council in objection to the officers' recommendation to refuse Listed Building Consent. The Director of Development stated that written representation had been received from Councillor Cook, a Ward Member, stating in summary that there had been no significant public reaction to the repainting of the listed building and that the Council should carefully consider the merits of taking enforcement action. Councillor Jeffs addressed the Committee as a Ward Member. In summary, Councillor Jeffs stated that Alresford was an attractive tourist town which benefited from the brightness of its buildings. He showed a number of photographs of other buildings within Alresford that had a variety of colours and differing tones. He added that there were no complaints from local residents and The Alresford Society had also not raised a complaint. He requested that Listed Building Consent be permitted and that the Council also enter into dialogue with New Alresford Town Council to provide a Conservation Area Brief on the future painting of listed buildings within the town.

In answer to Members' questions, the City Secretary and Solicitor explained that the decision taken by the Committee might set a precedent for the way in which the City Council dealt with the painting of listed buildings in the future. The number of houses in Alresford apparently in breach of the Listed Building Act should be taken into account in considering whether the decision was reasonable, but that those did not set precedent, not having been subject of a formal decision. The Council would need to be pro-active in giving advice on proposals for the treatment of listed buildings that would be acceptable to the Local Planning Authority. Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse Listed Building Consent on the application as set out.

In respect of items 11 and 12 – land adjacent to Pumping Station, Romsey Road, Winchester, Mr A Smith, Mr Hurrell and Mrs L Bainbridge spoke in objection to the application and Mr J Tyrrell, architect, spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Tait, a Ward Member, spoke on this item. In summary, he stated that the scheme did not enhance the conservation area and that, in order to fully appreciate the constraints of the site, a Viewing Sub-Committee should make a site visit. Councillor Mather, a Ward Member, also spoke on this item at the invitation of the Chairman. In summary, she stated that the development would have an unsuitable relationship with the surrounding area. The Architects' Panel had stated that the development was too high, and in particular Block B would have an impact on surrounding properties by reducing light and resulting in overlooking to properties on Romsey Road. She too requested that a Viewing Sub-Committee visit the application site. The Director of Development reported that a further letter of objection had been received since the report was prepared, reiterating points made in the other letters of objection received, as summarised in the report. Following debate, the Committee agreed that a special meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee be held on Tuesday 29 November, to commence with a viewing of the application site at 2.00 pm for members of the Committee, to be followed by a public meeting to be held in The Guildhall, Winchester, to commence at 3.30 pm.

In respect of item 13 – 108 Stockbridge Road, Winchester, Mr Cotterell, spoke in objection to the application on behalf of SSE Power Distribution and Mr John, agent, spoke in support. Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission on the application as set out, subject to the inclusion of a condition relating to lighting and landscaping.

In respect of item 14 – The Farm Yard, Easton Lane, Easton, Winchester, Mr Mezger, applicant, spoke in support of the application. Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission on this application as set out.

In respect of item 15 – Exton Park Organics, Allens Farm Lane, Exton, Southampton, Sir Simon Cassels, spoke in objection to the application both as an individual and on behalf of Exton Parish Meeting and Mr Gardner, applicant, spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Quar, the Ward Member, spoke on this item. In summary she stated that Exton Park was situated in a very beautiful area and was owned by the applicant. To meet changes in agricultural practice, the farm had diversified into rare breed sheep rearing, creating wild life habitats and by planting a vineyard. The applicant had met the criteria for the construction of an agricultural worker's dwelling, but its location on the farm was to be agreed. The farm was remote and large, having 95 hectares, with more than one entrance. If the agricultural dwelling was located at the entrance to the main approach, then it would be half a mile from the centre of operational needs and therefore the applicant had proposed that its best location would be in the centre of the farm, to be on low grade agricultural land. She also offered her support to the application.

In answer to Members' questions, the Director of Development confirmed that need had been established and that negotiation could continue with the applicant to agree a less sensitive site for the location of the agricultural dwelling. Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse planning permission for the reasons as set out.

In respect of item 16 – Parkersell Lighting and Electrical Limited, Parkersell House, Cranworth Road, Winchester, Mr Lothian spoke in objection to the application and Mr Buchanan, agent, spoke in support. Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse planning permission on the application for the reasons as set out.

In respect of item 17 – The Groom's House, Pursers Woodlands, Bramdean, the Director of Development reported that Mr Bowden, agent, had wished to speak on this item but had been unable to remain at the meeting. On Mr Bowden's behalf, the Director of Development stated in summary that the circumstances of the applicant had changed and the accommodation was no longer required. The applicant had offered to enter into a legal agreement with the Council that the accommodation remain in the ownership of the applicant. The Director of Development added, however, that it was the use of the accommodation and not the ownership that was in question and therefore the recommendation to refuse the application was before the Committee. Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application for the reasons as set out.

In respect of item 18 – 3 Railway Cottages, Old Station Road, Itchen Abbas, the Director of Development reported that Mr Stephens, agent, had registered to speak in support of this item but was not present at the meeting. Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission on the application as set out.

In respect of items not subject to public participation, the Committee agreed to approve items 8 and 19 as set out.

**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.

2 That in respect of item 1 – Freeman’s Yard, School Lane, Cheriton, Alresford the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee visit the site on Wednesday 23 November 2005 to commence at 8.30 am and that Councillors Busher, Davies, Pearce, Pearson and Jeffs be appointed to serve thereon.

3 That in respect of item 5 – land surrounding Sheildaig, Hill Crest, Heathfield House, Warnford Road, Corhampton, authority be delegated to the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman, to agree the detail of the wording for reasons of refusal in amplification of those set out in the report.

4 That in respect of item 7 – Garage Court, Harwood Place, Kings Worthy, authority be delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman, to agree conditions relating to service vehicles turning on the site, landscaping, and that an informative be added on the comments submitted by the Environment Agency relating to the Water Resources Act.

5 That in respect of items 11 and 12 – land adjacent to Pumping Station, Romsey Road, Winchester, a special meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee be held to determine the application on Tuesday 29 November 2005, to commence with a viewing of the application site at 2.00 pm for members of the Committee, to be followed by a public meeting to be held in The Guildhall, Winchester, to commence at 3.30 pm.

The meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and concluded at 9.30 pm.

Chairman