

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

14 September 2006

Attendance:

Councillors:

Jefts (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
Bennetts (P)
Beveridge (P)
Busher (P)
de Peyer (P)
Evans
Huxstep (P)

Johnston (P)
Read (P)
Ruffell (P)
Saunders (P)
Sutton (P)
Wood (P)

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Evans and Councillors Higgins and Pearce (Deputy Members).

2. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**

(Report PDC644 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 Wood declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of Item 5 (Little Mead, Home Lane, Sparsholt) as he was personally acquainted with the applicant and he left the meeting during the consideration of this item.

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Item 6 (Trelawney, 29 Stoney Lane, Winchester) as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust which had commented on the application and he spoke and voted thereon.

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

Item 1: Gunstock Farm, Northside Lane, Bishops Sutton - Case Number: 06/01623/FUL

Mr Russell (applicant) spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman reported that Councillor Verney (Ward Member) had indicated his support for the proposal but had been unable to attend the Committee.

Following debate, the Committee resolved to support the officers' recommendation to approve the cancellation of the Section 106 agreement.

Item 2: Quillon, Upper Crabbick Lane, Denmead - Case Number: 06/02037/FUL

Mr Griffin spoke in objection and Mr Banwell (applicant) spoke in support of the application.

During debate, Members considered that this application generally addressed the issues regarding the previous proposal that had been dismissed on appeal. The Committee therefore resolved to grant planning permission as set out.

Items 3: Micheldever Stores and Post Office, Church Street, Micheldever – Case Number: 06/02126/FUL

Mr Knight spoke in support of the proposals.

The Director of Development reported that since publication of the Report, a further letter of objection had been received raising concerns about the reduction of the area for parking and vehicular access, the reduction in the storage area for the shop, the close proximity of the new buildings to the boundary of the gardens of Waterloo Cottages and that the design, appearance and layout would not enhance the amenities of the village.

During debate, the Director of Development clarified that relevant Council policies indicated that replacement of the Stores should be with 'community facilities', and not necessarily another shop. Therefore, the overall reduction in retail floor space compared to that of the existing shop was not relevant in policy terms.

In conclusion, the Committee approved the application as set out.

Item 4: Micheldever Stores and Post Office, Church Street, Micheldever (demolition of detached double garage etc) – Case Number: 06/02210/LBC

The Committee approved the application as set out.

Item 6: Trelawney, 29 Stoney Lane, Winchester - Case Number: 06/02139/FUL

Mr Scull (agent) spoke in support of the application.

During discussion, the Committee noted that the site benefited from natural screening, especially at its boundaries and that the screenings removal would adversely affect the character of the area. Therefore, the inclusion of additional landscaping conditions to protect existing vegetation and to require details of new planting were requested.

Following debate, the Committee resolved to grant planning permission as set out, subject to the inclusion of additional conditions as above.

With regard to items that were not subject to public participation, the following matters were raised and changes to the Report's recommendations were made.

Item 5: Little Mead, Home Lane, Sparsholt – Case Number: 06/01648/FUL

Following debate, the Committee resolved to grant retrospective planning permission as set out.

Item 7: 10 Parchment Street, Winchester – Case Number: 06/02395/FUL

The Director of Development reported that since publication of the Report, it had subsequently been confirmed that the Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) referred to in the planning history section of the Report was submitted in error by the applicant and had subsequently been withdrawn.

Following debate, the Committee approved the application as set out.

Item 8: Keld, Hurdle Way, Compton Down, Winchester – Case Number 06/02110/FUL

Councillor Read explained that as he was absent from the previous meeting of the Committee, he would abstain from voting on this item.

The Director of Development advised that the Recommendation in the Report to defer the proposal was an error and should have read 'Permit'. He reminded the Committee that the application had been deferred by the Committee at its meeting on 24 August 2006, in order for additional information to be provided regarding vehicular movements, especially in light of information previously presented by the Compton Down Society.

Members agreed that the detail of the design and layout etc of the proposals had been previously considered and no objection had been raised. Therefore, it was agreed that the Committee would only consider the additional information supplied by officers referring to highway issues.

The Committee referred to Appendix A to the Report and agreed that assuming a trip rate of 11 for new dwellings, the application at Keld could be approved without exceeding the maximum 5% threshold of additional trips (at which point a Highway objection could be sustained). However, the situation regarding current applications at Compton Down yet to be considered was currently under review, pending a new survey which would take into account trips generated by Southdowns School. The Director of Development also advised that refusing permission because of potential traffic generated by the former Compton Diagnostic Unit (which had permission for conversion to flats) would be difficult to sustain even though the premises had been vacant for some time.

Following debate the Committee agreed to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions 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 6 Trelawney, 29 Stoney Lane, Winchester:

(i) Planning permission be granted and authority be delegated to the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman, to agree additional conditions for the protection of existing vegetation and to require details of new planting at the site.

2. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE – MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 18 AUGUST 2006**
(Report PDC645 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub Committee held on 18 August 2006 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 18 August 2006 be received.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 12.40pm.

Chairman