

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

5 October 2006

Attendance:

Councillors:

Jefts (Chairman) (P)

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

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

1. **APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

RESOLVED:

That, as Councillor Read was present for items 3 and 4 only of Report PDC648, Councillor Bennetts be appointed Vice-Chairman for the remainder for the meeting

2. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**

(Report PDC648 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 Sutton declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Item 9 as she was personally acquainted with the applicant. She addressed the Committee as a Ward Member and then withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of this item and did not vote thereon. Councillor Sutton also declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Items 5 and 6, as she was a member of Hampshire Buildings Preservation Trust Limited and spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Items 5 and 6, as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust which had commented on these applications and he spoke and voted thereon.

In respect of items 1 and 2, Land at Rear of 63 - 67 Church Street Micheldever (Case Number 06/02231/FUL and 06/02203/FUL), the Committee agreed to the Director of Development's request that both applications be deferred to a future meeting, to allow for consultation with English Heritage.

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

Items 3: Walterson, Hambledon Road, Denmead – Case Number: 06/02428/FUL

The Director of Development reported that, since publication of the Report, the following correction within Reason for Refusal 01 should be made:

The density of the proposed development was 13 dwellings per hectare, not 15 dwellings per hectare as stated.

The Director of Development clarified that amended plans had been submitted; however these had not been accepted by the Council and did not form part of the application under consideration. The Director stated that to consider the amended plans would require a new planning application, as the proposals were significantly different to those originally submitted.

Councillor Stallard (a Ward Member) spoke in support of the application and also on behalf of the applicant and fellow Ward Member Councillor Allgood, who were both unable to attend the meeting. In summary, she queried the reasons for refusal as set out in the Report, particularly the reason which stated that the proposal did not achieve a satisfactory housing density (and was therefore not in accordance with PPG3), but was also deemed excessively bulky as a single dwelling. She suggested that PPG3 had been applied more flexibly by other local authorities. Furthermore, she advised that the applicant had not been approached to seek a contribution towards public open space (reason for refusal 03) and that the amended plans submitted now satisfied reason 04 regarding adequate turning space on site. Finally, Councillor Stallard advised that the purpose of the dwelling was to house the applicant's elderly parents in-law and that the applicant had the support of the immediate neighbours.

Following debate, the Committee resolved to support the officers' recommendation to refuse the application, with the addition of an Informative stating that Reason for Refusal 03 could be overcome by a contribution towards the Council's public open space fund.

Item 4: 18A St Faiths Road, Winchester – Case Number: 06/02317/FUL

The Director of Development reported that since publication of the Report, Condition 01 should be amended to read (amended wording in italics):

No access shall be provided to the flat roof with the exception of the access hereby permitted which shall be used solely for the purposes of gaining access to the roof space to be used as ancillary amenity space.

Mrs Fifield spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor Tait (a Ward Member) spoke in objection to the application. In summary, he suggested that the implications for amending the condition of the original permission would make enforcement of any subsequent breaches difficult. Furthermore, even legitimate use of the flat roof (for construction and subsequent maintenance) would have significant impact upon the amenity of neighbours.

During discussion, the Director of Development clarified that the applicant could currently lawfully use the flat roof for any purposes, but that the proposals merely

sought to allow access from the first floor door of the new extension for construction and maintenance only.

Following debate, Members were concerned that granting permission may imply that access from the extension was acceptable and that regular access from the new extension (which could not be easily monitored) would have a significant and detrimental impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring properties, by virtue of increased overlooking and loss of privacy. Access to the roof could continue to be achieved by alternative means, such as by step ladder. Therefore, in conclusion, the Committee agreed to not support the officers' recommendation for approval and refused planning permission for the reasons as set out in the schedule of development control decisions, as outlined above.

Item 6: Royal Observer Corps HQ, Abbots Road, Winchester (Demolition of former Royal Observer Corps Headquarters building) – Case Number: 06/02251/LIS

Mr Maasz and Mr Cullingford spoke in objection to the application and Mr Chapman and Mr Holmes (agent) spoke in support.

The Director of Development reported that since the publication of the Report, comments had been received from the Archaeology Officer, and the following changes to Conditions had been made:

1. No development, or site preparation prior to development which has any effect on disturbing or altering the level or composition of the land, shall take place within the site until the applicant (or their agents or successors in title) has secured and implemented a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation to be submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the archaeological and historical interest of structures on the site is properly safeguarded and recorded.

2. No demolition or alteration to structures on the site shall take place until the applicant or their agents or successors in title has secured and implemented a programme of archaeological recording in accordance with a written scheme of investigation to be submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the archaeological and historical interest of structures on the site is properly safeguarded and recorded.

The Director of Development also reported that since publication of the Report the following additional representations had been received:

The Twentieth Century Society commented that the proposal was drastic as it would see the Grade II listed structures demolished and were disappointed that demolition was seen as the only option. It had been hoped that conversion into housing could have saved the buildings. The Society was unable to come to a conclusive view on the case. It had been noted that the provision of new housing was not likely to constitute a sufficiently beneficial alternative to meet the criteria for demolition.

Mark Oaten MP had written a letter of support to save the listed building.

During debate, the Director of Development clarified that as the building was Grade 2 listed, any subsequent approval for demolition could not be issued until the Secretary of State had made a decision on whether to call in the proposal. Call in was, however, unusual.

Members were mindful that, since previous permission for conversion of the building had been granted, its condition had deteriorated and based on new reports, English Heritage had advised that any attempt to repair, or to convert the building, would reduce the building's special interest to the point that it would no longer be worthy of its listed status. In noting the current disrepair of the building, and the comments of English Heritage regarding the impact of necessary replication of significant parts of the structure, the Committee referred to a general obligation upon the owner of the building to carry out maintenance.

However, noting relevant policy guidance as set out in PPG15 (which allowed for the demolition of historic buildings only in exceptional circumstances) it was suggested that the historic importance of the building could be preserved, regardless of cost and whether or not it became part of a residential conversion.

The Committee also noted the concerns of English Heritage that marketing of the site in its entirety had not taken place, which did not accord with the guidance contained in PPG15. Therefore, the building's incorporation into an alternative scheme might have been possible. It was also recognised that any partial retention of the building (for example, the brick built plotting room to the rear) would not serve any useful purpose in terms of its overall historical significance. Furthermore, partial retention would almost certainly result in 'de listing' thus allowing the owner to demolish it without consent.

In summary, the Committee were concerned that to allow the demolition of the building would be contrary to the heritage policies of the Local Plan, including policy HE1, in that adequate provision should be made for the preservation of the building and also PPG15, in that there was some doubt regarding the marketing of the site for alternative uses of the building.

Therefore, in conclusion, the Committee agreed to not support the officers' recommendation for approval and refused planning permission for the reasons as set out in the schedule of development control decisions, as outlined above.

Item 5: Royal Observer Corps HQ, Abbots Road, Winchester - Case Number: 06/02377/OUT

Mr Cealey spoke in objection to the application. Mr Chapman and Mr Holmes (agent) spoke in support of the proposal.

The Director also requested that an additional condition be added to ensure that development did not commence before the listed building was demolished on the site. Condition 13 should be omitted because matters of detailed design would be adequately controlled at the reserved matters stage.

In conclusion, the Committee approved the outline application as set out subject to conditions in the Report and above.

Item 7: Martins Close, Compton Street, Compton (Resubmission) – Case Number: 06/01835/FUL

The Director of Development advised that since publication of the Report, an additional Condition was recommended to specify that Units 3 and 4 must be kept as two separate dwellings unless permission was granted to allow their conversion to a single dwelling.

Mrs Fennell representing the Compton Village Association and Mr Walmsley representing Compton and Shawford Parish Council spoke in objection to the application. Mr Masker (agent) spoke in support.

In response to the Parish Council representations, the Director of Development reported that a highway objection to the proposals could not be sustained, particularly as Compton Street was not a throughway to traffic and had relatively low traffic speeds, and this situation was different to that of Compton Down.

In conclusion, the Committee approved the application as set out, subject to conditions detailed in the Report and as outlined above.

Item 8: Little Stocks Stables, Stocks Lane, Meonstoke – Case Number: 06/02321/FUL

Dr Armstrong and Mr Rowe (representing Corhampton and Meonstoke Parish Council) spoke in objection and Mr Buchanan (agent) and Mr Foot spoke in support of the application.

During discussion, the Committee was concerned at the intensification of activity on the site, including the movement of vehicles on Stocks Lane, which would be detrimental to the amenity of local residents. Therefore, at conclusion of the debate, the Committee agreed to not support the officers' recommendation for approval and refused planning permission for the reasons as set out in the schedule of development control decisions, as outlined above.

Item 9: The Coach House, Portsmouth Road, Fishers Pond – Case Number: 06/02252/FUL

As a Ward Member, Councillor Sutton spoke in support of the application. Mrs Price (applicant) also spoke in support.

In summary, Councillor Sutton requested that although the proposal was contrary to policy, an exception should be made in this case. She stated that whilst the Fishers Pond area was designated countryside in the adopted Local Plan, it was an area of mixed residential and commercial use and that the annexe building was in keeping. She added that the annexe was specially designed for the applicant's disabled son and was unlikely to suit other people, and that the applicant was unlikely to easily find suitable alternative accommodation.

During debate, the Director of Development clarified that although the annexe dwelling was already in existence, the proposal was effectively for a new development outside of the settlement boundary.

A Member suggested that it may be possible to place a restriction on the annexe, to designate the annexe as an agricultural worker's dwelling, to protect it from becoming a new and separate dwelling in the countryside in the event that the Coach House

had been sold and the applicant's son no longer resided there (such a condition might also allow the applicant's son to remain in the annexe). The Director of Development stated that it may not be possible to impose an agricultural tie, but that this would be investigated together with other options. The Committee resolved that the application be deferred to allow other options to be investigated further, in consultation with the applicant.

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 items 1 and 2 be deferred for consideration at a future meeting to allow for consultation with English Heritage.

3 That in respect of Item 3, planning permission be refused and that an Informative be added stating that Reason for Refusal 03 could be overcome by a contribution towards the Council's public open space fund

4 That in respect of item 4, planning permission be refused and authority be delegated to the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman, to set out detailed reasons for refusal based on the following principle:

That regular access to the flat roof would have a significant detrimental impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring properties by virtue of increased overlooking and loss of privacy.

5 That in respect of item 5, planning permission be granted and authority be delegated to the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman, to agree an additional condition to ensure that development did not commence until the listed building was demolished.

6 That in respect of item 6, planning permission be refused and authority be delegated to the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman, to set out detailed reasons for refusal based on the following principles:

That to allow the demolition of the building would be contrary to policies H1 and also PPG15 as adequate provision should be made for the preservation of the building and also that there was some doubt that the site and building had been adequately marketed.

7 That in respect of item 7, planning permission be granted and authority be delegated to the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman, to agree an additional condition to specify that units 3 and 4 must be kept as two separate dwellings, unless permission was granted to allow their conversion to a single house.

8 That in respect of item 8, planning permission be refused and authority be delegated to the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman, to set out detailed reasons for refusal based on the following principles:

That intensification of activity on the site, including the movement of vehicles on Stocks Lane, would be detrimental to the amenity of local residents.

9 That item 9 be deferred to a future meeting to allow for investigation of whether the severance of the existing tie could be subject to conditions.

3. **ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE WEST OF WATERLOOVILLE MAJOR DEVELOPMENT AREA (MDA) APPLICATION**
(Report PDC649 refers)

RESOLVED:

1. That the arrangements contained within Section 2 of the Report to determine the West of Waterlooville MDA application be agreed.

2. That the arrangements contained within Section 3 of the Report for the site visit in advance of the determination of the West of Waterlooville MDA application, be agreed.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned for lunch at 1.00pm, recommenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 5.00pm.

Chairman