

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**7 December 2006**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Jefferies (Chairman) (P)

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

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

Deputy Members in Attendance:

Councillor Pearson (Standing Deputy for Councillor Lipscomb)

---

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Huxstep and Lipscomb.

2. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**

(Report PDC660 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 Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Item 6 (62 Wavell Way, Winchester) as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on the application, and he spoke and voted thereon.

By way of personal explanation, Councillor Sutton drew attention to item 7 (The Coach House, Portsmouth Road, Fishers Pond) where her level of prior involvement with the application may risk the perception of predetermination. Therefore, she addressed the meeting as a Ward Member, sitting apart from the Committee, and she did not vote on this item.

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

Item 1 - Hilbre, Field Way, Compton Down, Winchester – Case Number: 06/02852/FUL

Mr Oxenham spoke in objection to the application and Mr P Mullins (joint applicant) and Ms V Ward (architect) spoke in support.

In his objection, Mr Oxenham stated that the size of the existing bungalow proposed for replacement was considerably smaller than as stated in the report, rendering the replacement bungalow to be three times larger than the existing bungalow. The Director of Development explained that, even if the figures for the size of the existing bungalow were incorrect as set out in the report, there would be no policy objections to the proposals, as the application site did not fall within the restrictions placed on the extension of small buildings within the countryside.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission, subject to the removal of Permitted Development Rights for further alterations to or conversion of the roof area, in order to retain the character and appearance of the dwelling and to protect the amenity of the neighbouring property, Pylewell House.

Item 3 - Littlestowe, Southdown Road, Shawford, Winchester – Case Number 06/02963/FUL

Dr Skipper and Mrs Curgenvin spoke in objection to the application and Mr A Welch (applicant) spoke in support.

The Director of Development asked the Committee to note that Condition 2 of the recommendations related to archaeology and not Condition 3 as set out on page 18 of the report.

Arising out of questions, the Director of Development explained that the necessary sight lines for the access to the development could be achieved by the removal of kerbside hedging along Otterbourne Road. Some of the hedging was in the ownership of the Highway Authority with the remainder in private ownership, but the Highway Authority had powers to ensure that this was cut back to achieve the necessary visibility splays.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to the granting of Planning Permission as set out.

The following items were not subject to public participation.

Item 2 – Little Haven, Mayles Lane, Wickham – Case Number 06/03271/FUL

This item was withdrawn from consideration at the meeting as it was the subject of further consultation with the Environment Agency.

Item 4 – Land adjoining Three Oaks, Botley Road, Bishops Waltham – Case Number 06/01916/FUL

The Director of Development reported that, since preparing the report, two further neighbour representations had been received. In summary, these stated that it was inevitable that servicing of go-carts would include test driving and these vehicles were not silenced to any significant degree and noisy servicing would inevitably require testing and major noise problems.

The Director of Development explained that the servicing of the engines for the go-carts did not take place on site, as these were serviced by the manufacturer. However, if circumstances did change, and the engines were serviced on site, then the building used for the maintenance of go-carts would be required to have sound insulation installed. This application was also the subject of a personal condition.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to the granting of planning permission as set out.

Item 5 - Three Oaks Boarding Kennels and Cattery, Botley Road, Bishops Waltham – Case Number 06/01999/FUL

In response to Members' questions, the Director of Development explained that as the application was principally for a single storey side extension, it would be unreasonable to include an additional Condition to require comprehensive landscaping to the front of the property.

Following debate, the Committee approved the granting of planning permission as set out.

Item 6 - 62 Wavell Way, Winchester – Case Number 06/02992/FUL

The Director of Development confirmed that as an employee of Winchester City Council, the applicant had taken no part in the determination of this application.

Following debate, the Committee approved the granting of planning permission as set out.

Item 7 - The Coach House, Portsmouth Road, Fishers Pond – Case Number 06/02252/FUL

The Director of Development stated that since preparing the report two further letters of representation had been received.

The local Member of Parliament, Mark Oaten, stated that he supported the proposal and considered that the application required special consideration due to the family's health situation. The Member of Parliament also considered that there were genuine motives behind the proposal.

In addition a letter from Mrs J Braithwaite, Lead Service Manager, Adult Service Department, Hampshire County Council had been received. Mrs Braithwaite supported the application, stating that the property was built in 2002 with the support of a full disabled facilities grant provided by Winchester City Council and additional charitable funding. She also considered that, should the disabled occupier of the annexe be forced to leave the property and move into a property not specifically adapted to his needs, it was likely that he would become increasingly dependent upon others for support.

Councillor Sutton, a Ward Member, spoke on this item. In summary, Councillor Sutton stated that this application had been deferred at the meeting held on 5 October 2006, to allow Officers to explore alternatives that may justify the proposal and to pursue further negotiations with the applicant. She thanked the Officers for the work they had carried out as detailed in the report.

She continued that although the report recommended that the application be determined in line with policy, it was still in the Committee's remit to set aside policy and grant relief of Condition 4. The proposal would not add an additional dwelling in the countryside, as the annexe was already constructed and would provide a small affordable house for a disabled person. It was sustainable as it was near bus stops accessing Bishops Waltham and Colden Common. The proposal would not affect the character of the area and would have no affect on highways. Councillor Sutton gave

other examples where policy had been set aside within the local area and referred to a recent Government statement about the possible relaxing of control over development within greenbelt areas. She added that the circumstances were genuine and unique to the applicant and were supported by the National Health Service, Member of Parliament and others. Although the dwelling was additional, it was justified, in a sustainable position, affordable and would give security of tenure to the disabled occupant. Permitted Development Rights could also be removed if required. She asked that the Committee support this modest proposal.

The Committee gave detailed consideration to the proposal and the representations made by Councillor Sutton. Detailed guidance on the legal position was provided by the City Secretary and Solicitor and on Planning Policy from the Director of Development.

Following debate, although sympathetic to the personal circumstances of the applicant, the Committee on balance agreed to uphold its policies and refuse the application for the reasons set out in the schedule.

**RESOLVED:**

That the decisions taken on the Development Control Applications, as set out in the schedule which forms an Appendix to the minutes, be agreed.

The meeting commenced at 9:30am and concluded at 1:05pm

Chairman