

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

1 February 2007

Attendance:

Councillors:

Jeffs (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)

Bennetts

Beveridge (P)

Busher (P)

de Peyer (P)

Evans

Huxstep (P)

Lipscomb (P)

Johnston (P)

Read (P)

Ruffell (P)

Saunders (P)

Sutton (P)

Deputy Members

Councillor Pearce (Standing Deputy for Councillor Bennetts)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Cook, Godfrey, Mather, Verney, Wagner and Wright

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Bennetts and Evans.

2. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**

(Report PDC664 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 Items 4 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.

The Chairman (Councillor Jeffs) declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of Item 3 as he knew the applicant and left the room during the consideration of this item. Councillor Read assumed the Chair for this item.

Councillor Ruffell declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of Item 1 as he knew the applicant and left the room during the consideration of this item.

Councillor Saunders spoke as a Ward Member in respect of Item 6, sitting apart from the Committee, and she did not vote on this item for reasons of predetermination.

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

Item 1: Downlands Estate Development, Downlands Way, South Wonston – Case Number: 06/02159/OUT

Mr Gibson (on behalf of local residents) and Mr Selby (South Wonston Parish Council) spoke against the application and Mr Rees (the applicant's agent) spoke in support.

Councillor Wright (a Ward Member) spoke against the application. In summary, he raised concerns about the use of Lower Road/Ox Road as an access to the site, which was currently used by cyclists and walkers as a rural link to Farley Wood. He stated that, at 40 proposed dwellings, the application was an overdevelopment of the site as the Urban Capacity Study had identified the area suitable for the development of 25 units. Due to the constraints of the site, 40 dwellings could only be achieved by the erection of two and three storey buildings which would be in complete contrast to the character of the village.

Councillor Wright also commented on the extra traffic likely to be generated as a consequence of the scheme and that it would be difficult to stop private vehicles using the emergency-only access between the two halves of the site. He added that there should be greater consultation on the application with the local community, that there was already an adequate play-area in the village, and commented on the gradient of the site which accentuated the height of the proposed buildings. In conclusion, he requested that the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee visit the site to assess these issues in further detail.

Councillor Godfrey (a Ward Member) also spoke against the application. In addition to echoing the comments made by Councillor Wright, he highlighted that the site was one of the highest points between Winchester and Andover. As the proposed development would exceed the height of the trees, it would therefore have a detrimental visual impact over long distances and was contrary to planning policies. He added that the constraints and density of the site would lead to overlooking and parking problems and that the access road would be unsuitable for large service vehicles.

During debate, the Director of Development explained that there was an error in the Report and stated that Units 1-7 were in fact proposed as two and three storey buildings. He also explained that, subsequent to the publication of the Report, the Ecology Department of Hampshire County Council had withdrawn its objection, subject to the addition of a Condition regarding a habitat study to be undertaken between March and October.

Following debate, the Committee agreed that the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee should visit the site to assess the relationship between the proposal and the surrounding village. This meeting was to be held on Monday 19 February 2007 on site (for Members of the Sub-Committee only) at 9.30am and at South Wonston Village Hall at 11.00am for the public meeting and determination of the application. In response to questions, the Director of Development agreed to supply to that meeting photographs of long distance views of the development.

Item 2: Sutton Court, Bishops Sutton Road, Bishops Sutton – Case Reference 06/03341/FUL

Mrs Miller (Bishops Sutton Parish Council) spoke against the application.

Councillor Verney (Ward Member) also spoke against the application. In summary, he stated that the development had grown incrementally through small increases in a number of planning applications and amendments which, if they had been submitted in their entirety at the outset, would have been refused as contrary to planning policies.

In response, the Director of Development explained that each application had been judged on its own merits and in accordance with procedures and policies. Having considered the points raised during public participation, Members agreed that the slight increase in the footprint of the building and the additional proposed window did not create any significant material harm to neighbours or the public realm.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission, subject to conditions.

Item 3: Wearne House, Basingstoke Road, Old Alresford – Case Reference 06/0077/FUL

Mr Hancock (Old Alresford Parish Council) spoke against the application.

Councillor Cook (a Ward Member) also spoke against the application. In summary, he stated that concerns had been raised in the local community about the proposals and that the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee should visit the site to consider the access point. He explained that access onto the B3046 was dangerous because of the high speed at which most vehicles travelled on this road, there was a nearby steep bend and that if the access was blocked, vehicles would be forced to reverse out onto this main road.

In response, the Director of Development clarified that there had been no highway objections against the application and that the access road would be one-way to prevent the potential for vehicles reversing onto the main road. He added that the application was likely to generate little additional vehicle and pedestrian traffic.

The Director of Development requested that the Committee consider three additional conditions (which limited the use and occupation of the building and concerned foul drainage) and an additional informative regarding foul drainage. These were accepted by the Committee.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission, subject to the inclusion of the additional conditions and the informative as outlined above.

Item 4: 7 Archery Lane, Winchester – Case Reference: 06/03406/LIS

Mr Thomas and Mrs Keen spoke against the application and Dr Casson (the applicant) spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Mather (a Ward Member) spoke against the application. In summary, she stated that, if approved, the application would set an undesirable precedent for the Peninsula Barracks development, as it was likely to encourage other residents to

submit applications for roof-lights. This, she suggested, would spoil the architectural integrity of the site, particularly at night.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse planning permission.

Item 5: Fernhurst, Lower Moors Road, Colden Common – Case Reference: 03/03374/FUL

Mr Beck spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Wagner (a Ward Member) spoke against the application. In summary, he drew Members' attention to the objections from local residents and the Parish Council, as set out in the Report, and requested the Committee to refuse the application.

During debate, Members discussed drainage, parking and density and noted that the Highways contribution would be spent on improvements to the pedestrian footpath on Spring Lane.

The Director of Development recommended an amendment to Condition 9 regarding the protection of trees on site and an additional condition regarding stopping up the existing access onto Lower Moors Road; these were agreed.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Item 6: Land at 1-3 Westley Close, Winchester – Case Reference 06/03262/FUL

Mr Charrett spoke against the application and Mr Moody spoke in support.

Councillor Saunders (as a Ward Member) spoke against the application. In summary, she explained that there were concerns in the local community that the application was likely to increase the risk of flooding into, and the overshadowing of, Weeke Pond. Councillor Saunders also expressed concern regarding the additional traffic the development was likely to generate onto Westley Close, as the Close was frequently used as a pedestrian and cycle route into town. She also raised doubts on the future viability of 1 and 3 Westley Close.

The Director of Development explained that there was an error in the Report in that the size of the site was 0.147 hectares, not 1.47 hectares as set out.

During debate, Members noted that none of the statutory consultees had raised an objection to the application with regard to its effect on the pond. However, the Committee agreed to include an additional condition that the driveway and parking areas should be constructed of a permeable material, to further reduce the risk of flooding from run-off water.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission, subject to conditions.

Item 7: Land at Mollison Rise, Whiteley – Case Reference 06/03260/FUL

Ms Burrus spoke in support of the application.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission, subject to conditions.

Item 8: Southern House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne – Case Reference 06/03678/FUL

Mr Moody spoke in support of the application.

During debate, the Director of Development explained that, since the publication of the Report, the Strategic Planning Team had commented on the application and had not raised an objection.

The Committee agreed to vary the existing legal agreement to allow for the use of Southern House by up to four separate undertakings and to include the provision of a travel plan, providing no substantial objections were received by the end of the publicity period.

Item 9: Brook, Tanfield Lane, Wickham – Case Reference 06/03169/FUL

Mrs de-Souza (a local resident) and Mr Carter (Wickham Parish Council) spoke against the application and Mr Harris spoke in support.

The Director of Development explained that both Ward Councillors (Councillors Evans and Clohosey) had submitted objections to the scheme.

As both Councillors were unable to attend the meeting, the Director read to the Committee their objections. In summary, Councillor Clohosey had stated that there had been insufficient notice taken of local opinion, that the application was an overdevelopment of the site, that it would create parking problems and additional traffic on Tanfield Lane, which was predominately used by walkers to access the countryside from Wickham. He also commented that the application would overlook the rear garden of an adjoining property and create potential flooding and drainage issues. If granted, he recommended that the trees on site should be protected by a Tree Preservation Order.

In summary, Councillor Evans' submission echoed the concerns of Councillor Clohosey above and additionally raised concerns regarding the height of the proposed buildings when viewed from the railway footpath at the rear; that the rear of the garden should be fenced and that the lack of spaces between adjoining properties set an undesirable precedent for future developments in the area.

In response to these comments, the Director stated that no objections had been received from the Environment Agency with regard to flooding or drainage issues. With regard to overlooking, he stated that it was not reasonable for the development to protect the privacy of the entire neighbouring garden and that views of the development from the railway footpath would be limited.

The Director of Development explained that, since the publication of the Report, the Parish Council had maintained its objection to the amended plans under consideration and a colour version of the streetscene plan had been submitted.

The Committee agreed to the imposition of additional conditions to cover boundary treatments, surface water disposal, tree protection and retention of plots 1 and 2 as separate dwellings, with approval of the precise wording to be delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission, subject to conditions.

Item 10: 2 Riverside Cottages, Finches Lane, Twyford – Case Reference 06/03106/FUL

The Director of Development corrected an error in the Report that Apple Tree House, on the opposite side of the River Itchen to the application site, was approximately 40 metres from the site and not “more than 100 metres away” as cited. He also explained that subsequent to the publication of the Report, he had received a petition signed by all eight of the Shawford Park Stables Residents’ Committee (plus two other signatories).

Mr Wessely, Mr Rewcastle and Dr Pryde (local residents) and Mr Buchanan (an agent on behalf of Twyford Parish Council) spoke against the application.

Councillor Wagner (a Ward Member) spoke against the application. In summary, whilst he did not object to the principle of the development of the site, he did object to the proposed design and scale of the application which was unsympathetic and alien to the character of the area. He stated that this was particularly important, as the site was within the curtilage of the Riverside Cottages, which were listed buildings.

Councillor Wagner also raised concerns about flooding and highlighted a letter from Natural England (formerly English Nature) that recommended that a species survey be conducted, but that this had not been acknowledged in the Report. In conclusion he requested that the Committee refuse the application or that the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee visit the site to consider the issues he raised in further detail.

Following debate, the Committee agreed that the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee should visit the site to assess and determine the application in further detail. Members requested that the Conservation Officer be available along with professional advice on the appropriateness of the proposed design. No date was set for the Sub-Committee meeting to allow sufficient time for officers to take into consideration the letter from Natural England.

Item 11: Red Lane House, Pearson Lane, Shawford – Case Reference 03/03318/FUL

The Director of Development updated the Committee that, since the publication of the Report, a further letter of representation had been received in objection to the proposal. He also recommended that a further condition (the approval of which was delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with Chairman) be included regarding the protection of a tree on site.

Mr Haggen (a local resident) spoke against the application and Mr Masker (the applicant’s agent) spoke in support.

Following debate, the Committee agreed the application as set out, subject to an additional condition regarding the protection of trees on site, the approval of which to be delegated as above.

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, the application be determined by a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee to be held on 19 February 2007.

3. That in respect of Item 10, the application be determined by a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee, to be convened once representations from Natural England had been fully assessed.

4. **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE, HELD 5 JANUARY 2007**

(Report PDC667 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee meeting held on 5 January 2007 at Andover Road, Winchester (attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Planning (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 5 January 2007, be received.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned for lunch at 1.15pm, recommenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 6.00pm.

Chairman