

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

13 September 2007

Attendance:

Councillors:

Jeffer (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
Busher (P)
Evans (P)
Huxstep (P)
Lipscomb (P)

Johnston
Pearce
Ruffell (P)
Saunders (P)
Sutton (P)

Deputy Members

Councillors Higgins (Standing Deputy for Councillor Pearce)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Bell and Goodall

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Pearce and Johnston.

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

1. That the minutes of the previous meetings of the Committee held on 14 June (less exempt item), 26 June and 3 July 2007, be approved and adopted.

2. That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 26 July 2007 be approved and adopted subject to a correction, as shown below, to Minute 262 (referring to Items 3 and 4: Yew Tree Service Station, Romsey Road, Pitt, Winchester – Case Numbers: 07/01304/FUL and 07/01301/OUT):

‘Councillor Sutton declared a personal and prejudicial item in respect of Items 3 and 4 (a Ward Member) as she was personally acquainted with the applicant. She left the room during consideration of both items and did not speak or vote thereon’.

3. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**

(Report PDC711 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.

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

Item 1: The Chimneys, 1 Burnett Close, Winchester - Case Number: 07/01294/FUL

Mr Wareham spoke against the application and Mr McFarland (applicant) spoke in support.

The Head of Planning Control advised that, since publication of the Report, the applicant had requested that determination of the application be deferred to a future meeting of the Committee, to allow for consideration of further information submitted by the applicant in response to landscape concerns.

The Head of Planning Control also advised that, with regard to Reason for Refusal 2 (that referred to the proposal's adverse impact in highways terms), the applicant had now submitted a draft unilateral undertaking in respect of the required contributions required by the Highway Authority, in order to mitigate its impact.

During discussion, the Head of Planning Control referred to the additional landscaping information submitted by the applicant. This included detail of the crib-lock retaining wall and planting to the boundary with 3 Burnett Close and further details of the landscape treatment of the front and rear boundaries of the site. It was reported that, having undertaken an initial review of this further information, in the opinion of officers the proposal remained unacceptable in landscape terms, particularly the lack of a sufficient buffer with the adjacent residential area, and therefore was still recommended for refusal. In view of the fact that the additional landscape information had recently been received, it was requested that officers and the Council's Landscape Architect should consider in more detail whether the reasons for refusal should make specific reference to the further information, or possibly include an additional reason, should the Committee be minded to accept the officer's recommendation to refuse the application.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse planning permission for the reasons as set out in the Report, with the addition of a specific landscaping reason(s), if necessary, as referred to above, with detailed wording delegated to the Head of Planning Control and the Council's Landscape Architect, in consultation with the Chairman.

Item 2: Lawsonia, Bull Lane, Waltham Chase, Southampton – Case Number: 07/01433/FUL

Ms Smith (a local resident) and Councillor Goodall (a Ward Member) spoke against the application and Mr Carrington (applicant) spoke in support.

In summary, Councillor Goodall stated that the design layout of the application remained broadly similar to the previously refused scheme, with no fundamental changes other than a few amendments to the elevations. The proposal remained overbearing and detrimental to the character of the surrounding area and was too dense (albeit within Government guidelines). Parking on site was insufficient and the additional traffic generation would have a negative impact on highways. Councillor Goodall was also concerned by potential flooding in the area being exacerbated from increased surface water runoff from the site.

Responding to the points raised, the Head of Planning Control acknowledged that the application had a similar site layout to the previously refused scheme, however the applicant had sought to address the previous reasons for refusal. In summary, the

parking layout and access road had been revised (reducing the overall number of spaces by one and reducing the amount of proposed garage spaces) to allow for more effective soft landscaping. The dwelling at plot 6 had also been reduced in terms of the number of bedrooms from four to three. Elevational changes and the slight re-siting of the two houses fronting Bull Lane had also been undertaken to address the previous concerns of the Committee.

The Head of Planning Control advised that, since publication of the Report, a further six letters of objections had been received and had been placed on the case file. These reiterated similar concerns to those already raised and highlighted within the Report.

During debate, it was agreed that storm water disposal should be aided by way of installation of water butts (in addition to the proposed soakaways), particularly as the area was predominantly clay. This would be met by way of a revision to existing Condition 2 that referred to the disposal of foul and surface water. It was also agreed to add an additional condition to ensure that only high quality traditional materials were used in construction, such as slate or clay tiles, stock brick and recessed timber windows.

With regard to the applicant's obligation to contribute to the Central Hampshire Rural Transport Strategy, it was explained that general improvements to sustainable initiatives along the Winchester to Wickham corridor were planned. Noting concerns that bus services in the Waltham Chase area had recently been reduced, the Committee requested that Hampshire County Council provide further detail on the allocation of such funds in this instance. The Head of Planning Control undertook to liaise with the County Council over this issue and, at the Chairman's request; in all similar cases where a contribution to the Strategy was a planning obligation.

At conclusion of debate, the Committee was not satisfied that the amended scheme had overcome its previous concerns and subsequent reasons for refusal. The Committee remained concerned that, by way of its design and layout, the application represented an unacceptable form of development of the site and that its resultant impact was to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

Therefore, the Committee resolved to refuse planning permission for the reasons described above. It was agreed that the wording of the Reasons would be the same as for the previously refused scheme (currently subject to appeal) as it was considered that the amended scheme had not overcome these objections.

Item 3: Fairhaven, 108 Christchurch Road, Winchester - Case Number: 07/00287/FUL

The Head of Planning Control advised that, since publication of the Report, a further five letters of representation and had been placed on the case file. In summary, the objectors generally reiterated previous objections.

The Committee noted that Item 4 below ran concurrently with this application, although it would be determined separately.

Mr Perkins and Councillor Mather (a Ward Member) spoke against both applications and Mr Ashe spoke in support of both.

In summary, Councillor Mather stated that this application represented over-development of the site and, as a result, would be to the detriment to the

Conservation Area. However, she was supportive of the demolition of the existing dwelling, although the replacement should be appropriate to the area, with a smaller overall footprint within the site. The improvements made to the design of the proposals were welcomed, but the general character of the area was of substantial Victorian houses in large plots and not characterised by terraces as represented by this proposal. She explained that, although sub-division of properties had taken place along parts of Christchurch Road, this had not been to the detriment of the immediate vicinity of the site, itself located within a private road.

During discussion, it was agreed that Condition 2 of any subsequent permission be amended, so as to ensure the appropriate design of the building, by requiring the submission of details of windows, doors, chimneys, eaves and barge/fascia boards.

At conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission for the reasons given and subject to the conditions as set out, with an amendment to Condition 2 as described above (with exact wording delegated to the Head of Planning Control in consultation with the Chairman).

Item 4: Fairhaven, 108 Christchurch Road, Winchester (Demolition of existing dwelling and garage) – Case Number: 07/00365/LBC

Having regard to its decision at Item 3 above, the Committee resolved to grant planning permission for the reasons given and subject to the conditions as set out.

Item 5: 28 Main Road, Littleton, Winchester – Case Number: 07/01576/FUL

Mr Elsmore (a local resident) and Mr Lupton (representing Littleton and Harestock Parish Council) spoke against the proposal and Mr Sherlock (applicant's agent) spoke in support.

Responding to questions, the Head of Planning Control reminded the Committee that PPS3 looked to achieve efficient and effective use of land and, following an assessment of the proposal's spatial context and of its design, the application was considered appropriate and was recommend for approval. It was also clarified that the scheme would retain a similar amount of space and vegetation fronting Main Road, and therefore was not considered to compromise the Village Design Statement.

Following debate, the Committee considered that the proposals represented over development of the site and were detrimental to the character of the area, and therefore contrary to Policy DP3(ii). It was also considered that the application was against the intentions of the Village Design Statement to retain the spacious frontages in this area of Main Road, as it would erode the existing building line that was generally set well back from the road. The Committee was also concerned that the proposal would create a precedent for similar garden development in the vicinity.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee refused planning permission for the reasons described above, with detailed wording delegated to the Head of Planning Control in consultation with the Chairman. The Head of Planning Control also suggested that a standard reason for refusal be added with regard to a lack financial contribution towards public open space, through the Open Space Funding system.

Item 6: 28 Highways, Main Road, Otterbourne, Winchester – Case Number: 07/01356/FUL

Councillor Bell (a Ward Member) and Mr Brown (applicant) addressed the Committee. They both advised that following clarification of the position of a sewer running across the site (and its relative impact on the position of the proposal building), Mr Brown would prefer to resubmit amended plans for a bungalow that was similar to an application previously submitted and refused.

Councillor Bell clarified that she was in support of the applicant and his intention to develop the site, but was also supporting objectors to the current proposal. In summary, she described how misunderstandings on Mr Brown's part had led to the submission of the current proposals, which were unsuitable to both the applicant and to the site's neighbours. Councillor Bell referred to the sewer running across the site that compromised its development and to the varied building line along Main Road at this location.

In response, the Head of Planning Control explained that the applicant's original proposal had been refused permission, due to it being too far forward of the building line at this location. This had largely been due to the bungalow's larger footprint and it being placed forward of the sewer. A resubmission reflecting the applicant's original intent with a revised footprint and siting, following diversion of the sewer, may be acceptable.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee resolved to grant planning permission for the reasons given and subject to the conditions as set out. Members noted that the applicant may submit a further application for the site which would be judged on its own merits.

Item 7: 4 Hunton Down Lane, Hunton, Winchester – Case Number: 07/01190/FUL

The Head of Planning Control advised that, since publication of the Report, two further letters of representation and had been received and were placed on the case file. In summary, the objectors stated that the building was unique and should be preserved in its present state.

The Head of Planning Control also advised that, also following the publication of the Report, it had been noted that the reason for Condition 8 was incorrect. This should read as follows:

Reason: To protect the setting of the Grade II listed building.

The Head of Planning Control also explained that that it was recommended that Condition 2 in the Report be amended for the following reasons.

It was considered that car parking on the grassed front garden would affect the setting of the listed building and, whilst there was a condition to restrict vehicular access from Hunton Down Lane (Condition 8) and a condition to restrict the provision of hard surfacing without planning consent (Condition 4), future occupiers and/or visitors may be tempted to park along the frontage. Therefore it was recommended that Condition 2 be amended to include a requirement for the provision of appropriate style posts along the front boundary. These would not affect the setting of the listed building, but would prevent opportunities for parking on the grassed frontage. There were other examples of these in the village.

The Committee noted that Item 8 below ran concurrently with this application although they would be determined separately.

Ms Edwards spoke against the application and Mr Partridge (for the applicant) spoke in support.

Following debate, the Committee resolved to grant planning permission for the reasons given and subject to the conditions as set out, and as amended above.

Item 8: 4 Hunton Down Lane, Hunton, Winchester (Change of use to a dwelling) – Case Number: 07/01191/LIS

Having regard to its decision at Item 7 above, the Committee resolved to grant planning permission for the reasons given and subject to the conditions as set out.

Item 9: Badgers Green, 117 Springvale, Kings Worthy – Case Number: 07/01653/FUL

The Head of Planning Control advised that, since publication of the Report, an additional Condition regarding landscaping was recommended to any subsequent consent.

Mr Stenning spoke against the application. As Mr Stenning was an employee of the City Council, he made his representation to the Committee and then withdrew from the meeting room.

Following debate, the Committee approved the application for the reasons given and subject to the conditions as set out and amended 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, planning permission be refused for the reasons as set out in the schedule which forms an appendix to the minutes and that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Control and the Council's Landscape Architect, in consultation with the Chairman, to agree the exact wording of an additional landscaping reason(s) for refusal.

3. That in respect of Item 2, planning permission be refused and that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Control, in consultation with the Chairman, to agree the detailed wording of the reasons for refusal based on those for the previously refused scheme, namely:

(i) The proposals would be, by virtue of its layout and design, an unacceptable form of development detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.

(ii) Inadequate provision for financial contribution towards public open space through the Open Space Funding system.

(iii) Inadequate provision for financial provision towards sustainable transport improvements contained in the Central Hampshire Rural Transport Strategy.

(iv) Inadequate provision for affordable housing.

4. That in respect of Item 3, planning permission be granted subject to the reasons and conditions as set out in the schedule which forms an appendix to the minutes and that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Control, in consultation with the Chairman, to agree detailed wording to an amendment to Condition 2 with regard to the ensuring the appropriate design of the building by requiring the submission of details of windows, doors, chimneys, eaves and bargeboards.

5. That in respect of Item 5, planning permission be refused and that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Control, in consultation with the Chairman, to agree the exact wording of reason(s) for refusal based on the following:

- (i) 'The proposals represented over development of the site and would be to detriment of the character of the area, and so contrary to policy DP3(ii).
- (ii) The application was also against the intentions of the Village Design Statement to retain the spacious frontages in this area of Main Road as it would erode the existing building line that was generally set back from the road.
- (iii) The proposal would create a precedent for similar garden development in the vicinity'.

4. **CONSTITUTION - SCHEME OF DELEGATION** [\(Report PDC712 refers\)](#)

Members noted that, under the Scheme of Delegation, approval of planning applications was delegated to the Head of Planning Control, subject to specified exceptions, one of which was for applications which were controversial or "major". Members also noted that the Government used the term "Major" (in the context of performance targets) to refer to development involving more than 10 dwellings, although the scheme had been designed before this definition had been adopted. Clarification of the Scheme of Delegation, to remove ambiguity and retain as much flexibility as possible, was required. Members would still be generally aware of applications relevant to the Wards that they represent and would continue to have the right to refer those of concern to the Committee.

During discussion, some Members expressed the view that, as 'major' development would be more significant to some of the smaller communities in the District, these should continue to be automatically referred to the Committee for determination, or that Ward Members should be consulted on such applications. Following further discussion, it was suggested that the scheme could be revised so as to require that significant applications which officers proposed to grant approval for under delegated powers, should be referred to Committee for determination. This would allow officers to refuse inappropriate significant development under delegated powers.

At the conclusion of discussion, the Head of Legal Services suggested that, in light of the discussion, the report be revised and brought back to a future meeting of the Committee to allow for consideration of the points raised and for their discussion among officers.

RESOLVED:

That the Report be revised and brought back to a future meeting of the Committee.

5. **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB COMMITTEE – 19 JULY 2007**
[\(Report PDC713 refers\)](#)

It was agreed that this matter be deferred to the next meeting of the Committee.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of the Minutes of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub Committee held on 19 July 2007, be deferred to the next meeting of the Committee.

6. **MORN HILL – HOTEL DEVELOPMENT (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)**
[\(Report PDC714 refers\)](#)

By way of personal explanation, Councillor Baxter pointed out that he was involved as a Ward Councillor in discussions with the Parish Council and with the Council's legal officers, with regard to the matters related to the development of the site. He considered that his position in determining the matter under consideration had not been compromised and he therefore remained in the room and spoke and voted thereon.

The Committee considered the above Report which set out the latest position concerning the hotel development at Morn Hill. At the invitation of the Chairman, the LPA Receiver (Mr Skinner) made representations in open session which were noted by Members, who also had regard to the legal advice set out in the exempt appendix to the Report, which was considered in closed session (detail in exempt minute) before making a decision.

Mr Skinner advised that he was a registered property receiver, who had been appointed by the Royal Bank of Scotland to recover monies advanced by the Bank to the site's owner. He explained that it was his job to find a suitable developer to purchase the site and to complete the scheme. This party would be required enter into a Section 106 agreement (S106) with the Council to take the proposal forward. Mr Skinner advised that completion of the hotel was now unlikely to take place within the 18 months specified in the completion notice and he was therefore seeking that a revised period of time that was acceptable to the Council should be agreed as part of the new S106.

Responding to questions, Mr Skinner stated that it was in his interests to sell the consent to a reputable developer as the Council may refuse to sign off the S106 if it remained unconvinced on the buyer's ability to complete the development.

The Head of Planning Control reminded Members, that should the Committee be minded to enter into a new S106 with a developer to implement the existing planning

consent for a hotel, any new application for the site would now be a departure from the Council's adopted Local Plan. As policies would now not support such a proposal in this location, any such application would be required to be referred to the Government Office South East (GOSE) who would, in turn, be likely to call in the matter. Furthermore, anything other than marginal changes to the agreed plans may constitute a material change requiring a planning application which would be subject to the same possibility of being called in. This would include changes to such matters as the external appearance and the number of bedrooms.

As a Ward Member, Councillor Baxter reiterated his (and the Parish Council's) dissatisfaction that the hotel had not been developed since it was granted permission in 1994. The site in the meanwhile remained an eyesore.

On behalf of the Committee, the Chairman thanked Mr Skinner for his attendance.

The Committee resolved to move into exempt business to consider the legal advice as set out in the exempt appendix to the Report (detail in exempt minute) before considering the Report's recommendations.

At the conclusion of debate, after having regard to the legal advice (set out in the Exempt appendix), the Committee agreed to support the intentions of the LPA Receiver to dispose of the site and associated planning consent. It was agreed that the Head of Legal Services (in consultation with the Chairman and Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation, the Ward Member and Head of Planning Control) be authorised to agree the terms, and enter into a new Section 106 agreement for the development of a hotel at Morn Hill. The Committee also agreed that, to assist Mr Skinner's marketing of the site, it be noted that a variation to the scheme could be submitted and considered on its own merits.

RESOLVED:

That the Head of Legal Services (in consultation with the Chairman and Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation, the Ward Member and Head of Planning Control) be authorised to agree terms of, and enter into a new Section 106 agreement for the development of the hotel element of the Morn Hill Development to include:

- A covenant not to use the land other than as a hotel;
- A covenant to build the hotel within three years of the date of the agreement;
- The withdrawal of the completion notice on the site upon the new agreement being entered into.

7. EXEMPT BUSINESS

RESOLVED:

1. That in all the circumstances, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

2. That the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business because it is likely that, if members of the public were present, there would be disclosure to them of 'exempt information' as defined by Section 100I and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

<u>Minute Number</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Description of Exempt Information</u>
##	Morn Hill – Hotel Development – Exempt Appendix) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). (Para 3 Schedule 12A refers)
	Exempt minute of the previous meeting held 14 June 2007:) Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained on legal proceedings. (Para 5 Schedule 12A refers)
	• Morn Hill – Hotel Development – Exempt Appendix)

8. **EXEMPT MINUTE**

RESOLVED:

That the exempt minute of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 14 June 2007, be approved and adopted

9. **MORN HILL – HOTEL DEVELOPMENT - EXEMPT APPENDIX**
(Report PDC714 refers)

The Committee considered the exempt appendix to the above report, which set out detailed legal advice on the current position for the hotel development at Morn Hill, together with possible options for future action (detail in exempt minute).

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned at 1.45pm, recommenced at 2pm and concluded at 7pm.

Chairman

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE : DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MEETING

DECISIONS

13.09.2007

PART II DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS
AND DECISIONS THEREON

Item

01

Parish Winchester Town

Conservation Area:
Case No: 07/01294/FUL
Ref No: W04183/20
Date Valid: 22 May 2007
Grid Ref: 446501 130815
Team: EAST **Case Officer:** Mr Dave Dimon
Applicant: Aldi Stores Ltd (Swindon)
Proposal: Single and partial two storey building to provide food store (Class A1); alterations to access, car park and landscaping (Site also includes No:2 Burnetts Close)

Location: The Chimneys, 1 Burnett Close, Winchester, Hampshire, SO22 5JQ
Recommendation: REF

REFUSED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING REFUSAL REASON(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

The exact wording of the reasons be delegated to the Director of Operations and the Chairman of PDC following a further consultation with the Council's landscape architect in respect of recently submitted amended sections and landscape drawings.

Item

02

Parish Shedfield

Conservation Area:
Case No: 07/01433/FUL
Ref No: W02350/08
Date Valid: 8 June 2007
Grid Ref: 456101 115026
Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Mr Simon Finch
Applicant: Foreman Homes Ltd
Proposal: 4 no. one bed, 1 no. three bed, 1 no. 2 bed, 1 no. four bed and 2 no. five bedroom dwellings; new access from Ashley Gardens
Location: Lawsonia, Bull Lane, Waltham Chase, Southampton, Hampshire, SO32 2LS
Recommendation: REF

REFUSED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING REFUSAL REASON(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

1. The proposal would be, by virtue of its layout and design, and unacceptable form of development detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The scheme therefore conflicts with policy UB3 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review) and policy DP.3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review.

2. The proposal is contrary to Policy R2 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review and Policy RT.4 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 in that it fails to make adequate provision for public recreational space to the required standard, and would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the area and would undermine the plan's policies for recreational open space provision with the district.

3. The proposal is contrary to Policies T1, T2, T5 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review and Policy T.5 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 in that it fails to make adequate provision towards sustainable transport improvements contained in the Central Hampshire Rural Transport Strategy and would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the area and the travel needs generated by the development.

4. The proposal is contrary to Policy H6 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review and Policy H.5 in the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 in that it fails to make adequate provision for affordable housing and would therefore be detrimental to the needs of local people in the Housing Monitoring Report and Housing Needs Survey.

Informatives

1 This permission is granted for the following reasons:

The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

2 The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB1, UB2, T1, T2, T5, H11, E4 , E8.

Winchester District Local Plan Review : DP.1, DP.3, DP.4, H.3, H.5, H.7, RT.4, T1, T.2, T.4.

Item
03

Parish	Winchester Town
Conservation Area:	
Case No:	07/00287/FUL
Ref No:	W06272/06
Date Valid:	6 February 2007
Grid Ref:	447427 128392
Team:	WEST
Case Officer:	Mr Neil Mackintosh
Applicant:	Brookeswood Developments Ltd
Proposal:	(AMENDED PLANS) Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 2 no. two bedroom and 1 no. four bedroom terraced dwellings with associated parking and landscaping (RESUBMISSION)
Location:	Fairhaven, 108 Christchurch Road, Winchester, Hampshire, SO23 9TG
Recommendation:	PER

APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 Plans and particulars showing the detailed proposals for all the following aspects of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development is commenced. The approved details shall be carried out as approved, fully implemented and, where appropriate, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details, before the building is occupied, unless otherwise agreed, in writing, with the Local Planning Authority;

1. Details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development;
2. Large scale drawings at 1:20 showing details of windows, doors, chimneys, eaves and bargeboards;
3. A landscape scheme, showing the planting proposed, the means of forming enclosures, the materials to be used for paved and hard surfaces and the finished levels in relation to existing levels;
4. Details of a scheme for protecting the proposed dwellings from noise from the railway line;
5. Provision to be made for the storage of cycles;
6. Details of surface water drainage.

Reason: In order to secure well planned development.

- 3 All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out before the use hereby permitted is commenced and prior to the completion of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed with the Local Planning Authority. If within a period of five years after planting any tree or plant is removed, dies or becomes, in the opinion of

the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged, defective or diseased another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally approved shall be planted at the same place, within the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscape in accordance with the approved designs.

- 4 Development shall not begin until drainage works have been carried out in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory provision of foul and surface water drainage.

- 5 Before the development hereby approved is first brought into use, a turning space shall be provided within the site to enable vehicles using the site to enter and leave in a forward gear. The turning space shall be retained and kept available for such purposes at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

- 6 Before the development hereby approved is first brought into use, a minimum of five car parking spaces shall be provided within the curtilage of the site and thereafter maintained and kept available.

Reason: To ensure adequate car parking provision within the site in accordance with the standards of the Local Planning Authority.

- 7 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Classes A, B C, D and E of Part One of Schedule 2 of the Order, shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the locality and to maintain a good quality environment.

- 8 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order, with or without modification), no windows, dormer windows or rooflights other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall, at any time, be constructed in the North and East elevations of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To protect the amenity and privacy of the adjoining residential properties.

- 9 The specialist louvred window to be constructed in the rear elevation of Unit B shall be retained and not replaced by a conventional window.

Reason: To protect the amenity and privacy of the adjoining residential properties.

Informatives

- 1 This permission is granted for the following reasons:
The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.
- 2 The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-
Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB1, UB3, E17, H11
Winchester District Local Plan Review: DP3, DP4, HE5, HE7, HE8, H3, H7, T4
- 3 All work relating to the development hereby approved, including works of demolition or preparation prior to operations, should only take place between the hours of 0800 and 1800 Monday to Friday and 0800 and 1300 Saturdays and at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
- 4 During demolition and construction no burning should take place on site.
- 5 A formal application for connection to the water supply is required in order to service this development. Please contact Southern Water's Network Development Team based at Chatham, Kent or www.southernwater.co.uk

Item

04

Parish	Winchester Town
Conservation Area:	Winchester Conservation Area
Case No:	07/00365/LBC
Ref No:	W06272/07LBCA
Date Valid:	23 February 2007
Grid Ref:	447427 128392
Team:	WEST
Applicant:	Brookeswood Developments Ltd
Proposal:	Demolition of existing dwelling and detached garage
Location:	Fairhaven, 108 Christchurch Road, Winchester, Hampshire, SO23 9TG
Recommendation:	PER
Case Officer:	Mr Neil Mackintosh

APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

- 1 The works hereby consented to shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.
- 2 The demolition hereby permitted shall not be undertaken before a contract for the carrying out of the works of redevelopment of the site has been made and planning permission has been granted for the redevelopment for which the contract provides and the redevelopment shall be commenced within one month following the completion of the demolition

Reason: To prevent the premature demolition of the building and the creation of a gap site which will be prejudicial to the amenities of the Conservation Area and to accord with paragraph 4.29 of PPG15.

Informatives

- 1 The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-
Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB1, HE7
Winchester District Local Plan Review: HE7

Item
05

Parish	Littleton And Harestock
Conservation Area:	
Case No:	07/01576/FUL
Ref No:	W07241/06
Date Valid:	26 June 2007
Grid Ref:	445782 132065
Team:	EAST
Applicant:	Mr S J Neilson
Proposal:	Erection of detached four bedroom dwelling with new access to Bercote Close
Location:	28 Main Road, Littleton, Winchester, Hampshire, SO22 6PS
Recommendation:	REF
Case Officer:	Lorna Hutchings

REFUSED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING REFUSAL REASON(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

- 1 The proposed development is contrary to the urban regeneration policy (UB3) if the Hampshire Country Structure Plan Review and the design and development policy (DP3) of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that the proposal is out of keeping with the spatial characteristics of the area as the building is situated in the front garden of an existing residential curtilage, fronting the main road, contrary to the requirements of Littleton's Village Design Statement 2001, which would be materially detrimental to the street scene and character of the area and would set a harmful precedent of frontage development.
- 2 The proposal is contrary to the policies of the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review (R2) and the policies of the Winchester District Local Plan Review (RT4) in that it fails to make adequate provision for the public recreational open space to the required standard, and would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the area.

Informatives

- 1 The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB3
Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: DP.3

Item
06

Parish	Otterbourne
Conservation Area:	
Case No:	07/01356/FUL
Ref No:	W20538/01
Date Valid:	8 June 2007
Grid Ref:	445966 123051
Team:	WEST
Applicant:	Mr H L Brown
Proposal:	1Two bedroom house in front garden (RESUBMISSION).
Location:	Highways, Main Road, Otterbourne, Winchester, Hampshire, SO21 2EQ
Recommendation:	PER
Case Officer:	Mr James Jenkison

APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- 2 No additional rooflights or dormer windows shall at any time be constructed in the rear roof slope of the development hereby permitted unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the privacy and amenity of the bungalow to the rear of the site.
- 3 No development shall take place until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwelling hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development presents a satisfactory appearance in the interests of the amenities of the area.
- 4 No development shall take place until details of both hard and soft landscape works and existing tree and hedgerow protection have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved within the first planting season of the substantial completion of the development or as otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include the following, as relevant:
 - means of enclosure, including hedgerow planting:
 - other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas:
 - hard surfacing areas and materials:
 - Landscape areas.Soft landscape details shall include the following as relevant:

- Landscape planting and maintenance schedule for visibility splays.
- Retention of existing trees and hedgerows
- planting plans
- written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment:
 - schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate:
 - schedule of plants for the re-reinforcement of the existing hedgerow and new hedgerow planting:
 - manner and treatment of watercourses, ditches and banks:
 - implementation programme:

Reason: To preserve the rural character of the site and locality.

- 5 Before the development hereby approved is first brought into use, visibility splays of 2.4metres by 43metres shall be provided at the junction of the access and public highway. The splays shall be kept free of obstacles at all times. No structure, erection or vegetation exceeding 1 metre in height above the level of the adjacent highway shall be permitted within the splays.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

- 6 Before the development hereby approved is first brought into use, a minimum of twocar parking spaces shall be provided within the curtilage of the site and thereafter maintained and kept available.

Reason: To ensure adequate car parking provision within the site in accordance with the standards of the Local Planning Authority.

Informatives

- 1 This permission is granted for the following reasons:
The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.
- 2 The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB3, R3
Adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP3, RT4

Item
07

Parish	Wonston
Conservation Area:	
Case No:	07/01190/FUL
Ref No:	W20474/02
Date Valid:	10 May 2007
Grid Ref:	448217 139717
Team:	EAST
Applicant:	Mr R Mackinnon
Proposal:	Change of use to a dwelling including a rear extension and associated off site parking at Hunton Lane(RESUBMISSION)
Location:	4 Hunton Down Lane, Hunton, Winchester, Hampshire, SO21 3PT
Recommendation:	PER
Case Officer:	Mrs Julie Pinnock

APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 No development shall take place until details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include the following, as relevant:

- means of enclosure including details of posts to the front boundary, including any retaining structures:

- other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas:

- hard surfacing materials:

- minor artefacts and structures (eg. street furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc):

- proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc, including lines, manholes, supports etc.):

- retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration.

Soft landscape details shall include the following as relevant:

- planting plans:

- written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment:

- schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where

appropriate:

- retained areas of grassland cover, scrub, hedgerow, trees and woodland;
- manner and treatment of watercourses, ditches and banks:
- implementation programme:

Reason: To improve the appearance of the site in the interests of visual amenity.

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out before the use hereby permitted is commenced and prior to the completion of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed with the Local Planning Authority. If within a period of five years after planting any tree or plant is removed, dies or becomes, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged, defective or diseased another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally approved shall be planted at the same place, within the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscape in accordance with the approved designs.

4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Classes A, B, C, D, E, F, and H of Parts 1 of Schedule 2 of the Order, shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the locality and to maintain a good quality environment.

5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Classes A or B of Parts 2 of Schedule 2 of the Order, shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the locality and to maintain a good quality environment.

6 Details of provisions to be made for the parking and turning on site of operative and construction vehicles during the period of development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and fully implemented before development commences. Such measures shall be retained for the construction period.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

7 Prior to the commencement of development, details of a secure undercover cycle parking shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure cycle provision is provided at the site in accordance with current standards.

8 There shall be no means of vehicular access to the site from Hunton Down Lane

Reason: To protect the setting of the grade II listed building.

9 The car parking hereby approved shall not be used for any other purpose than the parking of cars.

Reason: To ensure the provision and retention of the car parking: in the interests of local amenity and highway safety.

Informatives

1 This permission is granted for the following reasons:

The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

2 The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB1, UB3, T2, H10, R2, C2, E6, E16

Winchester District Local Plan Review: DP.1, DP.3, DP.4, DP.5, CE.5, CE.17, CE.24, HE.4, HE.5, HE.8, HE.13, HE.14, HE.17, RT.4, T.4

Item

08

Parish	Wonston
Conservation Area:	Hunton Conservation Area
Case No:	07/01191/LIS
Ref No:	W20474/03LB
Date Valid:	10 May 2007
Grid Ref:	448217 139717
Team:	EAST
Applicant:	Mr R Mackinnon
Proposal:	Change of use to a dwelling including a rear extension and associated off site parking at Hunton Lane (RESUBMISSION)
Location:	4 Hunton Down Lane, Hunton, Winchester, Hampshire, SO21 3PT
Recommendation:	PER
Case Officer:	Mrs Julie Pinnock

APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

- 1 The works hereby consented to shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.

Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 18(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be constructed using handmade bricks and lime mortar, handmade claytiles, weatherboarding and any colour finish to boarding, French doors and glazed links to match those on the existing building. If any materials or their means of fixing are not identical to the original then drawn details and samples of these materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the commencement of works. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the subsequently approved details and materials.

Reason: To maintain the architectural interest of the building.

- 3 Prior to the commencement of development 1:10 elevations and sections showing the design of the French doors and glazed link shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of work. The French doors and glazed link shall be installed in accordance with the approved details

Reason: To protect the character and appearance of the building (or conservation area).

- 4 Details of the siting and design and method of fixing of any external meter boxes/metal ducting/flues to be provided, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of works. The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the character and appearance of the listed building (and Conservation Area).

- 5 All rainwater goods shall be of cast iron unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the character and appearance of the (listed) building.

Informatives

1 This permission is granted for the following reasons:
The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

2 The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB1, UB3, T2, H10, R2, C2, E6, E16
Winchester District Local Plan Review: DP.1, DP.3, DP.4, DP.5, CE.5, CE.17, CE.24, HE.4, HE.5, HE.8, HE.13, HE.14, HE.17, RT.4, T.4

Item
09

Parish	Kings Worthy
Conservation Area:	
Case No:	07/01653/FUL
Ref No:	W05342/03
Date Valid:	5 July 2007
Grid Ref:	448992 133324
Team:	EAST
Applicant:	Mr J Russell
Proposal:	Amendment to permission W05342/02 to provide additional living space in roof including 3 no. rear dormer windows and 2 no. front velux windows
Location:	Badgers Green, 117 Springvale Road, Kings Worthy, Hampshire, SO23 7LE
Recommendation:	PER

Case Officer: Mr Nick Fisher

APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2 No development shall take place until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwelling hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development presents a satisfactory appearance in the interests of the amenities of the area.

3 A detailed scheme for landscaping, tree and/or shrub planting / retention of existing trees and shrubs shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The scheme shall specify species, density, planting, size and layout. The scheme approved shall be carried out in the first planting season following the occupation of the building or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. If within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, any trees, shrubs or plants die, are removed or, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or defective, others of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, in the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To improve the appearance of the site in the interests of visual amenity.

4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order, with or without modification), no dormer windows or roof-light windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall, at any time, be constructed in the front (western) and rear (eastern) elevation(s) of the dwelling hereby permitted.

4 In the interests of protecting the residential amenity of nearby neighbours and in the interests of ensuring that the development relates well to nearby buildings and the street-scene.

5 The temporary domestic mobile home, located at the site shall be removed within 3 months of the replacement bungalow being first occupied.

Reason: To ensure that the temporary building is removed, in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

6 Details of measures to be taken to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site during construction works being deposited on the public highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and fully implemented before development commences. Such measures shall be retained for the duration of the construction period. No lorry shall leave the site unless its wheels have been cleaned sufficiently to prevent mud being carried onto the highway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

7 No development, or works of site preparation or clearance, shall take place until details, including plans and cross sections of the existing and proposed ground levels of the development and the boundaries of the site and the height of the ground floor slab and damp proof course in relation thereto, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development is satisfactory in relation to nearby buildings.

8 No materials shall at any time be burnt on site during the removal of the existing building and construction of the replacement dwelling.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby neighbours.

9 A hedgerow shall be planted along the rear boundary (East boundary) containing species of plants which shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The hedgerow shall be maintained at a height of no less than 2.5 meters and species that die shall be replaced.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjacent residential properties.

Informatives

1 This permission is granted for the following reasons:

The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

2 The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB3
Winchester District Local Plan Adopted 2006: DP1, DP3, DP4
Kings Worthy and Martyr Worthy Village Design Statement

Item
10

Parish	Denmead
Conservation Area:	
Case No:	07/01801/FUL
Ref No:	W10001/03
Date Valid:	20 July 2007
Grid Ref:	464497 112633
Team:	EAST
Applicant:	Mr Paul Stallard
Proposal:	Conservatory to rear
Location:	High Trees, Thompsons Lane, Denmead, Waterlooville, Hampshire, PO7 6NB
Recommendation:	PER
Case Officer:	Mr Andrew Rushmer

APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the conservatory hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual relationship between the new development and the existing.

Informatives

1 This permission is granted for the following reasons:
The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

2 The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB3
Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: DP3
Denmead Village Design Statement.

Item

Parish

Conservation Area:

Case No:

Ref No:

Date Valid:

Grid Ref:

Team:

Applicant:

Proposal: Morn Hill Hotel Development

Location:

Recommendation:

Agreed a new section 106 agreement. The Construction of the Hotel is to be completed within 3 years. Full details are in full committee minutes.