

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

19 November 2009

Attendance:

Councillors:

Jeffs (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
Bell (P)
Busher (P)
Evans (P)
Fall (P)

Huxstep (P)
Johnston (P)
Lipscomb (P)
Ruffell (P)
Tait (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Learney and Cook

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Beckett

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee, held on 29 October 2009, be approved and adopted.

2. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SCHEDULE**

[\(Report PDC381 refers\)](#)

The schedule of development control decisions arising from the consideration of the above Report is circulated separately and forms an appendix to the minutes.

By way of a personal statement, Councillor Bell explained that due to her involvement with the parish council and local residents, she had predetermined Item 1. Councillor Bell therefore withdrew from the Committee for that item and, having made representations during public participation as a Ward Councillor, sat in the public gallery during the subsequent discussion.

By way of a personal statement, Councillor Lipscomb advised that, although he had been in contact with several of the objectors and the applicant on Items 3 and 4 in relation to the use of the building, he was satisfied that he had not predetermined those items. Councillor Lipscomb therefore remained in the room during consideration of both items and spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Busher declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Item 2 as she was acquainted with an objector to the application. She spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Jeffs declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of Item 7 as he was a close associate of the main objector to the application. He therefore withdrew from the meeting room during consideration of the item and took no part in the debate or voting thereon.

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

Item 1: Post Office and Stores Compton News, Attwoods Drove, Compton – Case Number 09/01689/FUL

Mr Wilson and Mr Bell (representing Compton and Shawford Parish Council spoke against the application.

Councillor Bell (a Ward Member) also spoke against the proposals.

In summary, Councillor Bell referred to the loss of the stores as a facility to the local community, but recognised that this had occurred some time ago and pre dated her time as a local Councillor. Councillor Bell stated that the Parish Council and local residents generally supported the appropriate re-use of the site, and accepted that affordable housing with local nomination rights was probably the best solution.

However, Councillor Bell reported on the concerns of the local community about the Council's proposals to extend the property to produce four small one bed units. This would almost double the building's current size and include developing part of the garden area. Conversion to two more modest flats was likely to be more appropriate. The current proposals would have a lack of useable outside amenity space and would have a negative impact on quality of life of residents.

Councillor Bell referred to existing parking issues in Attwoods Drove and Martins Field. She referred to the density of properties at that location and that many did not have frontages to the road, nor driveways, which further exacerbated problems. She also reported on problems of the parking situation impacting on bus services accessing that part of the village. Councillor Bell then drew attention to the inadequacy of the allocation of four parking spaces to the front of the building, which assumed that new residents would have only one car and that visitors would have to park on-street, in an already congested area.

In conclusion, Councillor Bell stated that for the proposals to genuinely benefit the local community, the application should be revised to include more appropriate living space and a design that would not further exacerbate the parking problems in the area.

In response, the Head of Planning Management stated that the officer's Report addressed the concerns that Councillor Bell had raised.

The Head of Planning Management also explained that, subsequent to the publication of the Report, consultation responses from the Council's Conservation and Landscape officers had been received. They were placed on the case file, but in summary, the Conservation Officer had raised no objection to the application and the Landscape Officer had requested further amended plans, to secure necessary changes to indicate shared outside amenity space. An amended condition was therefore recommended to this effect. This was noted by the Committee.

A Member also suggested that any subsequent planning consent should be supported by an informative, limiting the operating hours of construction workers to appropriate times. This was agreed by the Committee.

Further to questions, the Head of Planning Management clarified that, although the trees at the boundary to the garden were likely to require some substantial pruning, the Council's Arboricultural Officer had raised no concerns. Therefore the works would not have a negative impact on their health. He also reminded the meeting that the site was not located in the Compton Conservation Area and that he was satisfied that the proposed changes to the building and its design would not have a negative impact on its character or appearance. The Head of Access and Infrastructure highlighted the parking standards to be achieved and advised that the building's previous use, as a shop, probably generated more traffic than would the proposed redevelopment into flats.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed that the development as proposed would result in an overdevelopment of the site, due to limited parking and the outside amenity areas available to residents. Members also considered that it was likely to have an adverse impact on the character of the area, including not making a positive contribution to the adjacent Conservation Area. The application would therefore be contrary to Policy DP3 (ii), (vii) and (viii) of the Winchester District Local Plan.

The Committee therefore did not support the recommendation set out in the Report and instead agreed to refuse planning permission, with authority being delegated to the Head of Planning Management (in consultation with the Chairman) to agree the detailed wording of the reasons for refusal as decided by the Committee and summarised above.

Item 2: 15 Folly Field, Bishops Waltham – Case Number 09/01809/FUL

Ms Watts and Ms Edge (representing Bishops Waltham Parish Council) spoke against the application.

The Head of Planning Management advised that, since publication of the Report, an objector from Eastways had submitted an additional representation objecting to the application, which was held on the case file. In summary, they had raised concerns about the loss of amenity and privacy, and queried

accuracy of the plans with reference to the impact of the development on their property. They were also concerned about overdevelopment, highway safety and traffic issues and that the recommendations of consultees should be met in full.

Following discussion, the Committee agreed that the application should be determined by a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee, to be held on Tuesday 8 December 2009. This was because Members did not consider it possible to determine the application without first visiting the site to assess potential impact of the close proximity of the development to neighbouring properties in Eastways and at Follyfield.

Item 3: Egg Day Nursery, Stockbridge Road, Sutton Scotney, Winchester – Case Number 09/01754/FUL

Mr Mieczkowski spoke against the proposals and Mr Wright (agent for the applicant) spoke in support.

The Head of Planning Management suggested that conditions be amended to provide greater control over the materials used in the proposed repairs. Therefore, Condition 4 should continue to read "...and that these details be agreed by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of that part of the development and retained thereafter." This proposal was supported.

The Head of Planning Management made reference to Item 4 below, which sought to replace the areas of the building that were proposed to be repaired, as detailed as part of this application. The Committee's attention was also drawn to concerns raised during public representation on this item, that referred to the change of use of the building (which had not required planning permission). Therefore, Members were advised that, those concerns were not material considerations to the planning applications at Item 3 and 4.

During discussion, it was agreed that an additional Condition be added (with exact wording to be delegated to the Head of Planning Management, in consultation with the Chairman) to require the applicant to provide details of a cross section through the building, to demonstrate how access and egress would be achieved via the new doorways. The Committee was mindful that the change in levels through the site was likely to require additional structural work, to allow that to be easily achieved.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission for the reasons (and subject to the conditions) set out in the Report and referred to above.

Item 4: Egg Day Nursery, Stockbridge Road, Sutton Scotney, Winchester – Case Number 09/01829/FUL

Mr Mieczkowski spoke against the proposals and Mr Wright (agent for the applicant) spoke in support.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the Report.

Item 5: Sir John Moore Barracks, Andover Road, Winchester – Case Number 09/000468/FUL

Mr Elsmore (representing Littleton and Harestock Parish Council) spoke against the application.

Councillor Learney (a Ward Member) also addressed the Committee with regard to the proposals.

In summary, Councillor Learney was concerned that there had been no consultation by the Ministry of Defence (MOD) with local residents on the siting of the training equipment. She also advised that the owners of Flowerdown Mobile Home Park had made representation against the application; therefore, many of its residents had chosen not to submit individual representations. She referred to the main source of complaints of local residents, being shouting (including swearing) and the noise of the zip wire. She suggested that the use of the equipment should be further limited to not include weekends and bank holidays. Councillor Learney also drew attention to the importance of the trees at the boundaries of the site in offering screening. Therefore, responsibility for their maintenance should be clarified to protect the amenity of residents.

In response to Councillor Learney's representation, the Head of Planning Management stated that an apparent lack of consultation by the application with residents was not a material consideration.

The Head of Planning Management referred to Condition 1 in the Report and suggested that this be deleted, as it was not relevant because the application was for the retrospective siting of the equipment. Furthermore, Condition 3 should be amended to include reference to the zip wire, in addition to the high ropes course. This was supported by Members. The Committee did not support a proposal to include a condition to prevent use of the equipment at weekends and bank holidays.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission for the reasons (and subject to the conditions) set out in the Report with amendments referred to above.

Item 6: Lone Farm, Northington Road, Itchen Abbas – Case Number 09/01306/FUL

Mr Hecks (agent) and Mr Leeming (applicant) spoke in support.

The Head of Planning Management advised the meeting that, since publication of the Report, the Council's Conservation Officer had submitted further representation on the proposals. In summary, the Conservation Officer had advised that whilst some of the individual elements of the proposal had appeared acceptable, there were a large number of design elements within the

scheme which were detrimental to the character and appearance of the barns. Cumulatively, officers had considered that they would make for a considerable loss of character and contribute considerable harm to the appearance of the building. In addition, the works proposed would require considerable re-build, new build, alteration and additional works which had not been detailed in the plans submitted, thus outweighing the benefits of the “conversion” element within the countryside, where new build of residential units was severely restricted.

As a consequence, amended reasons for refusal were proposed as follows:

1. The proposal, by virtue of the additional openings in the existing fabric, extent of new build and alteration including subdivision of internal space and lowering of floor levels, creates a scheme which is detrimental to the agricultural and historic characteristics of the building and is therefore contrary to the requirements of policies CE 17, CE24 and HE17 of the WDLPR 2006

Following discussion, the Committee agreed that the application should be determined by a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee, to be held on Tuesday 8 December 2009. This was because Members did not consider it possible to determine the application without first visiting the site to assess the advice of the Conservation Officer as referred to above and also to make comparisons of the existing structures to the proposals under consideration.

Item 7: 16 Witton Hill, Alresford – Case Number 09/01306/FUL

Mr Mansfield (representing New Alresford Town Council) commented on the application and Mr Atkins and Councillor Cook (a Ward Member) spoke in support of the proposals.

In summary, Councillor Cook drew attention to the application being the same as for two previous applications, which had been granted planning permission in 1997 and 2004, but the consent had recently expired. New Alresford Town Council had not objected to the proposals at that time and therefore he questioned why it had requested that the matter now be determined by this Committee.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission for the reasons (and subject to the conditions) set out in the Report, with an additional Informative regarding construction working hours.

Item 8: 43 Brassey Road, Winchester – Case Number 09/01618/FUL

Mr McCarthy and Ms Dadam spoke against the application and Mr Dryden-Brownlee (agent) spoke in support.

During discussion, the Committee raised particular concerns about loss of light to neighbouring properties at 41a and 45 Brassey Road. In particular, Members referred to submissions made by the occupiers of 41a that had

provided technical justification to assume up to 90 per cent loss of light to the kitchen and living areas of that property. Whilst the Head of Planning Management advised that the likely loss of light had not been assessed as being materially excessive, the Committee was concerned that the impact of the proposed extension would have a significant adverse impact on neighbouring properties.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee considered that the proposals would have an adverse impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties and so was contrary to Policy DP43 (vii) of the Winchester District Local Plan.

The Committee therefore did not support the recommendation set out in the report and instead agreed to refuse planning permission, with authority being delegated to the Head of Planning Management (in consultation with the Chairman) to agree the detailed wording of the reasons for refusal as decided by the Committee and summarised 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 (Post Office and Stores, Attwoods Drove, Compton) the application be refused, with authority being delegated to the Head of Planning Management (in consultation with the Chairman) to agree the detailed wording of the reasons for refusal as decided by the Committee and summarised above.

3. That, in respect of Item 2 (15 Folly Field, Bishops Waltham) this application be determined by a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee, to be held on Tuesday 8 December 2009.

4. That, in respect of Item 3, planning permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Report, and re-wording of Condition 4 so to continue to read "...and that these details be agreed by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of that part of the development and retained thereafter." An additional Condition be also included to require the applicant to provide details of a cross section through the building to demonstrate how access and egress would be achieved via the new doorways, with exact wording delegated to the Head of Planning Management in consultation with the Chairman.

5. That, in respect of Item 5, planning permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Report (Condition 1 be deleted) and re-wording of Condition 3 to include the zip wire, in addition to the high ropes course.

6. That, in respect of Item 6 (Lone Farm, Northington Road, Itchen Abbas) this application be determined by a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee, to be held on Tuesday 8 December 2009.

7. That, in respect of Item 8 (43 Brassey Road, Winchester) the application be refused, with authority being delegated to the Head of Planning Management (in consultation with the Chairman) to agree the detailed wording of the reasons for refusal as decided by the Committee and summarised above.

3. **MINUTES OF PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB COMMITTEE HELD 2 NOVEMBER 2009**
[\(Report PDC832 Refers\)](#)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee, held 2 November 2009, which determined an application at 37 Willis Way / Meadowsweet, King Worthy (attached as Appendix A to the minutes)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee, held 2 November 2009, be approved.

4. **PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS 1 APRIL 2009 – 30 SEPTEMBER 2009**
[\(Report PDC830 Refers\)](#)

RESOLVED:

That the Report be noted.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned for lunch at 1.20pm, reconvened at 2.15pm and concluded at 4.20pm

Chairman

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE : DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MEETING

DECISIONS

19.11.2009

PART II DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS
AND DECISIONS THEREON

Compton And Shawford

Ward

Compton And Otterbourne

- 1 **Conservation Area:** Compton Street
Case No: 09/01689/FUL
Ref No: W21561
Date Valid: 27 August 2009
Grid Ref: 446500 125855
Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Nick Parker
Applicant: Mr B Bottriel
Proposal: Extension and conversion of existing building into 4 No. flats
Location: Post Office And Stores, Compton News, Attwoods Drove,
Compton, Winchester, Hampshire, SO21 2AX
Officer PER
Recommendation

Committee Decision:

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

Conditions/Reasons

- 1 Development as proposed would result in an overdevelopment of the site due to the limited parking and amenity areas available and the likely adverse impact on the character of the area contrary to the provisions of policy DP.3 ii, vii, viii of the Winchester District Local Plan Review.
- 2 Having regard to the juxtaposition of the site to the conservation area the design of the proposed conversion and extension would not be of a quality appropriate to the character of the area and would be contrary to policy HE 4 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review.
- 3 The proposal is contrary to policy RT4 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that it fails to make adequate provision for public recreational open space to the required standard, and would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the area and would undermine the policy's objectives for recreational open space provision within the District.

Bishops Waltham

Ward

Bishops Waltham

- 2** **Conservation Area:** Bishops Waltham - Extended October 1985, Boundary amendments March 2000 Published November 2001
Case No: 09/01809/FUL
Ref No: W21574
Date Valid: 8 September 2009
Grid Ref: 455548 117282
Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Mr James Jenkison
Applicant: Swathling Housing Society
Proposal: (AMENDED PLANS) Erection of 2 no. three bed dwellings with new access and parking in land adjacent to 15 Follyfield
Location: 15 Follyfield, Bishops Waltham, Southampton, Hampshire, SO32 1EB
Officer PER
Recommendation

Committee Decision:

DEFERRED for consideration by Planning Viewing Sub Committee

Wonston

Ward

Wonston And Micheldever

- 3 Conservation Area:** Sutton Scotney
Case No: 09/01754/FUL
Ref No: W21375
Date Valid: 28 August 2009
Grid Ref: 446257 139533
Team: EAST **Case Officer:** Mrs Julie Pinnock
Applicant: Mr & Mrs White
Proposal: The repair and replacement (where deemed necessary) of existing windows and doors, introduction of 7 no. conservation roof-lights, and the replacement extension to rear (Part Retrospective)
Location: Egg Day Nursery, Stockbridge Road, Sutton Scotney, Winchester, Hampshire, SO21 3JW
Officer: PER
Recommendation

Committee Decision:

APPROVE SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

Permitted as set out in report with the following amendment to condition 4, and an additional condition requiring details of a cross section through the site to explain levels from the new side access doors to the outside space, including any steps, ramps, retaining walls and handrails as appropriate.

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 single storey rear extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

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

3 No development shall take place until details of the final design of the rooflights has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The rooflights shall be conservation type rooflights which sit flush or below the roof

covering. The insertion of the rooflights shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.

Reason: To ensure that the external visual character of the building is retained for the benefit of the character of the Conservation Area.

4 The repair of the existing windows, and replacements, where required, shall be carried out using single glazing, which includes coloured marginal panes to replicate those on the existing windows and that those details be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is commenced, such details shall be implemented as approved before the use commences and thereafter retained.

Reason: To ensure that the external visual character of the building is retained for the benefit of the character of the Conservation Area.

5 Prior to the commencement of development, drawings and details showing cross sections through the building to demonstrate the relationship from the internal floor level, to the outside garden space, and details of any steps, ramps, retaining walls and handrails as appropriate shall be submitted to and approved in writing. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.

Reason: To ensure that the external visual character of the building is retained, for the benefit of the character of the Conservation Area.

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: BE6
Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: HE.5

Wonston

Ward

Wonston And Micheldever

- 4 Conservation Area:** Sutton Scotney
Case No: 09/01829/FUL
Ref No: W21375/01
Date Valid: 10 September 2009
Grid Ref: 446257 139533
Team: EAST **Case Officer:** Mrs Julie Pinnock
Applicant: Mr & Mrs White
Proposal: Replacement of existing windows and doors with identical windows and doors; timber framed single glazed units, 7no. conservation roof lights. Replacement of an existing shed structure to the rear of the existing building.
Location: Egg Day Nursery, Stockbridge Road, Sutton Scotney, Winchester, Hampshire, SO21 3JW
Officer Recommendation: REF

Committee Decision:

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

Conditions/Reasons

1 The proposal is contrary to policy HE.5 of Winchester District Local Plan in that the replacement of all windows has not been justified. In accordance with the principles of conservation of historic buildings, those windows that can be repaired should be retained rather than replaced in the interest of the conservation of this important historic building within the Sutton Scotney Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore affect the historic integrity of this former Victorian Methodist church to the detriment of the conservation area.

Informatives

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: BE6
Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: HE.5

Littleton And Harestock

Ward

Littleton And Harestock

5 Conservation

Area:

Case No: 09/00468/FUL

Ref No: W06226/02

Date Valid: 17 June 2009

Grid Ref: 446323 132479

Team: EAST

Case Officer: Mr Andrew Rushmer

Applicant: Andy Kirby

Proposal: Erection of high ropes course (Retrospective) (Amended Description).

Location: Sir John Moore Barracks, Andover Road, North Winchester, Hampshire, SO22 6NQ

Officer PER

Recommendation

Committee Decision:

APPROVE SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

Permitted as set out in report; subject to the omission of condition 1 and amendment to condition 3.

1 The equipment hereby permitted shall only be used between the hours of 8:00 - 18:00 (Monday to Sunday).

Reason: In the interests of the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, as required by policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

2 The high rope course and zip wire which forms the subject of this application shall not be used for more that 50 days in any calendar year, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposal does not have a significant detrimental impact on neighbouring properties, as required by policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 and Planning Policy Guidance Note 24.

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:-

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP3
Planning Policy Statement 24

Itchen Valley

Ward

Itchen Valley

6

Conservation

Area:

Case No: 09/01306/FUL

Ref No: W20376/04

Date Valid: 17 July 2009

Grid Ref: 453349 134171

Team: EAST

Case Officer: Mrs Jane Rarok

Applicant: Mr David Leeming

Proposal: Demolition of agricultural buildings and conversion of barn to 1 no. 3 bed live/work unit including landscaping and associated works

Location: Lone Farm, Northington Road, Itchen Abbas, Hampshire

Officer REF

Recommendation

Committee Decision:

Application DEFERRED FOR CONSIDERATION by Planning Viewing Sub Committee

New Alresford

Ward

The Alresfords

7

Conservation

Area:

Case No: 09/01636/FUL

Ref No: W09331/03

Date Valid: 28 August 2009

Grid Ref: 458492 131882

Team: EAST

Case Officer: Mr Andrew Rushmer

Applicant: Mrs B CHAMBERLAIN

Proposal: Two storey attached dwelling on land to west of number 16
Witton Hill

Location: 16 Witton Hill, Alresford, Hampshire, SO24 9PT

Officer PER

Recommendation

Committee Decision:

APPROVE SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

Permitted as set out in report with the addition on informative relating to construction hours:

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 A detailed scheme for landscaping, tree and/or shrub planting 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.

3 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 a satisfactory relationship between the new development and adjacent buildings, amenity areas and trees.

4 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.

5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 as amended by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2008 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Classes A,B,C,D,E of Part 1 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 The garage and parking space hereby approved shall not be used for any other purpose than the parking of cars.

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

7 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.

8 No new first floor windows shall be inserted in the side elevations of the new dwelling hereby permitted without the written consent of the local planning authority.

Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings, in accordance with the requirements of policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

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:-

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006:
South East Plan 2009:

3. All building works including demolition, construction and machinery or plant operation should only be carried out between the hours of 0800 and 1800 hrs Monday to Friday and 0800 and 1300 hrs Saturday and at no time on Sundays or recognised public holidays. Where allegations of noise from such works are substantiated by the Environmental Protection Team, a Notice limiting the hours of operation under The Control of Pollution Act 1974 may be served.

Winchester Town

Ward

St Paul

8 Conservation

Area:

Case No: 09/01618/FUL

Ref No: W21541

Date Valid: 10 August 2009

Grid Ref: 447737 130351

Team: EAST

Case Officer: Ms Anna Rolls

Applicant: Mr M Dryden-Brownlee

Proposal: Alterations and first floor rear extension

Location: 43 Brassey Road, Winchester, Hampshire, SO22 6SB

Officer PER

Recommendation

:

Committee Decision:

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

Conditions/Reasons

1 The proposed first floor rear extension would adversely impact on the amenity on the occupiers of the neighbouring properties 41a and 45 Brassey Road contrary to the provisions of policy DP3 vii of the Winchester District Local Plan Review.
