

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

22 April 2010

Attendance:

Councillors:

Jefferies (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:

Councillor Thompson

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee, held on 1 April 2010, be approved and adopted.

2. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SCHEDULE**

[\(Report PDC852 refers\)](#)

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

Councillor Lipscomb declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Item 3, as he was a member of the Council of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on the application. However, he had taken no part in the Trust's consideration of the item and therefore he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillors Lipscomb and Jefferies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Items 6, 7 and 8 as they both knew the applicant as a casual acquaintance through their political party. They both spoke and voted thereon.

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

Item 1: 16 Fox Lane, Winchester – Case Number 09/02556/FUL

Mr Glasgow and Councillor Thompson (a Ward Member) spoke against the application and Mr Andrews spoke in support.

In summary, Councillor Thompson stated that the amendments detailed in the current application (relating to the roof profile and tiles) were relatively minor. Therefore the reasons the Committee refused the previous application in 2008 were still valid. She considered the application to be over development and out of character with the surrounding area. The density of the neighbouring area was 18 dwellings per hectare, whereas the application site proposed 54 dwellings per hectare. She suggested that the application proposed the needless demolition of good homes and their replacements would not assist those on the housing waiting list. The application would also not redress the car parking problems in the area (a consequence of the increasing number of houses of multiple occupation). Councillor Thompson also stated that she considered the design of the proposals, through its proposed use of timber cladding and grey windows, to be out of character and if it were granted permission, could lead to a precedent of corner-infill development in Stanmore.

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 18 May 2010. This was because Members did not consider it possible to determine the application without first visiting the site to assess its impact in the context of the adjacent dwellings.

Item 2: Stillwaters House, Avington Lane, Avington – Case Number 09/01626/FUL

The Head of Planning Management advised that, since publication of the Report, the occupant of Avington Park House had requested an additional condition be imposed on any future consent in order to safeguard the pipe linked to the old turbine associated with Avington Park House. The Head of Planning Management also reported that the Environment Agency had reaffirmed that their granting of an abstraction licence would have a beneficial effect on the river, as it would guarantee a minimum flow to the lake and waterfall. They had also reiterated that the lake required dredging.

Mr Hiscock raised concerns regarding the application (on behalf of occupants of Avington Park House) and Mr West (applicant) spoke in support.

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, subject to an amendment to Condition 4. The Committee had been concerned about the flow-rate of water to the grounds of Avington Park House and therefore agreed to include the words “in consultation with the Environment Agency” as part of Condition 4.

Item 3: 74 Woodfield Drive, Winchester – Case Number 09/02576/FUL

The Head of Planning Management advised that, following the publication of the Report, further representations had been received with similar comments to those already summarised in the Report. One letter was received in support and two were received in objection to the application.

Mr Reed (a neighbour) spoke against the application and Mr Golding (one of the applicants) spoke in support.

During discussion, the Committee raised concerns regarding the effect of the proposed long and low side extension along the boundary on the neighbouring property; the potential for light nuisance on the neighbour from the extension's roof lights and the impact of the proposed porch on the streetscene.

Therefore, at the conclusion of debate, the Committee 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. In summary, these were that the Committee agreed that the application did not respond positively to, and was out of character with the area; that the porch had a detrimental impact on the street scene and that the extension had a detrimental impact on the occupiers of the neighbouring property (74 Woodfield Drive) in respect of a loss of outlook and light from the roof lights of the proposed extension.

Item 4: The Black Barn, Floud Lane, West Meon, Petersfield – Case Number 09/02614/FUL

Mr Cowell (a neighbour) spoke against the application.

Councillor Lipscomb requested that his regret that the South Downs Joint Consultative Committee had not been consulted on this application be minuted.

During debate, the Committee raised concerns regarding the scale of the proposal, its relationship to the main building and the likelihood that it would have the undesirable effect of in-filling the gap between the Black Barn and the neighbouring property.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee 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. In summary, these related to the detrimental impact the proposal had on the character and appearance of the conservation area in terms of scale and design; loss of outlook to ground floor side window of the neighbouring property and, with reference to Policy HE.5 of the Winchester District Local Plan, that the proposed extension would not be subordinate to the character and scale of the main building.

Item 6: Black Farm, Avington – Case Number 09/02289/LIS

Mr Gottlieb (one of the applicants) spoke in support of the application.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee did not support the recommendation set out in the Report and instead agreed to grant planning permission, with authority being delegated to the Head of Planning Management (in consultation with the Chairman) to agree suitable conditions. This was because the Committee did not concur with the Historic Environment Manager's view that the proposed replacement windows would detract from the architectural and historic interest of the building. In arriving at this conclusion, the Committee considered that replacement glass would not be to the detriment of any historic fabric; only to the windows that had been inserted into the front elevation in the 1950s. The Committee noted that as the building was Grade II* Listed and as they had agreed to grant permission, the application would be referred to GOSE to determine whether they wished to call the application in.

Item 7: Black Farm, Avington – Case Number 09/02290/LIS

The Head of Planning Management explained that, subsequent to the publication of the Report, the applicant had withdrawn this application.

Item 7: Black Farm, Avington – Case Number 09/02291/LIS

Mr Gottlieb (one of the applicants) spoke in support of the application.

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

The following item had no public participation.

Item 5: Pitcot House, Pitcot Lane, Owslebury – Case Number 10/00395/FUL

The Head of Planning Management explained that, subsequent to the publication of the Report, a further representation had been received from Owslebury Parish Council which raised concerns that all the construction should be undertaken on the site only; further landscaping was required to screen the development and concerns regarding its proximity to the boundary and fire regulations.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission for the reasons set out in the Report.

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 (16 Fox Lane, Winchester) the application be determined by a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee, to be held on Tuesday 18 May 2010. This was because Members did not consider it possible to determine the application without first visiting the site to assess the impact of the application in the context of the character of the area.

3. That, in respect of Item 3 (74 Woodfield Drive, Winchester) planning permission 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. In summary, these were that the Committee agreed that the application did not respond positively to, and was out of character with the area, the porch had a detrimental impact on the street scene and that the proposal had a detrimental impact on the occupiers of the neighbouring property (74 Woodfield Drive) in respect of a loss of outlook and light from the roof lights of the proposed extension.

4. That, in respect of Item 4 (The Black Barn, Floud Lane, West Meon, Petersfield) planning permission 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. In summary, these related to the detrimental impact the proposal had on the character and appearance of the conservation area in terms of scale and design; loss of outlook to ground floor side window of the neighbouring property and, with reference to Policy HE.5 of the Winchester District Local Plan, that the proposed extension would not be subordinate to the character and scale of the main building.

5. That, in respect of Item 6 (Black Farm, Avington) planning permission be approved provided that GOSE do not call in the application for determination by the Secretary of State. If the application is not called in, authority is delegated to the Head of Planning Management (in consultation with the Chairman) to agree suitable conditions. This was because the Committee did not concur with the Historic Environment Team Manager's view that the proposed replacement windows would detract from the historic fabric of the building. In arriving at this conclusion, the Committee considered that replacement glass would not be to the detriment of any historic material; only to the windows that had been inserted into the front elevation in the 1950s. The Committee noted that as the building was Grade 2* Listed and as they had agreed to grant permission, the application would be

referred to GOSE to determine whether they wished to call the application in.

6. That in respect of Item 7 (Black Farm, Avington) the Committee note that the application was withdrawn by the applicant.

3. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (TPO) 1989 – LAND AT THE SMALL HOUSE, HIGH STREET, DROXFORD**
[\(Report PDC849 refers\)](#)

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to confirm the TPO for the reasons set out in the Report.

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 1989, be confirmed.

4. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (TPO) 1990 – LAND AT ST FRANCIS, 9B RANELAGH ROAD, WINCHESTER**
[\(Report PDC850 refers\)](#)

Mr Corstophine (a local resident) spoke in opposition to the proposal to confirm the TPO.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed not to confirm the TPO. The Committee agreed that the tree did not offer wider amenity value and would affect neighbouring properties due to proximity.

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 1990, be not confirmed.

5. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (TPO) 1994 – LAND AT NETTLEBED HOUSE, MILL LANE, DROXFORD**
[\(Report PDC851 refers\)](#)

Mrs F Hinks and Mrs J Melson spoke in opposition to the proposal to confirm the TPO.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to confirm the TPO for the reasons set out in the Report and noted that the owner could apply to works to be undertaken on the tree to make it safe, if considered necessary in future.

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 1994, be confirmed.

6. **VOTE OF THANKS**

As this was last meeting of the 2009/10 Municipal Year the Committee recorded its unanimous thanks to its Chairman, Councillor Jeffs, for his chairmanship and work throughout the year and Councillor Jeffs reciprocated accordingly.

7. **COUNCILLOR BUSER**

The Committee also passed on its best wishes to Councillor Buser as this was her last meeting as a Councillor, given that she was not standing in the forthcoming elections. Councillor Buser had served as Councillor for all but two of the previous 34 years, during which time she had been Mayor, Leader of Council and a long-time member and Chairman of this Committee. The Committee stood and applauded Councillor Buser in recognition of her outstanding contribution to public service, the City Council and her constituents at Bishops Waltham.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned for lunch between 1.00pm and 1.50pm and concluded at 4.20pm

Chairman

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE : DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MEETING

DECISIONS

22.04.2010

PART II DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS
AND DECISIONS THEREON

Winchester Town

Ward

St Luke

1 Conservation

Area:

Case No: 09/02556/FUL

Ref No: W21058/02

Date Valid: 16 December 2009

Grid Ref: 446393 128374

Team: EAST

Case Officer: Mr Nick Fisher

Applicant: Mr K Read

Proposal: Demolition of no.16 Fox Lane & no.1 Chatham Road and erection of 2 no. two bedroom houses, 2 no. two bedroom flats and 2 no. one bedroom flats in two storey building

Location: 16 Fox Lane, Winchester, Hampshire, SO22 4DY

Officer: PER

Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

DEFERRED for consideration by Planning Viewing Sub Committee - 18th May 2010.

Itchen Valley

Ward

Itchen Valley

- 2 Conservation** Avington Conservation Area
Area:
Case No: 09/01626/FUL
Ref No: W02331/08
Date Valid: 2 September 2009
Grid Ref: 453661 132518
Team: EAST **Case Officer:** Mr Andrew Rushmer
Applicant: Mr Robert West
Proposal: Installation of an Archimedean Screw hydroelectricity generation (additional information received 21/10/2009 giving more information concerning flow-rates and the ecological impact of the proposal).

Location: Stillwaters House, Avington Lane, Avington, Winchester, Hampshire, SO21 1DE
Officer PER
Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

APPROVE SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

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 An Arboricultural Method Statement, in accordance with BS5837:2005 shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, prior to any demolition, construction or groundwork commencing on the site. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to protect the trees on the site, as required by policy DP4 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

3 Details of a scheme for insulating the turbine house hereby approved against internally generated noise shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning authority before the commencement of development and completed before the use permitted commences. Such noise insulation shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To secure the reduction in the level of noise emanating from the building and to protect the amenities of the occupiers of nearby premises.

4 Prior to the commencement of development a detailed methodology to demonstrate how flow over the waterfall will be maintained in line with the existing flow regime, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In order to prevent a reduction in water supply necessary to sustain the ecological interest features of Avington Lake and Woods Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC).

5 Prior to the commencement of development, the finishing materials of the generator cover are to be agreed in writing with the local planning authority, and the development carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure that the character and appearance of the conservation area is maintained, in accordance with the requirements of policy HE5 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 and Planning Policy Guidance Note 15.

6 Immediately prior to commencement of the scheme an updated wolverole survey will be carried out, the results of which (along with a plan of any necessary mitigation) will be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority (including any necessary mitigation implemented).

Reason: In order to ensure that wolveroles are protected, in line with the requirements of Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

7 Prior to the commencement of development a working methods statement (based on measures described in the Revised Design and Access Statement page 30/31) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority, which will demonstrate how habitat damage, disturbance and pollution will be prevented during construction. The proposal shall be carried out in accordance with the approved working methods.

Reason: In order to ensure that the requirements of policy CE9 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006, Planning Policy Statement 9, the Conservation (Natural Habitats) Regulations 1994 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 are satisfied.

8 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.

9 The Archimedean Screw is to be buried into the ground in accordance with a scheme to be agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The development is to be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposal will not have an unacceptable impact on the visual appearance of the area, in accordance with the requirements of Planning Policy Statement 5.

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:-

South East Plan 2009:

NRM1, NRM2, NRM5, NRM10, NRM11, NRM15, NRM16

Winchester District Local Plan Review

DP1, DP3, DP4, CE5, CE9, CE10, CE11, HE4

National Planning Policy Guidance/Statements:

PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS 5 Planning and the historic environment

PPS 9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

PPS 22 Renewable Energy

PPG 24 Planning and Noise

PPG 25 Development and flood risk

3. In relation to condition 4:

This methodology will demonstrate that the current flow regime will be protected and maintained by matching the current flow regime in terms of both the total volume of water passing over the waterfall within each year, and in terms of the variability of flow in time throughout the year.

It should be noted that the flow data presented in Appendix 1 of the revised (October 2009) Design and Access Statement characterises flow over the waterfall only in

terms of the proportion of time within which a given flow rate is reached. It does not characterise how flow rates vary in time throughout the year. The condition requires that variability in flow rate in time throughout the year should be characterised in order that it too can be matched.

The condition is required to prevent the proposed development having a detrimental impact on the water supply to the wetland SINC habitats and features including Desmoulin's whorl snail which is listed as a BAP priority, species that the Environment Agency has a role in protecting.

The UK Biodiversity Action Plan 1994 (BAP) identifies certain species and habitats as being of 'principal' importance" for the conservation of biodiversity, also listed for England under s41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Action is now required to halt the acknowledged loss of biodiversity in the UK.

4. Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Southern Region Land Drainage and Sea Defence Byelaws, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank of the River Itchen, designated a 'main river'.

The Environment Agency will only issue of Flood Defence Consent for the works if it can be demonstrated that there will be no increase in flood risk. The Environment Agency also considers other issues such as the sustainability of the proposals and their impacts upon the bio-diversity of the area.

Full consultation will take place with the Environment Agency's bio-diversity team and Natural England as part of the application process. The requirement for Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency is separate and in addition to any planning requirements, but the applicant should be aware that any bio-diversity issues raised in response to the planning application will be relevant to the Flood Defence Consent application.

Please contact Rob Waite, in the Development & Flood Risk team on telephone number 01962 764897, for further information about submitting an application for Flood Defence Consent.

Winchester Town

Ward

St Luke

3 Conservation

Area:

Case No: 09/02576/FUL

Ref No: W21688

Date Valid: 4 January 2010

Grid Ref: 445681 128942

Team: EAST

Case Officer: Mr Andrew Rushmer

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Ian Golding

Proposal: (HOUSEHOLDER) Construction of a new single storey extension to rear and side and new porch to front

Location: 74 Woodfield Drive, Winchester, Hampshire, SO22 5PU

Officer: PER

Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

Recommendation overturned:

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

Conditions/Reasons

1 The development is contrary to policies DP.3(ii) and (vii) of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that:

- i) The proposed development does not respond positively to the character, appearance and variety of the local environment in terms of design, scale and layout;
- ii) The proposed porch has a detrimental impact on the character of the street scene as a result of an inappropriate form of development to this dwelling out of character with dwellings in Woodfield Drive;
- iii) The proposal has a detrimental impact to the amenities of the occupiers of 72 Woodfield Drive as a result of loss of outlook and light spill from the rooflights.

Informatives

1. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following Development Plan policies and proposals:-

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP3

South East Plan 2009: BE.1

West Meon

Ward

Upper Meon Valley

- 4 Conservation Area:** West Meon
Case No: 09/02614/FUL
Ref No: W21648
Date Valid: 16 December 2009
Grid Ref: 463939 124042
Team: EAST **Case Officer:** Beverley Morris
Applicant: Mr G Walker
Proposal: (Amended plans received 26 February 2010) Single storey side and rear extension; garage conversion, car port and decking to front
Location: The Black Barn, Floud Lane, West Meon, Petersfield, Hampshire, GU32 1JD
Officer Recommendation: PER

Committee Decision:

Recommendation overturned:

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

Conditions/Reasons

1 The development is contrary to policies DP.3 (ii) and policy HE.5 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that:

- i) The proposed development detracts from the character and appearance of the area designated a Conservation Area in terms of its scale and design.
- ii) The proposed development affects the amenities of the occupiers of Church Barn as a result of loss of outlook from the ground floor window to the side

Informatives

1. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following Development Plan policies and proposals:-

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP3, HE4, HE5.

South East Plan 2009: C2

Owslebury

Ward

Owslebury And Curdrige

5 Conservation

Area:

Case No: 10/00395/FUL

Ref No: W05585/06

Date Valid: 17 February 2010

Grid Ref: 451559 123415

Team: EAST **Case Officer:** Lorna Hutchings

Applicant: Mr J Pride

Proposal: (HOUSEHOLDER) Single storey side extension

Location: Pitcot House, Pitcot Lane, Owslebury, Winchester,
Hampshire, SO21 1LR

Officer: PER

Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

APPROVE SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

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 extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing garage building as specified in section 10 of the planning application form.

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:-

South East Plan 2009: C2, C4.

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP.3, DP.4, CE.5, CE.6, CE.23.

Itchen Valley

Ward

Itchen Valley

6 Conservation

Area:

Case No: 09/02289/LIS

Ref No: W13229/06LB

Date Valid: 6 November 2009

Grid Ref: 455089 132114

Team: EAST

Case Officer: Mr Andrew Rushmer

Applicant: Mr And Mrs Gottlieb

Proposal: Replacement of dormer and sash window single glazing with new slimlite double glazing

Location: Black Farm, Avington, Winchester, Hampshire, SO21 1DA

Officer REF

Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

Recommendation overturned:

APPROVE SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

REFEREALL TO GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH EAST (GOSE) TO DECIDE WHETHER THEY WISH TO CALL THE APPLICATION IN FOR FORMAL DETERMINATION.

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. Prior to the commencement of the works hereby permitted, specific details of the glazing to be used is to be agreed in writing by the local planning authority and the development carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure that the works do not harm the character of the listed building, as required by policy HE14 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 and Planning Policy Statement 5.

Informatives

1. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following Development Plan policies and proposals:-

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: HE.14
South East Plan 2009: BE.6

Itchen Valley **Ward** **Itchen Valley**

7 Conservation

Area:

Case No: 09/02290/LIS

Ref No: W13229/07LB

Date Valid: 6 November 2009

Grid Ref: 455089 132114

Team: EAST **Case Officer:** Mr Andrew Rushmer

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Gottlieb

Proposal: Proposed new dormer windows to north and south elevations

Location: Black Farm, Avington, Winchester, Hampshire, SO21 1DA

Officer REF

Recommendation:

WITHDRAWN

Itchen Valley **Ward** **Itchen Valley**

8 Conservation

Area:

Case No: 09/02291/LIS

Ref No: W13229/08LB

Date Valid: 6 November 2009

Grid Ref: 455089 132114

Team: EAST **Case Officer:** Mr Andrew Rushmer

Applicant: Mr _ Mrs Gottlieb

Proposal: Insertion of 3 conservation style roof lights in east roof slope (amended plans dated 27.11.2009 which slightly alter the position of the rooflights in order to suit the existing timber roof structure).

Location: Black Farm Avington, Winchester, Hampshire, SO21 1DA

Officer REF

Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

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

Conditions/Reasons

1 The proposal will adversely affect the architectural and historic character of this grade II* listed building. Therefore the proposal is contrary to the provisions of policy HE14 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006, policy BE6 of the South East Plan and Planning Policy Statement 5.

Informatives

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

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: HE14
South East Plan 2009: BE6
Planning Policy Statement 5

PDC 850 Conservation
Area:
Case No: TPO 1990
Ref No:
Date Valid:
Grid Ref:
Team: **Case Officer:** Thomas Gregory
Applicant:
Proposal:
Location: Land at St Francis, 9b Ranelagh Road, Winchester
Officer: Confirmation of Tree preservation order
Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

TPO 1990 **NOT** confirmed

PDC 851 Conservation
Area:
Case No: TPO 1994
Ref No:
Date Valid:
Grid Ref:
Team: **Case Officer:** Thomas Gregory
Applicant:
Proposal:
Location: Land at Nettlebed house, Mill Lane, Droxford
Officer: Confirmation of Tree preservation order
Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

TPO 1994 confirmed

PDC **Conservation**
849 **Area:**

Case No: TPO 1989

Ref No:

Date Valid:

Grid Ref:

Team:

Case Officer: Thomas Gregory

Applicant:

Proposal:

Location: Land at the Small House, High Street, Droxford

Officer Confirmation of Tree preservation order

Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

TPO 1989 confirmed
