

# **Planning Development Control Committee**

## **Update Sheet**

**20 June 2013**

**The information set out in this Update Sheet includes details relating to public speaking and any change in circumstances and/or additional information received after the agenda was published.**



Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
WCC 01	13/00023/FUL	Abbey Mill, Colebrook Street, Winchester	Permit

**Agenda Page: Page 5**

**Officer Presenting: Megan Osborn**

**Public Speaking**

**Objector:** Guy Ashton

**Parish Council representative:**

**Ward Councillor:** Cllr Tait and Cllr Mather and Cllr Saunders

**Portfolio Holder:**

**Supporter:** Martin Wiltshire and Rob Greacen and Kevin Warren

**Update**

Ecology - A further bat survey of Abbey Mill was undertaken in 12<sup>th</sup> June 2013. The report concluded that, where the small area of roofing tiles proposed to be removed from the roof in order to tie in the new proposed roof, there were a few gaps found between tiles, but no evidence was found of past use by bats. A few gaps were also noted around the edge of the flat roof, but on closer inspection they appeared to be filled with cobwebs. In summary, the presence of bat roosts in the area where the work is proposed is considered to be highly unlikely. A precautionary approach to the undertaking the proposals is advised. New roosting provision will be made in the replacement extension to enhance the value of the site for bats, this will be requested by the following conditions:

*10 Details of biodiversity enhancement, in the form of alternative bat roosting sites as highlighted in Bat Survey (2013) section 5.2, should be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before construction, and carried out in accordance with the approved details.*

*Reason: In order to provide adequate ecological mitigation.*

*11 Removal of the roof tiles, wood cladding, and soffits from the existing building shall be carried out by hand. If bats, or evidence of bat presence (e.g. droppings, bat carcasses or insect remains), are encountered at any point during this development, all work shall stop immediately and further advice sought from Natural England and/or a professional ecologist.*

*Reason: in the interest of nature conservation.*

Environmental Protection - A Noise Impact Assessment has been received since writing the report (ref. AS7490.130618.NIA). This provides information in relation to people noise inside and outside, whilst dining. The Environmental Protection officer is satisfied that this supports the initial stance that these noise impacts will be acceptable with an appropriate hours of use condition, already recommended (Condition 3). A further noise report will be required regarding plant noise, as per condition 04 in the report.

Recommend that condition 7 is amended to refer to 'external' lighting.

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
WCC 02	13/00024/LIS	Abbey Mill, Colebrook Street, Winchester	Permit
<b>Agenda Page: Page 16</b>			
<b>Officer Presenting: Megan Osborn</b>			
<b><u>Public Speaking</u></b>			
<b>Objector:</b> Guy Ashton			
<b>Parish Council representative:</b>			
<b>Ward Councillor:</b> Cllr Tait			
<b>Supporter:</b>			
<u>Update</u>			
No Update			

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
WCC 03	13/00759/AVC	Abbey Mill, Colebrook Street, Winchester	Permit
<b>Agenda Page: Page 23</b>			
<b>Officer Presenting: Megan Osborn</b>			
<b><u>Public Speaking</u></b>			
<b>Objector:</b> Guy Ashton			
<b>Parish Council representative:</b>			
<b>Ward Councillor:</b> Cllr Tait			
<b>Supporter:</b>			
<u>Update</u>			
Due to amended plans the proposed description of this application has been amended to read:			
'1 no. externally illuminated fascia sign and 2 no. non-illuminated fascia signs to be mounted on building'			

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
WCC 04	13/00768/LIS	Abbey Mill, Colebrook Street, Winchester	Permit

**Agenda Page: Page 29**

**Officer Presenting: Megan Osborn**

**Public Speaking**

**Objector:** Guy Ashton

**Parish Council representative:**

**Ward Councillor:** Cllr Tait

**Supporter:**

Update

Due to amended plans the proposed description of this application has been amended to read:

‘1 no. externally illuminated fascia sign and 2 no. non-illuminated fascia signs to be mounted on building’

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
WCC 05	12/02351/OUT	Ministry of Defence, Worthy Down Camp, Worthy Down, Winchester	Permit

**Agenda Page: Page 34**

**Officer Presenting: Lorna Hutchings**

**Public Speaking**

**Objector:**

**Parish Council representative:**

**Ward Councillor:**

**Supporter:** Jon Rose

Update

Amended conditions:

04. “SFA Housing shall comprise a mix of unit sizes up to 5 bedroom dwellings.”

Additional Informative:

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

## Winchester District Local Plan Review

DP.2, DP.3, DP.4, DP.5, DP.13, HE.1, HE.2, H.3, T.2, T.3, T.4

### Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy

DS1, MTRA1, MTRA4, MTRA5, CP2, CP3, CP4, CP7, CP8, CP10, CP11, CP12, CP13, CP14, CP15, CP16, CP17, CP20, CP21.

### Amended HOTs for S106

Omission of 7) “Commencement of footpath upgrade prior to the occupation of a number of SFA dwellings, to be agreed when a timeframe for legal matters and implementation are set out with HCC and WCC or any other measures to secure this as necessary.”

This is now considered unnecessary and very difficult to reasonably comply with. HCC have given further guidance and assurances in respect of the implementation of the South Wonston to Winchester footpath link and can explore first a permissive footpath and if this is not successful (i.e. landowners do not wish to designate), then can provide the upgrade under the Highways Act. A meeting with HCC RoW and Countryside Access Improvement team highlighted their commitment to this and is included in their strategy. It is not considered reasonable to prevent the development of key worker housing when the applicants would be reliant on a number of third parties and complex legal process for which a timeframe is difficult to establish and entirely out of their control.

### Updated Representation from South Wonston Parish Council received 12.06.2013

“Thank you for meeting Members of the Parish Council last week and many thanks also for your work in negotiating the contributions/improvements for South Wonston, along with Stuart Dunbar-Dempsey.

At a meeting of the Parish Council on Monday evening it was **resolved to approve a conditional withdrawal of the Parish Council’s objection** to the application for redevelopment of Worthy Down. We confirm this is conditional on the matters discussed and included in the initial letter below.

We note:

- A generous financial contribution to both sport and play facilities - £95580 play and £54420 sport in the order of £150k for sport and play are confirmed. We see the new pavilion project as a primary scheme and would request that funds are weighted for this.
- Assistance with the improvements to the public footpath from South Wonston to Worthy Down, and on to Winchester – in order to establish a cycleway. Cllr Wood was very keen on this at a recent Barton Farm Forum i.e. to potentially ‘link up’ the route to the Andover Road, close to the Wellhouse Lane/Harestock Road junction, the Barton Farm development then potentially providing an additional route on to Winchester.
- Contributions to improve the 86 bus service and possible discussion with Worthy Down camp re flexibility in the use of a camp minibus.
- We note that highway improvements have been discussed with HCC.

- We would like to reiterate that the bridleway east of Worthy Down camp is a much valued amenity for South Wonston, Worthy Down, Kings Worthy, and other walkers and cyclists and this is not overgrown. We have noted some apparent encroachment by the camp in one section and also the bridleway is next to the rifle range, which does pose problems. We have asked Lt Col Marc Lawson to ensure the red warning flag is erected when in use, and if possible a second flag displayed. We understand that less use of the range will take place in the coming years.
- We would also uphold the requirement for proper archaeological investigations.

Many thanks again.”

Designated sites within 5km

There is one statutory nature conservation site of international importance located within 5km of the site boundary. This is The River Itchen Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which is located 2.7km south-east of the Site boundary. The site is also designated as a SSSI, (albeit the extent of the SSSI exceeds that covered by the SAC designation). There is also one statutory nature conservation site of national value located within 5km of the Site boundary. The River Test SSSI is located 4.3km north of the site boundary. The locations of these sites and mitigation in respect of impact from demolition, construction the proposal (such as dust control and measures incorporated into the CEMP) and increased populations are dealt with in section 10 of the Environmental Impact Assessment. As are three non-statutory nature conservation sites (referred to within Hampshire as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation [SINCs]) within 1km of the site boundary. It is therefore not considered that the proposal will have a materially harmful impact of these areas and designations to the detriment of their nature conservation interests.

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
WCC 06	13/00317/ful	River View, Old Alresford, Alresford	Permit

**Agenda Page: Page 85**

**Officer Presenting: Richard Whittington**

**Public Speaking**

**Objector:**

**Parish Council representative:**

**Ward Councillor:** Cllr Cook

**Supporter:** Alex Webb (Agent) and Mrs Valler (Applicant)

Update

No Update

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
WCC 07	12/02344/FUL	Swanmore College of Technology, New Road, Swanmore, Southampton	Refuse

**Agenda Page: Page 94**

**Officer Presenting: Nick Parker**

**Public Speaking**

**Objector:** Rachel Pelly

**Parish Council representative:**

**Ward Councillor:**

**Supporter:** Robin Reay (Agent) and Cllr Huxstep (speaking as HCC Councillor)

**Update**

**Consultations**

Head of Housing – Objection.

*“This application is contrary to policy CP3 of the Winchester District Joint Core Strategy and also the Council’s Affordable Housing supplementary planning guidance. I am unable to support this planning application and I request that a reason for refusal regarding affordable housing is included as part of the recommendation to committee”.*

The specific concerns relate to:

- Under provision of affordable housing – propose that the 0.6% shortfall is made up through a financial contribution.
- Vast majority of affordable units are too small and fail to meet the Council's internal floor space requirements
- Unacceptable mix. Require 50% three bedroom family units (current level 35%).
- The three bedroom shared ownership properties may lead to affordability issues.
- Concerns with internal layouts – open plan living preventing provision of separate quiet spaces.
- Improved integration of the affordable units within the whole development would have been preferred.
- Garden sizes are on the small size (some two and three bed houses have garden sizes in the range of 35 sq.m – 60 sq.m approx) and are significantly smaller than those provided for the private houses.

*“If the planning committee should choose to approve the application I request that they do so subject to the following:-*

*The submission and approval of a section 106 agreement to secure the proposed affordable housing provision and to secure a financial contribution to ensure that the application meets the requirement to provide 40% affordable housing provision as required by policy CP3”.*



## Application mail

Summary of letter from Linden Homes received 17<sup>th</sup> July 2013 raising the following issues:

- Confirms the benefits arising from the proposed development which include the generation of a significant capital receipt payable directly to the college that would facilitate not only the playing pitch improvements but also refurbished classrooms and a new drama facility.
- Advise that the delivery of the improved playing field could be provided through an appropriately worded clause in the S106 Legal Agreement preventing the residential scheme from being implemented until such time as replacement facilities are available for use.
- States that since the Head of Strategic Planning response, the new Local Plan Part 1 (Joint Core Strategy) has been adopted. Policies MTRA 1 and 2 and policy DS1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development) apply and have not been addressed in the report.
- States that the District currently has a 5 year housing land shortfall. Evidence shows that this situation is unlikely to be resolved very soon. In accordance with the NPPF planning applications for new housing development in sustainable locations should be approved in these circumstances. This is another important material consideration in support of this proposal.
- Refers to the comments from the Council's Urban Designer. Confirms that a pedestrian access was originally considered to link to New Road from the area at Plots 44 and 45 but was omitted following advice from the college that it might lead to amenity issues for residents and/or drop off parking taking place. However, if officers are of the view that the permeability benefits outweigh the issues cited then a pedestrian link can be provided and conditioned.
- New hedge now provided to the south of plots 41 – 43 and shown on amended Landscape Strategy Plan ref. 712 – 0101 – rev G
- Clarify that it is not possible to provide a pedestrian link to the proposed playing fields as this would break the proposed acoustic barrier and that unfettered access has been identified by the college as a security risk which would be unacceptable to OFSTED.
- Further landscape drawing provided ref. A/05/103 representing an accurate assessment of how the proposed trees on site will appear when mature. In summary it is felt that the development is adequately landscaped and that these images clearly demonstrate that fact. "Forest scale" trees, particularly on the frontage seem both unnecessary and at odds with the established scale of planting in this location.
- Public Open Space accurately measured by the architect at 940 sq.m and not the 864 sq.m cited in the report. Whilst 185 sq.m below the requirement we would normally expect to address this by means of a financial contribution, especially given that 150 sq.m of the total requirement relates to allotments which one would clearly not provide on a site of this nature.
- Comments in respect of proximity of trees to proposed dwellings rejected and the acceptability of the scheme is demonstrated by the submitted images.

- The alleged shortfall of 14 visitor parking spaces is disputed and consider scheme provides 41 visitor spaces made up of on-street parking and parking within property curtilages. While ignoring the curtilage parking and parking in front of driveways, the result is 26 on-street visitor parking spaces and are not considered to interfere with other properties or the free flow of traffic to any significant degree.
- Lack of engagement with the District in relation to the Highway Contributions.
- Consistently fail to understand officer's views in respect of numbers and density. The proposed reduction from 75 to 71 represents 31 dph and other higher density schemes have been ruled out on viability grounds. Croton Way is very much "of its time" and no doubt met a need for a certain type of housing at that time and is a very low density by modern standards. Similarly, Springvale to the east met another need but did so at 28 dph and is more exposed and "edge of settlement" than our site. Given the site's location between the main body of the village and the substantial campus of Swanmore College I disagree that a density lower than 31 is essential in order to make the proposal acceptable.
- The scheme has broad public and community support and note that representations by members of the public in support of the proposal outweigh those objecting by more that two to one.
- By giving appropriate weight to the significant material considerations that exist in this case this application should have been recommended for approval.

**Clarification on the above points raised by the developer:**

**Benefits** - The benefits associated with the development are recognised and set out in the Committee Paper at page 109 – 110. The improvements to the refurbished classrooms and new drama facility at the college were not raised in support of the application until this late stage. Again the improvements are welcome but do not outweigh the objections to the proposed scheme.

**Replacement pitch delivery** - Following legal advice it is accepted that if Members were minded to approve this application then a suitably worded clause in the S106 would prevent the residential scheme from being implemented until such time when the replacement sports facilities are available for use. It should be noted, however, that Sport England previously confirmed that they would usually require that planning permission be in place for the replacement sports field before accepting a loss of facility and that a "Grampian" condition be used to link the two permissions.

**Housing supply** - The Head of Strategic Planning has confirmed that the District's 5 year housing supply (including 5% buffer) can be met and expects the land supply situation to improve further as the major developments at Waterlooville, Barton Farm etc. come on stream.

**Public Open Space** - Clarification on the amount of Public Open Space has been provided by the Head of Landscape and following a more accurate (CAD) calculation it is agreed that the overall area of POS within the site amounts to approximately 940 sqm which is in accordance with the applicant's calculation. This amount is still below the standard as set out in policy CP7 which requires a total of 1,125 sqm. However as

indicated on page 100 of the agenda 150 sqm of this total relates to allotment provision and it is agreed that it is reasonable for this to be provided off site as a financial contribution. This leaves the on-site POS provision 35 sqm short of the requirement and highlights the limited amount of space available for amenity purposes within the site. Members may take the view that this shortfall can be made up by an off-site financial contribution which could be secured through a S106. Notwithstanding these conclusions, reason for refusal 04 (lack of public recreational space) remains at this stage due to the unresolved S106 requirement.

**Landscaping** - The Head of Landscape maintains the view that the proposed landscaping is inadequate for a scheme of this nature in this semi-rural location.

*“The majority of the proposed tree planting within the streetscape on the Swanmore College site are shown at distances from buildings of between 3.5 and 5m. The minimum distance small tree species such as apple (Malus) and Pear (Pyrus) can be planted from buildings is approximately 5m. Larger more appropriate street trees require larger minimum distances from buildings of between 8-18m.*

*As the majority of the proposed tree planting within the streetscape are small tree species which would be dwarfed by the adjacent buildings, there would not be sufficient greening of the street-scene to add significantly to the visual amenity of the housing scheme.*

*Apart from the trees shown within the ‘Open Space’ and back gardens there are only another 5 proposed trees shown at 8m distances from buildings, which could accommodate more appropriate street trees.*

*Additionally, some of the proposed trees are shown within the front gardens of residential properties and would receive no protection and should therefore, not be relied upon to form part of the design strategy to ‘green’ the street scene”*

**Parking** - The Highway Engineer has assessed the additional detail that has been submitted and is still of the view that the proposed development does not provide an acceptable design for visitor parking in accordance with “Winchester City Council’s Residential Parking Standards” and the design guidance contained in “Manual for Streets”.

**S106 for Highway improvements** - Should Members be minded to approve the development then it is agreed that a S106 will be required to secure a financial contributions towards local highway improvement measures. Notwithstanding these conclusions reason for refusal 06 (inadequate provision of improvements to transport and highway network through financial contribution) remains valid at this stage due to the unresolved S106 requirement.

**Amended recommendation:**

As per report to include the following additional reason for refusal:

08 – The proposal is contrary to policy CP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy and also the Council’s Affordable Housing supplementary planning guidance, in that it fails to provide an adequate level and standard of affordable housing.

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
WCC 08	13/00212/FUL	Wickham Laboratories Ltd, Winchester Road, Wickham, Fareham	Permit

Agenda Page: Page 113

**Officer Presenting: James Jenkison**

**Public Speaking**

**Objector:** Simon Pack

**Parish Council representative:**

**Ward Councillor:** Cllr Clear

**Supporter:** Matthew Shellum

Update

The Head of Estates has confirmed that the final contribution figures (as set out in the report) are those that were agreed and the applicant has confirmed that a controlled pedestrian crossing at Buddens Road has not been costed into the proposal.

The applicant has also confirmed that controlling the use of the access from Tanfield Park can be controlled through a S.106 agreement so as to ensure that the gates will only be opened for emergency vehicles and situations and refuse collection.

The applicant has confirmed that the previous owner of Wickham laboratories continues to own 1 and 2 Lower Cottages and that the provision of the 2 carparking spaces shown are required as part of the purchase contract. Accordingly, and additional condition 25 is recommended;

*25 No units of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until a plan and particulars have been first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority detailing the provision of two carparking spaces to be permanently retained for use by the occupants of 1 and 2 Lower Cottages. The parking spaces shall be marked out and identified for use by the occupants of 1 and 2 Lower Cottages only and thereafter permanently retained for use by the occupants of 1 and 2 Lower Cottages.*

*Reason: To ensure adequate parking provision for 1 and 2 Lower Cottages that were formerly incorporated in the same ownership as the application site.*

The applicant has now provided amended plans revising the roof form above unit 24 (facing 5 Mosse Court) to a full hipped roof in line with concerns expressed by Councillors. Condition 24 has therefore been amended to read;

*24 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details as listed below, except for landscaping, boundary treatment and hard surfacing details, which shall be subject to conditions 4, 5, 10 and 11.*

<b>The Planning Bureau Limited</b>					
<b>Drg. No</b>	<b>Scale</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>Rev</b>	<b>Date</b>
A01-1826-00	1:1250	A1	Site location plan	-	Nov 2012
A01-1826-01	1:200	A1	Site plan	B	15.04.2013
A01-1826-02	1:100	A1	Ground floor plan	A	24.04.2013
A01-1826-03	1:100	A1	First floor plan	A	24.04.2013
A01-1826-04	1:100	A1	Second floor plan	C	18.6..2013
A01-1826-05	1:100	A1	Roof Plan	C	18.6.2013
A01-1826-06	1:20	A1	North East Elevation & North East Sectional Elevation	A	April 2013
A01-1826-07	1:100	A1	South East Elevation & North East Sectional Elevation	A	April 2013
A01-1826-08	1:200	A1	South West Elevation & North West Elevation	B	June 2013
A01-1826-09	1:500	A1	South West sectional elevation	A	April 2013
<b>Paul Basham Associates</b>					
034.0026.100	1:1250	A1	Traffic Calming Scheme	P5	21.01.13
<b>New Leaf Studio</b>					
MCS463 DRG01	1:1000	A1	Indicative Landscape Proposals	D	15.04.2013

24 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to the scope of this planning permission and the permitted plans and to ensure a high quality development.

Condition 7 has been modified for clarity:

07 Prior to work commencing on the site, details of the condition of the existing brick boundary walls (and details for their strengthening where necessary) and details of their protection during the construction process shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

07 Reason: To ensure the protection he brick walls which make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area.

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
WCC 09	13/00439/FUL	33 Drayton Street, Winchester,	Refused

**Agenda Page: Page 133**

**Officer Presenting: Megan Osborn**

**Public Speaking**

**Objector:**

**Parish Council representative:**

**Ward Councillor:** Cllr Scott and Cllr Tait (on behalf of Cllr Green)

**Supporter:** Amanda Chard

Update

No Update

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
WCC 10	13/00525/FUL	Daisy Nook, South Drive, Littleton, Winchester	Permit

**Agenda Page: Page 142**

**Officer Presenting: Jill Lee**

**Public Speaking**

**Objector:** Sheila Showan

**Parish Council representative:**

**Ward Councillor:**

**Supporter:** Paul Garry (Applicant)

Update

Condition 6 wording amended.

Prior to any works of commencement the applicant shall submit and have approved in writing by the local planning authority a statement outlining the proposed sustainable design and construction to comply with policy CP11 of the Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy. The statement should include the measures required to achieve a minimum Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) for Housing Level 4 for Water and Level 5 for Energy, except where it can be demonstrated that this is not practical or feasible. In the event that the code levels cannot be met, the development should then follow the specified hierarchical approach in CP11 to achieve the carbon reductions set out in the policy. Development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a sustainable form of development consistent with the objectives of The National Planning Policy Framework 2012, the policies of the South East Plan and to accord with the requirements of Policy CP11 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 (Joint Core Strategy).

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
WCC 11	13/00890/FUL	Lansker House, Lovedon Lane, Kings Worthy	Permit

**Agenda Page:** Page 151

**Officer Presenting:** Andrea Swain

**Public Speaking**

**Objector:**

**Parish Council representative:**

**Ward Councillor:**

**Supporter:** Alex Webb (Agent)

**Update**

Planning Condition Number 2 should read as follows:

2 The short term tourist accommodation hereby permitted shall be used for holiday accommodation only which shall be limited to one or two occupier(s) occupying a room for a maximum period of 4 weeks and for no more than 3 times per year, with a break between each occupation, by the same occupier(s), of 4 weeks. A register of the names of the occupier(s) of the accommodation and their arrival and departure dates shall be kept by the applicant and shall be produced to the Local Planning Authority upon reasonable notice. At no time shall a separate dwelling unit or private residential occupation be established.

2 Reason: The site is in an area where new dwellings are not normally permitted except where there is an overriding need in the interests of agriculture or forestry.

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
SDNP/01	SDNP/13/01006/HOUS	The Garden House, Brandy Mount, Cheriton, Alresford	Permit
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agenda Page: Page 157</b></p> <p><b>Officer Presenting: Beverley Morris</b></p> <p><b><u>Public Speaking</u></b></p> <p><b>Objector:</b></p> <p><b>Parish Council representative:</b></p> <p><b>Ward Councillor:</b></p> <p><b>Supporter:</b></p> <p><u>Update</u></p> <p>No Update</p>			

**End of Updates**