

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**23 July 2015**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Ruffell (Chairman) (P)

Dibden (P)  
Evans  
Izard (P)  
Jeffs (P)

Johnston (P)  
McLean (P)  
Scott (P)  
Tait (P)(for Items 2-10)

Deputy Members:

Councillor Newman-McKie (Standing Deputy for Councillor Evans)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Godfrey (Leader), Bodtger, Laming, Mather and Wright

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Read (Portfolio Holder for Built Environment) and Twelftree

---

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 25 June 2015 be approved and adopted.

2. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS SCHEDULE**  
(Report PDC1030 and Update Sheet refers)

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

The Committee agreed to receive the Update Sheet as an addendum to Report PDC1030. The Update Sheet contained additional representations submitted by members of the public.

By way of personal statement, Councillor Tait declared that he had pre-determined his decision in respect of item 1 (Wellington House, 77 Kingsgate Street, Winchester). He spoke on this item under public participation as a Ward Member, sitting apart from the Committee and taking no part in the vote thereon.

Councillor Dibden declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Item 6 as she was a trustee of Council Protection of Rural England (CPRE) Hampshire which had objected to the application. However, she had taken no part in the consideration of this item and she spoke and voted thereon.

At the invitation of the Head of Development Management, the Committee had visited the sites relating to Items 1 and 7 on 21 July 2015, to assist them in assessing the proposed development in relation to the setting and relationship with neighbouring properties. The site visit was attended by Members present on the Committee, with the exception of Councillors Dibden, Ruffell and Scott who explained that they considered they had sufficient knowledge of the area and the sites to determine the applications.

**Applications outside the area of the South Downs National Park (WCC):**

Item 1. Proposed renovation conversion and development of land and buildings to create 11 dwellings for private rent with eight parking spaces, bicycle storage and associated landscaping – Wellington House, 77 Kingsgate Street, Winchester.  
Case number: 14/02535/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which made a number of factual corrections to the Report and subsequent changes to conditions as follows:

Page 4 – Site Description/ third para – the road is a single yellow line marked.  
 Page 12 – Sustainability – whilst the submitted documentation refers to Code 5, current guidance from Government is not to seek more than a Code 4. The applicants have advised they would seek to achieve Code 4.  
 Condition 14 - Sustainability – given the above, this condition would be reworded to reflect the Code for Sustainable Homes Code 4 as the requirement to be reached in line with current government advice and  
 Condition 16 – Approved Plans – the revision number to some plans will be changed to reflect the correct and current drawing details as presented to Members at the meeting, and which have been subject to public viewing.  
 Drawing 1241-107 Rev P6; 1241-104 Rev P5; 1241-106 Rev P4; 1241-108 Rev P2; and Drawing 1241-110 Rev P7 (remove both P2 and P6).

An additional change was reported at the meeting that Conditions 11 and 12, as contained within the Update Sheet, should read: ‘Conditions 12 and 13’ which are no longer required.

During public participation, Mr Martin Holmes, on behalf of the Resident’s Association, spoke in objection to the application, and Deborah Ivory (Agent and John Wells (Applicant) spoke in support of the application and both answered Members’ questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillors Mather and Tait spoke on this item as Ward Members.

In summary, Councillor Mather stated that whilst she welcomed the improved plans to address the design and appearance issues, she was of the opinion that there was scope to change the plans further to address the highway concerns expressed by many of the local residents to amend traffic access points to the eastern side of the Kingsgate Arch. She stated that the trip movement data, presented to the Committee by the Council's Highway Development Control Engineer, did not accurately reflect the vehicular traffic movements in Kingsgate Street and Canon Street which were regularly used by parents of the school, delivery drivers accessing premises and by other roads users using the roads as a cut through to the motorway. Councillor Mather made reference to the approval that had been granted to the residents of 56 Canon Street to replace their wall with a 1.8 metre fence which would further restrict visibility in this area and referred Members to the representation that had been submitted by John Spokes, which urged the Committee to seek alternatives to the plans to protect the city heritage.

In summary, Councillor Tait stated that in his capacity as Ward Member he raised objection to these particular plans submitted on highway grounds and considered that the access and egress for the proposed development was sited in the wrong location and would exacerbate highway issues in this area. He made reference to the weakness in dialogue and consultation with local residents on the proposed scheme.

At the conclusion of debate, subject to the further correction to Condition 12 and 13, as outlined above, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons (and subject to the conditions and informatives), set out in the Report and as per the Update Sheet.

Item 2: Reinstatement of residential use in existing building and alterations to provide first floor accommodation – The Pantiles, 7 City Road, Winchester  
Case number: 15/00510/FUL/W01636/09

During public participation, Mr Phillip Yates spoke in objection to the application and also on behalf of local residents in Tower Street, and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

Item 3: Outline application for the erection of two self build residential dwellings Plot 1 and Plot 2 with two accesses off Harestock Road (OUTLINE – considering access).  
Case number: 15/00064/OUT/W00701/03

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which stated that the applicant had questioned the use of Policy MTRA4 in the Report. However, The Head of Strategic Planning had confirmed its use was correct.

Additional information had been submitted by the applicants in relation to ecology. This had been assessed by the Ecologist and, as a result, no objections were raised in terms of ecology. Refusal reason 3 was therefore withdrawn.

One letter of support had been withdrawn.

Page 31 of the Report showed the site location map and it was clarified that the larger site to the north did not form part of the application. The application related to the smaller site to the south only.

During public participation, Kelsie Learney, representing Littleton and Harestock Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application and Mrs B Welch, spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application for the reasons set out in the Report and the Update Sheet.

Item 4: Outline application for the Erection of two self build homes – Little Harestock Farm, Harestock Road, Winchester  
Case number: 15/00191/OUT/W00701/04

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet, as set out in Item 3 above.

During public participation, Mark Welch (Applicant) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application for the reasons set out in the Report and the Update Sheet.

Item 5: Variation of condition no. 11 of planning permission 13/02859/FUL, code for sustainable homes – 6A Dean Close, Winchester.  
Case number: 15/01091/FUL/W24218/01

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

**Applications inside the area of the South Downs National Park:**

Item 6: Erection of a detached two-storey building with a part basement together with associated access, car parking and landscaping for use as wine promotional premises (Resubmission) – Exton Park, Allens Farm Lane, Exton  
Case number: SDNP/15/01505/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which stated that one further letter of objection had been received, raising no additional points to those covered in the summary of the Report.

During public participation, David Frere-Cook, spoke in objection to the application and Sati Panesar (Agent), Ian Adam-Smith (Architect) and Malcolm Issac (Applicant) spoke in support and all answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Bodtger spoke on this item as Ward Member of the neighbouring Upper Meon Valley Ward.

In summary, Councillor Bodtger made reference to the objection submitted by CPRE Hampshire and the concerns expressed by local residents in relation to the adverse impact of the application on the landscape and character of the area. She was of the opinion that the revised application was still as dominant in its form, having a chateau style design that was out of keeping in a deeply rural part of the South Downs National Park (SDNP).

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

**Applications outside the area of the South Downs National Park (WCC):**

Item 7: Redevelopment including demolition of existing dwelling: Erection of 9no dwellings (7no three bedroom and 2no four bedroom) Amended plans – Teg Down House, 29 Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester.  
Case number: 14/02356/FUL/W23778/01

During public participation, Jeremy Tyrell (Agent) spoke in support to the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

Item 8: Variation of condition no. 7 of planning permission 14/02440/FUL: Sunday hours of use/opening – Venta UK Ltd, West Hill Road North, South Wonston, Winchester.  
Case number: 15/00578/FUL/W17464/05

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which stated that the recommendation outlined on Page 2 of the Report for Item 8 should read 'PER' and not 'REF' to reflect the correct

recommendation for permission. The recommendation contained within the individual report for this item is correct.

Complaints have been raised that the proposed noise plan is unenforceable. Officers have considered this point, in relation to tests laid down in the Planning Practical Guidance, and are of the view that the noise management plan offers an effective way to seek noise mitigation of the development and proposed hours of use.

During public participation, Neil Cowie (Trustee) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation Councillors Godfrey and Wright spoke on this item as Ward Members.

In summary, Councillor Godfrey stated that he was supportive of those residents of South Wonston that used this facility and confirmed that early morning prayer was currently taking place in a residents house with no complaints of noise received by Ward Members and was confident that users of the building would be respectful by not causing any disturbance to residents situated nearby.

In summary, Councillor Wright stated that he was speaking on behalf of other residents of South Wonston that were not in support of the application. He was of the opinion that the proposed 5/5.30am start would be detrimental to the peace and tranquillity of the area and requested that users be reasonable and considerate to other residents.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons (and subject to the conditions and informatives), subject to additional wording to Condition 13, in relation to lighting scheme, to read that the 'development must be undertaken in accordance with the approved detail', as set out in the Report and as per the Update Sheet.

Item 9: AMENDED PLANS (HOUSEHOLDER) Demolition of existing outbuildings and garage, raising of roof to provide first floor living accommodation and a two storey extension with roof lights and integral garage and carport – Linden Lea, 2 Compton Close, Oliver's Battery, Hampshire

Case number: 15/00135/FUL/W24095

During public participation, Reg Fletcher, representing residents of Oliver's Battery Gardens, spoke in objection to the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation Councillor Laming spoke on this item as Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Laming stated that the roof of the application site was higher than intended on the original scheme, creating a large over intrusive

building that he considered to be overdevelopment of the site. He reported that the mature trees to the close boundaries on either side had been removed by the owners which had previously softened the landscape and he made reference to the roof lines of Cromwell Cottage and 4 Compton Close in comparison to the application site.

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

Item 10: (HOUSEHOLDER) Proposed two storey extension (RETROSPECTIVE) – 6 Hillside, Kitnocks Hill, Curdridge, Southampton  
Case number: 15/01166/FUL/W22735/02

During public participation, Mr Atkinson, spoke in objection to the application and Stephen Wallin (Applicant) spoke in support and both answered Members' questions thereon.

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

#### RESOLVED:

1. That the decisions taken on the Planning Applications in relation to those applications outside the area of the South Downs National Park be agreed as set out in the Schedule (appended to the minutes for information),
  - i) That in respect of item 8 (Venta UK Ltd, West Hill Road North, South Wonston) additional wording statutory wording be added to Condition 13, in relation to the lighting scheme, to read that the 'development must be undertaken in accordance with the approved detail'.
2. That the decision taken on the Planning Application in relation to the application inside the area of the South Downs National Park be agreed as set out in the Schedule (appended to the minutes for information).

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned for lunch between 12.10pm and 2.00pm and concluded at 4.55pm.

Chairman