

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**21 April 2016**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Ruffell (Chairman) (P)

Dibden (P)

Evans (P) (for Items 2-12)

Izard (P)

Jefferies (P)

Johnston (P)

McLean (P) (for Items 1-6 & 8-11)

Scott (P) (for Items 1 -6)

Tait (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Burns, Susan Cook, Hiscock, Horrill (Portfolio Holder for Housing Services), Laming, Thompson and Warwick.

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Byrnes (Portfolio Holder for Local Economy), Read (Portfolio Holder for Built Environment) and Weir

---

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 24 March 2016 be approved and adopted.

2. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS SCHEDULE**  
(Report PDC1051 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 PDC1051.

At the invitation of the Head of Development Management, the Committee had visited the sites relating to Items 1, 6, 8 and 9 on 19 April 2016, to assist them in assessing the proposed developments in relation to their setting and relationship with neighbouring properties. The site visits were attended by

Members present on the Committee, with the exception of Councillors Evans and McLean, who explained that they considered they had sufficient knowledge of the area and sites to determine the applications.

Councillor Dibden declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in respect of item 1 (Sparsholt College, Westley Lane, Sparsholt) as trustee of CPRE Hampshire who had raised objection to the application. However, she stated that she had taken no part in any discussion of this application and as such she spoke and voted on the matter thereon.

Councillor McLean declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in respect of item 6 (Sandyfields Nurseries, Main Road Colden Common) as the landowner was known to him. However, he stated that he had not been in discussion with the landowner on this particular application and as such he spoke and voted on the matter thereon. In addition, he declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of item 12 (23 Morley Drive, Bishops Waltham) as the owner of the property. Councillor McLean withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of this item, taking no part in the discussion or vote thereon.

Councillor Izard spoke as a Ward Member in respect of Item 6 (Sandyfields Nurseries, Main Road, Colden Common), as he had predetermined the application and been in consultation with residents and the Parish Council regarding this application. Councillor Izard sat apart from the Committee during its determination of the application.

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

Item 1: Biomass-based anaerobic digestion plant including: 3 No. digesters (2 No. 'primary', 1 No. 'secondary'); 2 No. digestate storage tanks; biomethane upgrading plant; biogas boiler; standby flare stack; weighbridge & marshalling yard; agricultural feedstock storage (silage clamps); biomass pre-treatment hall; 2 No. buffer tanks (liquid substrate & silage effluent storage); digestate separation station; office, electrical and control building; ground works including bunding and re-profiling using excavated materials; surface water storage lagoon; hard surfacing; means of enclosure; landscaping; alterations to an existing access to Westley Lane; and an education building (Use Class D1) for the Hampshire Centre for the Demonstration of Renewable Technologies' - Sparsholt Collage, Westley Lane, Sparsholt.  
Case number: 16/00116/FUL/ W00124/132

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which outlined details of correspondence and comments submitted by; the Principal of Sparsholt College, Sparsholt Parish Council and Hursley Parish Council. In addition, it also included comments from the Landscape Team, in response to the applicant's submission of two plans for on and off site mitigation measures, together with responses from Planning Officers.

Revisions to condition 13 to include the wording highlighted in bold, as follows: 'A landscape management plan, including long term design

objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules, **relating to environmental enhancement proposals within both the red lined application site and the Sparsholt College Land Boundary (shown in blue) as identified on the Ecotricity Figure A15 entitled Offsite Landscape Mitigation Enhancement Plan drawing number 6438\_T0255\_03 dated April 2016**, shall be submitted...'

Additional condition 24 'Decommissioning of the AD Plant', wording as set out in full within the Update Sheet.

During public participation, Douglas Paterson, Sue Wood (Sparsholt Parish Council), Carol Phillips (Crawley Parish Council), Councillor Jan Warwick (Hursley Parish Council) and Councillor Patrick Cunningham (Littleton and Harestock Parish Council) spoke in objection to the applicant and Tim Pope and Tim Jackson spoke in support to the application and all answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Horrill spoke on this item as a Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Horrill stated that the application submitted by Ecotricity was much larger than the size of a standard Anaerobic Digester (AD) plant, the scale of which was not necessary to offer an educational facility. She considered that the application was contrary to Policy MTRA(4) and queried the health and safety aspects of AD plants following previous history of known explosions at other plant sites. Concern was expressed regarding the siting of the proposed AD plant alongside a public footpath and, as a result, was considered to be inappropriate for this area and a danger to pedestrians using this access. The proposed traffic and trailer movements would have a detrimental impact on Sparsholt Village with traffic using the rural lanes within the countryside for access to and from the site and detailed highway plans should be required before the application could be assessed accurately, therefore the application should be refused.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee resolved to refuse planning permission due to the type and volume of traffic the impact on the road network and the fact that no details of the route and volume of traffic proposed within a 15km radius of the application site had been provided, the type and volume of traffic which would be harmful to road users and the character of the area associated with the use. The proposal was considered contrary to the intentions of saved policies T2, DP3(ii), DP.11 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review and policies MTRA(4), MTRA(5), CP.10 and CP.21 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy 2013 The Committee agreed that the exact wording of the reasons for refusal and policy basis for refusal were to be delegated to the Head of Development Management to determine, in consultation with the Chairman.

Item 2: Construction of 62 Bed Care Home for the Elderly containing 40 single rooms and 11 double nursing units plus a villa of 4 double nursing units on the site of the former Captain Barnard Public House and part of the rear garden of

Calvi (OUTLINE – considering access, appearance, layout and scale) (Re-submission, ref: Consented Case No. 12/01298/OUT) – Plot 1, The Captain Barnard, Otterbourne Road, Compton.  
Case number: 15/02427/OUT / W00532/22

During public participation, Carole Sawyer spoke in support to the application 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), set out in the Report.

Item 3: (RESUBMISSION) Demolition of existing buildings and the erection of six houses with associated garaging, parking and landscape works (Amended Plans 02/02/16) – 15 Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester.  
Case number: 15/02884/FUL / W14276/09

During public participation, Susan Antoniou spoke in objection to the application and Dan Wilden (Agent) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Thompson spoke on this item as a Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Thompson stated that the Committee had previously visited the site to look at the relationship of the application site with 15a Chilbolton Avenue and considered that if a three-way communication had taken place with the occupants of 15a Chilbolton Avenue this matter could have been remedied. If minded to approve the application, Councillor Thompson suggested that the Committee impose a condition to ensure that no balconies, verandas or raised platforms be allowed to the first floor of the development. In conclusion, Councillor Thompson advised that representation should be made to Hampshire County Council to assess the speed limit in Chilbolton Avenue and seek a reduction in the limit to 30mph. In response to Members' questions Cllr Thompson confirmed that she and other local residents had made representations to HCC. Members of the Planning Committee considered that this was the appropriate course of action.

In response, the Head of Development Management confirmed that condition 12, as set out in the Report, addressed concerns with regard to balconies, verandas or raised platforms to the first floor of the application site, In addition, obscure glazing to the windows in the north (side) elevation of houses 5 and 6 (looking towards 15a Chilbolton Avenue) was required by condition 13, as set out in the Report.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons (and subject to the s106 agreement, conditions and informatives), set out in the Report.

Item 4: (AMENDED PLANS 03.03.16) Demolition of existing dwelling erection of 3 no. dwellings with associated access from Petersfield Road and 1 no. dwelling with associated access from Quarry Road – 22 Quarry Road, Winchester

Case number: 15/01414/FUL / W10350/10

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons (and subject to the s106 agreement, conditions and informatives), set out in the Report.

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

Item 5: Construction of a replacement dwelling – Blue Moon Caravan, Green Lane, Hambledon.

Case number: SDNP/15/06425/FUL

During public participation, Ian Donohue (the Agent) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Report, subject to a strengthening of the wording by Officers of reason 2, along the lines of the Inspector's wording in respect of a similar appeal decision in Shedfield in 2014, as set out on page 115 of the Report.

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

Item 6: Amended plans including revised indicative site layout for up to 165 dwellings, landscape strategy and other supporting documents, 165 no. dwellings and associated works (outline) – Sandyfields Nurseries, Main Road, Colden Common, Winchester.

Case number: 14/01993/OUT / W23240/02

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which advised that a letter had been submitted to the Council from solicitors acting for Welbeck Strategic Land LLP, one of the objectors to this application. The majority of the points raised in the letter were already covered in the officer report but a detailed breakdown of the points, and the Head of Development Management's responses, were provided at the meeting. Picking up on points raised in the letter, it was noted that the proposed woodland was within the ownership of the applicant and their intention was to transfer this to the Parish Council. This requirement would be secured through a legal obligation, should permission be granted. The applicant had submitted a revised Affordable Housing Plan (drawing no. 14.128.03 rev B), following discussions with the Council's Strategic Housing officer to improve the distribution of affordable housing across the site.

It was also noted that there was an error in the report on page 134 where it was stated that details of the proposed walkway would form part of the reserved matters application. This was not the case as reserved matters could

only be submitted in relation to the redline application site itself, whereas the woodland was outside of this area. However, the submitted Landscape and Public Open Space Strategy and Woodland Trail and Woodland Management Plan provided details of how the access to the woodland would function and the details and operation of this would be undertaken by the Parish Council.

It was highlighted that the location plan with the committee report incorrectly showed the woodland at Stratton's Copse within the red line of the application site. The location plan was amended in the update sheet to show the application site outlined in red and other land in the applicant's ownership in blue.

In addition, it was reported that eight other letters of objection and eight letters of support for the application had been received. South Downs National Park Authority raised objection to the application due to access concerns and impact on ecology.

It was also reported that HCC Highways had provided further comments and were happy that the scheme could be finalised with delegated authority being given by the Planning Committee to the Head of Planning Management to approve final highways details.

During public participation, Kirsten Gray (Pro Vision) and David Barnes (Star Planning) spoke in objection of the application and Councillor Maggie Hill (Colden Common Parish Council) and Steve Carrington (Applicant) spoke in support of the application and all answered Members' questions thereon. Councillor Hill clarified that following further information and technical advice from the City Council, the Parish Council now supported the application along with the taking on of ownership of the adjacent woodland as was being proposed.

During public participation, Councillors Izard and Susan Cook spoke on this item as Ward Members.

In summary, Councillor Izard stated that he felt this was a key development for Colden Common. Consultation on the proposals had been exemplary, and Sandyfields Nursery was seen to be a largely favoured option for development given its status as a brownfield site with capacity to hold the numbers required. In conclusion, Councillor Izard stated that he considered the proposal was right for the village and would not be detached from the existing village, therefore the application should be approved.

In summary, Councillor Susan Cook stated that Foreman Homes (Applicant) had worked well with the local community and had been very accommodating. She highlighted that required car parking standards had been met, gardens were of a relatively good size and Foreman Homes had made it clear that they would bring the woodland up to a good condition before transferring it to the Parish Council. In summary, she felt it to be a good quality development, therefore the application should be approved.

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services advised the Committee that contrary to the views expressed by the objectors during public participation, officers did not consider that granting planning permission for this site would be pre-determining the LPP2 process. The process was at an advanced stage and it was highly unlikely that this site which had the support of the community and the Parish Council and was the allocated site for Colden Common, would be rejected by the Local Plan Inspector.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons (and subject to the s106 agreement, conditions and informatives), set out in the Report and as per the Update Sheet, with outstanding highway issues at Hampshire County Council (HCC) to be delegated to Head of Development Management to resolve.

Item 7: Demolition of existing buildings and development of the site by the erection of 63 dwellings with parking, landscaping and amended access – Land Junction of Sandy Lane and Bull Lane, Waltham Chase.  
Case number: 15/02765/FUL / W02200/03

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which stated that amended plans had been submitted outlining minor revisions in the layout of plots 1 – 21 in the northern part of the site and to plot 38 along the southern edge of the development. Recommendation to include the following wording ‘Delegate to the Head of Development Management to amend the wording of condition 24 ‘Approved Plans’ to include the revised drawing numbers as appropriate.’ Secondary education contribution request withdrawn by Hampshire County Council’s Education Department.

During public participation, Mrs Bostock spoke in objection to the application and Ian Johnson (Agent) spoke in support of the application and answered Members’ questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Gemmell spoke on this item as a Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Gemmell stated that she was speaking in objection to the application due to the vast development that had taken place in Shedfield over the past three years, which had seen the delivery of three housing schemes to satisfy the needs of the allocations as set out in Local Plan Part 1 and in the emerging Local Plan Part 2, which was yet to be approved by the Council and was due to be delivered over a 20 year period and not condensed into and completed within three years as would be the case in this instance. It was considered that access onto Sandy Lane would be problematic and that opening the splay of the hedges would not overcome concerns, with no footpaths provided on Bull Lane this could prove hazardous for children accessing the primary school, therefore the application should be refused.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons (and subject to the s106 agreement, conditions and informatives), set

out in the Report and as per the Update Sheet, with changes to I conditions as follows: removal of the requirement for a secondary school contribution to education; and condition 24 updated to reflect the most recent plans submitted., as set out in the Update Sheet). The exact wording of conditions, as set out above to be delegated to Head of Development Management for approval, in consultation with the Chairman.

Item 8: Demolish existing bungalow and replace with 2No. 3 bed chalet bungalows with single garage – 2 Broad View Lane, Oliver's Battery, Winchester.

Case number: 15/02274/FUL / W19214/05

During public participation, Mary Birkett and John Brighton and Margaret Collin (Oliver's Battery Parish Council), spoke in objection to the application and Niger Dyer (Architect) spoke in support to the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Laming stated that the proposed development was out of keeping with the area and an overbearing form of development, contrary to Oliver's Battery Village Design Statement (VDS) with a site level eight metres higher and in close proximity to all neighbouring properties. Concerns raised by Southern Water that no building was to take place within three metres of the waste pipe had been overlooked. In conclusion, Councillor Laming considered the development out of context with the surrounding area due to its size and mass, therefore the application should be refused.

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

Item 9: 1 bedroom studio flat oversailing retained vehicle parking - W I House, 56 Hyde Abbey Road, Winchester

Case number: 16/00371/FUL/ W12354/05

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which stated that the agent had submitted a response to the comments of the objectors; amendment to condition 3 to remove the wording '**of the east elevation**'.

During public participation Sophia Terrachov (on behalf of Olly Bray (Architect)) spoke in support to the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation Councillors Burns and Hiscock spoke on this item as Ward Members.

In summary, Councillor Burns stated that she was giving a presentation produced by local residents which set out the loss of light and detrimental



impact on neighbouring properties at 55, 54, 53 and 52 Hyde Abbey Road if the development was to be approved due to the overbearing canyon effect that the proposal would create. Councillor Burns stated that the application was contrary to policies 4.53 of the High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document and policy DP3, therefore the application should be refused.

In summary, Councillor Hiscock reiterated the concerns expressed by Councillor Burns in relation to the design and overbearing impact adversely impacting properties at 55, 54, 53 and 52 Hyde Abbey Road resulting in loss of light into kitchen and dining areas. The proposal was set in a Victorian suburban area within a City Centre location where the developer had not provided details of the visual impact on the rear of the surrounding properties and, with the exception of the front aspect, the site was closed on all sides.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse permission of the application for the following reasons: the proposed development would by reason of its height and proximity to the boundary, affect the amenity of adjacent residential dwellings due to its overbearing and loss of light to the garden area and rear primary windows, contrary to policy DP3(vii) of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document High Quality Places guideline AB6 on amenity considerations. In addition, the proposal is contrary to the intentions of emerging policy DM.16 (vii) and policy CP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy in that the development fails to make provision for affordable housing and would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the area.

Item 10: (HOUSEHOLDER) Two storey rear extension – Yew Tree Cottage, Ervills Road, Worlds End, Hambledon.  
Case number: 16/00276/FUL / W06589/07

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which stated that the Parish Council had withdrawn their objection, but this was too late to withdraw the application from the committee agenda.

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 11: Proposed change of use of land from agricultural yard and building to provide caravan, boat and vehicle storage – Belney Farm, Belney Lane, Southwick, Fareham  
Case number: 15/02382/FUL / W24357

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which referred to two documents submitted by the agent in response to the Highway Engineer's consultation comments and the Highways Engineer's final consultation response to these additional comments, all of which were now available to view on the Council's website.

During public participation, Jim Watson (Southwick and Widley Parish Council) and Paul Harris (Agent) spoke in support to the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the application, subject to the following conditions: Development permitted to commence before the expiration of three years from the date of permission; the premises and access shall only be used as caravan, boat and vehicle storage and not for any other use falling within Class B8 of the Use Classes Order 2015; hours of opening 0700 to 2000 hours Monday to Saturday and 0900 to 1800 hours on Sunday and Public Holidays; external lighting details to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development; and details of the plastic coated chain link fence and galvanised lockable gates to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development, with the exact wording of conditions, reasons and informatives delegated to the Head of Development Management, in consultation with the Chairman.

Item 12: 1 No. sycamore – fell and 1 No. Norway maple – fell – 23 Morley Drive, Bishops Waltham, Southampton  
Case number: 16/00547/TPO / WTPO/1172/11

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 Development Control 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), subject to:

(i) That, in respect of item 1 (Sparsholt College, Westley Lane, Sparsholt), planning permission be refused due to the type and volume of traffic the impact on the road network and the fact that no details of the route and volume of traffic proposed within a 15km radius of the application site had been provided, the type and volume of traffic which would be harmful to road users and the character of the area associated with the use. The proposal was considered contrary to the intentions of saved policies T2, DP3(ii), DP.11 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review and policies MTRA(4), MTRA(5), CP.10 and CP.21 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy 2013. The exact wording of the reasons for refusal and policy basis of the refusal to be delegated to Head of Development Management to determine, in consultation with the Chairman;

(ii) That, in respect of item 6 (Sandyfields Nurseries, Main Road, Colden Common) planning permission be granted subject to s106 agreement, with outstanding highway issues at Hampshire County Council (HCC) to be delegated to Head of Development Management to resolve,

(iii) That, in respect of item 7 (Land junction of Sandy Lane and Bull Lane, Waltham Chase), planning permission be granted, subject to a s106 agreement; removal of the requirement for a secondary school contribution to education and condition 24 updated to reflect the most recent plans submitted., as set out in the Update Sheet);

(iv) That, in respect of item 9 (W I House, 56 Hyde Abbey Road, Winchester), planning permission be refused for the following reasons: the proposed development would by reason of its height and proximity to the boundary, affect the amenity of adjacent residential dwellings due to its overbearing and loss of light to the garden area and rear primary windows, contrary to policy DP3(vii) of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document High Quality Places guideline AB6 on amenity considerations. In addition, the proposal is contrary to the intentions of emerging policy DM.16 (vii) and policy CP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy in that the development fails to make provision for affordable housing and would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the area; and

(v) That, in respect of item 11 (Belney Farm, Belney Lane, Southwick), planning permission be granted, subject to the following conditions: Development permitted to commence before the expiration of three years from the date of permission; the premises and access shall only be used as caravan, boat and vehicle storage and not for any other use falling within Class B8 of the Use Classes Order 2015; hours of opening 0700 to 2000 hours Monday to Saturday and 0900 to 1800 hours on Sunday and Public Holidays; external lighting details to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development; and details of the plastic coated chain link fence and galvanised lockable gates to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development, with the exact wording of conditions, reasons and informatives delegated to the Head of Development Management, in consultation with the Chairman.

2. That the decision taken on the Development Control Applications in relation to the applications inside the area of the South Downs National Park be agreed as follows:

(i) That, in respect of item 5 (Blue Moon Caravan, Green Lane, Hambledon), planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in the Report, subject to a strengthening of the wording by Officers of reason 2, along the lines of the Inspector's wording in respect of a similar appeal decision in Shedfield in 2014, as set out on Page 115 of the Report.

3. **VOTE OF THANKS**

This being the last meeting of the Municipal Year, the Committee passed a vote of thanks to its Chairman, Councillor Laurence Ruffell.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned between 12:55pm and 1.55pm and concluded at 7.50pm.

Chairman