

PLANNING COMMITTEE

30 June 2016

Attendance:

Councillors:

Ruffell (Chairman) (P)

Evans (P) (for Items 1, 2 ,5 and 6)

Izard (P)

Jeffs

Laming (P) (for Items 1-11)

McLean (P) (for Items 1-8)

Read (P)

Scott

Tait (P)

Deputy Members:

Councillor Berry (Standing Deputy for Councillor Jeffs) and Councillor Clear (Standing Deputy for Councillor Scott)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Cook, Cutler, Godfrey (Leader), Prince, Thompson and Warwick

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Burns, Byrnes (Portfolio Holder for Transport & Professional Services) and Weston (Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Built Environment)

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 26 May 2016 be approved and adopted.

2. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS SCHEDULE**
(Report PDC1054 and Update Sheet refers)

The schedule of planning application on 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 PDC1054.

At the invitation of the Head of Development Management, the Committee had visited the site relating to Item 1 on 28 June 2016, to assist them in assessing the proposed development in relation to their setting and relationship with neighbouring properties. The site visit was attended by Members present on the Committee, with the exception of Councillors Evans and Clear who explained that they considered they had sufficient knowledge of the area and site to determine the application.

Councillor Izard spoke as a Ward Member in respect of Item 1 (Land at Church Lane, Colden Common), having declared a personal but not prejudicial interest due to his involvement and support of the Local Plan process on site selection of Colden Common. He made a personal statement that despite abstaining from Parish Council Planning Decisions, particularly on this application, he had taken the decision to stand down from the decision making process to avoid any perception of predetermination. 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: A Garden Village comprising up to 13 open market and 8 affordable houses, including a community orchard and major new public open space – Land at Church Lane, Colden Common, Winchester
Case number: 16/00819/OUT / W24457

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which sets out an additional letter of support and outlined a further letter in support, disagreeing with various aspects of the Report that had been submitted by the applicant. Comments had been submitted by the South Downs National Park (SDNP) raising no objection to the proposals.

During public participation, Barbara Kelly and Debbie Harding (Colden Common Parish Council) spoke in objection of the application and Richard Cutler (Applicant/Agent) spoke in support of the application and all answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillors Izard and Susan Cook spoke on this item as Ward Members and also responded to Members' questions.

In summary, Councillor Izard referred to the consideration of site allocations in Colden Common for the provision of 250 homes for development (as set out in the Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2)) which had been a long process, including consultations and community engagement exercise as part of the LPP2 process, to seek the views and opinions of local residents on various aspects. This had included site preference which had identified Sandyfield's as the key site and for which planning permission had now been approved. Residents had expressed a view that rural aspects of the village should be retained and that the smaller site at Bargate should be held in reserve if the development at Sandyfield's did not generate all 165 units expected and were strongly opposed to any development on the application site. Councillor Izard stated that the Applicant's view that the Welbeck site would be better for

development than that of Sandyfield's was not supported by the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE), the Parish Council or local opinion. In conclusion, Councillor Izard stated that the site was outside of the revised LPP2 boundary, was not needed at the present time and was not required to fulfil the target of 250 homes; therefore the application should be refused.

Prior to the commencement of her representation, Councillor Cook declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in respect of the application, as a long standing friend of the landowners.

In summary, Councillor Cook referred to the contents of a personal email she had received which indicated that she was no longer representing the views of the residents Colden Common or the Parish Council. Councillor Cook stated that she had supported the Sandyfield's application fully, but raised concerns that the figure of 165 dwellings had not been provided initially and that this figure for housing provision had changed over a period of time from 97 to 120 and then to 145, prior to the application being approved for 165 dwellings. She made reference to proposals for the Bishopstoke bypass and stated that she would rather see a development of this form in Church Lane over this. In conclusion, Councillor Cook stated that she remained fully committed to the Parish but had concerns over the numbers at the Sandyfield's development and was pro-open space. She urged the Committee to look at the details and maps again to consider what was being proposed within this application.

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

Item 2: (RESUBMISSION) Proposed new two bedroom dwelling (WITHIN THE CURTILAGE OF A LISTED BUILDING) – Tudor Cottage, 22 Church Lane, Kings Worthy, Winchester
Case number: 16/00748/FUL / WPP-05027752

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which sets out an amendment to the wording contained in the Proposal, second paragraph to delete the following text with strikethrough '....The front door will be oak ~~with glazed surround~~ and the...' and addition to Condition 10 for clarity (text in italics) ..'10. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans *submitted by Huw Thomas Architects on the 14th of April 2016:....*'

During public participation, Dr J Greenleaf spoke in objection of the application and Lucy Kelly and Huw Thomas who spoke in support of the application and all answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Prince stated that the property and location were well known to him as a local resident for many years and that traffic was of a

particular concern in this area causing hazardous situations for pedestrians as well as access issues. The road was extremely busy and used as the main link for The Worthy's with 10 buses (5 in each direction) per hour and a school situated only yards away with parents mostly travelling by car. Councillor Prince considered that the proposed application site was positioned in a critical location of Church Lane where additional car movements would exacerbate existing traffic concerns. In conclusion, Councillor Price suggested that the provision of appropriate signage and passing points in Church Lane would assist in alleviating the current issues with traffic in Church Lane.

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 and as per the Update Sheet.

Item 3: (RESUBMISSION) (HOUSEHOLDER) Two storey rear extension, refurbishment of existing house and construction of home office and cycle store (AFFECTS THE SETTING OF A LISTED BUILDING) – 56 Hyde Street, Winchester

Case number: 16/00225/FUL / W22958/03

During public participation, Gareth Davies (Agent) spoke in support of the application.

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 4: (RESUBMISSION) (HOUSEHOLDER) Two storey rear extension, refurbishment of existing house and construction of home office and cycle store – 56 Hyde Street, Winchester

Case number: 16/00226/LIS / W22958/04LB

The Head of Development Management advised the Committee of an additional clause to Condition 3 which was requested by the Historic Environment Team. This would specify that details of the technical specification of the tanking should be submitted to the Council for approval before any works commenced.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant listed building consent for the reasons (and subject to the conditions and informatives), as set out in the Report. The exact wording of an addition to Condition 3 was delegated to Head of Development Management, in consultation with the Chairman.

Item 5: Single storey rear extension and alterations to the existing garage – 39 Vernham Road, Winchester.

Case number: 16/00852/FUL / WPP-05049581

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 6: Proposed 4-bed dwelling (2 storey) with garage (OUTLINE) – Birch Lodge, Trampers Lane, North Boarhunt, Fareham.

Case number: 16/00551/OUT / W04159/02

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out one letter of support making no new additional points.

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

During public participation, Councillor Cutler spoke on this item as Ward Member and also responded to Members' questions.

In summary, Councillor Cutler stated that North Boarhunt had been plagued by three enforcement cases that had been detrimental to the village; as a consequence villagers had become disillusioned with the planning process. The application had received support by the Parish Council, neighbouring properties and residents located in the eastern end of Trampers Lane with no objections made. Councillor Cutler reported that there was significant deep rubble and hard standing with a small layer of top soil, therefore the site would still be rendered unfit for agricultural development or grazing. In conclusion, Councillor Cutler stated that 28 neighbours had supported the application in principle, therefore he considered that this fulfilled the definition of the neighbourhood plan and process.

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

Item 7: Demolition of existing house and development of 5 new dwellings (RESUBMISSION) – 28 Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester.

Case number: 15/01364/FUL / W04642/10

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which summarised seven additional objections received following notification of amended plans. An additional Condition 22 was also set out with regard to the development being carried out in accordance with various aspects of the approved plans.

During public participation, Jonathon Kane spoke in objection to the application and Nigel Dyer (Architect) spoke in support of the application. Mr Dyer answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Thompson stated that the proposals were considered as overdevelopment of the site and would have a detrimental impact to the amenity of the existing neighbouring properties. Councillor Thompson highlighted that the new houses would have windows overlooking neighbouring gardens and that the natural slope to the site would exacerbate their overbearing. There would also be a harmful impact to the mature trees to the rear of the site, which were an important landscape feature in the area. This included the felling of a copper beech tree.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons (and subject to the s106 agreement, conditions and informatives), as set out in the Report and an amendment to condition 3 to include plots 1 and 2, and an additional Condition 22, as set out in the Update Sheet.

Item 8: Demolition of existing dwelling, erection of 4 no. new dwellings (as amended) – The Anchorage, 75 Downs Road, South Wonston, Winchester. Case number: 15/01895/FUL / W24306

The Head of Development Management drew attention that the plans referred to in the Report should be substituted for the most recent plans submitted for Plots A and B, i.e. 504P2.04A and 504P4.04B.

During public participation, Grant Johnston and Anne Peal (South Wonston Parish Council) spoke in objection of the application and Jeremy Tyrell (architect and agent) spoke in support of the application. Mr Johnston and Mr Tyrell answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Godfrey spoke on this item as a Ward Member and also responded to Members' questions.

In summary, Councillor Godfrey raised concerns that the site was the equivalent of a single plot (when compared to other development plots in the vicinity) and consequently the proposals represented significant overdevelopment. The proposed houses were also large and overbearing and would be detrimental to the character of the area – which was predominantly bungalows. For all these reasons, the proposals were also contrary to the South Wonston Village Design Statement.

The Head of Development Management drew Members' attention that the size of plots in this area of Downs Road had not been quantitatively assessed. However, it was clear that, for example, Plots 49/51 were narrower and more linear when compared to this Plot.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to defer determination of the application to a meeting of the Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee to be held on Thursday 14 July at 1.30pm in Winchester Guildhall. The Planning

(Viewing) Sub Committee would assess the proposal in its context with adjacent development plots and existing houses, and also to assess the relevance of the South Wonston Village Design Statement.

Item 9: Erection of 1 no. 5 bedroom dwellings within the garden to the rear of the existing property. Partial demolition of existing garage – Old Orchard, 79 Downs Road, South Wonston, Winchester.
Case number: 15/02325/FUL / W24348

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which sets out, in full, comments received from South Wonston Parish Council and requests for conditions, should the Committee be minded to approve the application.

During public participation, Susan Donato spoke in objection of the application and Jane Brooks spoke in support of the application and all answered Members' questions thereon.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to adjourn the decision to a meeting of the Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee to be held on Thursday 14 July 2016 at 1.30pm in Winchester Guildhall. The Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee would assess the relationship between the existing and proposed properties, as well as the potential impact on neighbouring properties.

Item 10: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 3 no. five bedroom dwellings with associated access, garages, parking and landscaping (Amended Plans 10.12.15) – Smallwood, Cross Way, Shawford, Winchester.
Case number: 15/01925/FUL / W13330/03

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which sets out in full two further proposed conditions as follows: Condition 8: to ensure first floor windows on east elevation of plot 1 and west elevation of plot 3 facing both neighbours are obscure glazed; and Condition 9: to restrict any further windows/openings on these elevations. Condition 10 proposed to ensure the mitigation measure outlined in the submitted biodiversity survey/assessment are secured. In addition, two verbal updates including, Condition 11: requiring development access arboricultural appraisal method statements; and Condition 12: no development until WCC arboricultural officer has attended pre-commencement meeting.

During public participation, Mr G Odd and Parish Councillor Una Stevens (Compton and Shawford Parish Council) spoke in objection of the application and Chris Rees (Agent) spoke in support of the application, all answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Warwick spoke on this item as Ward Member and also responded to Members' questions.

In summary, Councillor Warwick stated that she reinforced the concerns of the Parish Council and local residents that the application disregarded the

Village Design Statement (VDS) and if approved sought clarification to understand why this is and what message this would be sending to the local residents. She considered that the density and layout of proposed buildings did not fit in existing context and was at odds with the rest of the road with more houses on one side than the other in contrary to CP2 (housing provision and mix).

In conclusion, Councillor Warwick urged the Committee to support the Parish Council and local residents by refusing the application, if minded to approve she suggested that the Committee defer the application for a site visit.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to adjourn the decision to a meeting of the Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee to be held on Thursday 14 July 2016 at 1.30pm in Winchester Guildhall. The Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee would assess the relationship between the existing and proposed properties and the view that the application is contrary to the VDS, as well as the potential for overdevelopment of the area.

Item 11: (RESUBMISSION) Erection of new dwelling and detached garage with guest room above – Southgate, Cross Way, Shawford, Winchester.
Case number: 15/02176/FUL / W05460/06

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which sets out comments from Compton and Shawford Parish Council detailing reservations to the proposal in relation to the non-adherence to criteria set out in Appendix 1 of the Design Guidelines of the Compton and Shawford VDS 2011.

During public participation, Pat Appleton and Parish Councillor Una Stevens (Compton and Shawford Parish Council) spoke in objection of the application and both answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Warwick stated that the application would impact significantly to adjacent properties, particularly Mrs Appleton's property, 'Tanera'. She considered that this was a development of a substantive property onto a relatively small plot, at odds with other properties in the road and was against the guidance contained in the adopted High Quality Places SPD.

In conclusion, Councillor Warwick stated that all other properties in this area were set back but that this application was set at an angle which was out of character and appearance of the local area. She referred to three trees that had been identified in a 2010 survey of the western boundary, these mature trees provided additional privacy and considerable amenity to the adjacent property. If minded to approve the application, she urged the Committee to place Tree Preservation Orders on all remaining trees and update the root protection measures by condition.

In response, it was noted that the Monterey Cypress tree had already been taken down but that the remaining trees were already covered by TPOs.

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 and as per the Update Sheet.

Item 12: Erect garage and workshop – Firgrove, 65 Anmore Road, Denmead, Waterlooville

Case number: 16/00750/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which sets out an amendment to Condition 3, to include elevations of the workshop.

During public participation, Parish Councillor Langford-Smith (Denmead Parish Council) spoke in objection of the application and Martin Critchley spoke in support of the application and all answered Members' questions thereon.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to adjourn the decision to a meeting of the Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee to be held on Thursday 14 July 2016 at 1.30pm in Winchester Guildhall. The Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee would view the site and assess the effect of the proposal on the streetscene.

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 2 (Tudor Cottage, 22 Church Lane, Kings Worthy), planning permission be granted, subject to amendment to the wording contained in the Proposal, second paragraph to delete the following text with strikethrough '....The front door will be oak ~~with glazed surround~~ and the...' and addition to Condition 10 for clarity (text in italics) ..'10. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans *submitted by Huw Thomas Architects on the 14th of April 2016:....*' as set out in the Update Sheet;

(ii) That, in respect of items 3 and 4 (56 Hyde Street, Winchester planning permission and listed building consent be granted subject to s106 agreement; and new clause to Condition 3 to specify that details of the technical specification of the tanking should be submitted to the Council for approval before any works commenced;

(iii) That, in respect of item 7 (28 Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester), planning permission be granted, subject to a s106 agreement; and new Condition 24 to reflect the most recent plans submitted, as set out in the Update Sheet);

(iv) That, in respect of item 8 (The Anchorage, 75 Downs Road, South Wonston, Winchester), determination be deferred to a meeting of the Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee to be held on Thursday, 14 July 2016 at 1.30pm in order to assess the proposal in its context with adjacent development plots and existing houses, and also to assess the relevance of the South Wonston Village Design Statement;

(v) That, in respect of item 9 (Old Orchard, 79 Downs Road, South Wonston) the item be adjourned to a meeting of the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee to be held on Thursday, 14 July 2016 at 1.30pm in order to assess the relationship between the existing and proposed properties, as well as the potential impact on neighbouring properties;

(vi) That, in respect of item 10 (Smallwood, Cross Way, Shawford) the item be adjourned to a meeting of the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee to be held Thursday, 14 July 2016 at 1.30pm in order to assess the relationship between the existing and proposed properties and the view that the application is contrary to the VDS, as well as the potential for overdevelopment of the area; and

(vii) That, in respect of item 12 (Firgrove, 65 Anmore Road, Denmead) the item be adjourned to a meeting of the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee to be held Thursday, 14 July 2016 at 1.30pm in order to view the site and assess the effects of the proposal on the streetscene.

3. **MINUTES OF PLANNING (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE HELD ON 13 JUNE 2016**

(Report PDC1055 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee, held on 13 June 2016 (relating to 23 Clifton Road, Winchester), be received (attached as Appendix A to these minutes).

5. **PLANNING APPEALS**
(Report PDC1052 refers)

Following a request made at the previous meeting held 26 May 2016, the Head of Development Management provided a verbal update of further information regarding the appeals in relation to the alterations to 'North Loggia' and provision of a disabled toilet facility at Lainston House Hotel, Sparsholt, as set out in Items 11 and 12 of Report PDC1052. In summary, the Head of Development Management stated that she had discussed this case with the Historic Environment Team who advised they had no objection to the provision of disabled toilet facilities. She explained that the Inspector concluded that the loggia had fundamentally been altered already. It was noted that there had been an issue with the initial application which may have been resolved if the applicant had agreed to use non reflective glazing. The inspector agreed that non reflective glazing should be installed, for which the applicant is required to comply.

It was requested that further information regarding Item 5 of the Appeals Report, in respect of 26, Rosebery Road Alresford, be brought to the next meeting of the Committee for consideration.

RESOLVED:

That the Report be noted.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned between 1pm and 2pm and concluded at 6.20pm.

Chairman