

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**21 July 2016**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Ruffell (Chairman) (P)

Evans  
Izard (P)  
Jeffs (P)  
Laming (P)

McLean (P)  
Read  
Scott (P)  
Tait (P)

Deputy Members:

Councillor Clear (Standing Deputy for Councillor Evans)  
Councillor Berry (Standing Deputy for Councillor Read)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Achwal and Bell

---

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That subject to the reference on page 2 of the Minutes, final paragraph, under Councillor Izard's public participation, to refer to the Bloombridge site and not the Welbeck site, the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 30 June 2016 be approved and adopted.

2. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS SCHEDULE**  
(Report PDC1061 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 PDC1061.

By way of personal statement, Councillor Laming declared that he had pre-determined his decision in respect of item 1 (Land at Vale Farm, Romsey Road, Pitt). 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.

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

Item 1: - (AMENDED PLANS received on 24.03.2016) Development of a maximum of 350 no. dwellings including a maximum of 140 no. affordable dwellings, site for a care village suitable for the elderly, mixed use local centre, retention and enhancement of existing permissive bridleways supplemented with new pedestrian and cycle links, a network of open spaces and play areas, surface water drainage works, supporting highways and drainage infrastructure. (OUTLINE) - Land At Vale Farm, Romsey Road, Pitt. Case number: 15/01383/OUT / W16759/02

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which contained details of the applicant's response to a number of matters in the Report. These were Hampshire County Council Highway's objection; additional consultation with Hampshire County Council Education, including Education justification for S106 contributions (an additional reason for refusal was required to cover the current lack of a S106 agreement to cover off site contributions towards education), and Hampshire County Council Highway's response to the applicant agent's letter from Boyer dated 20 July 2016 and the appended letter from I-Transport dated 6 July 2016. The Head of Development Management added that since publication of the Report a letter had also been received from the local Member of Parliament in support of the reasons for refusal.

During public participation, David Barnes (representing Pitt Village Association) and Joe Winchester (representing Hursley Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Mike Newton (applicant) and James Bevis (Agent) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillors Bell and Laming spoke on this item as Ward Members and answered Members' questions.

In summary, Councillor Bell stated that together with the other local ward Councillors (Councillors Laming and Warwick), they were united in their objection to the application and welcomed the reason for refusal. There were also objections from the City of Winchester Trust and the Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) as there was no justification for the application as it was contrary to the Local Plan Part 1 and had environmental and traffic concerns. Hampshire County Council Highway's comments contained within pages 35 to 50 of the Report had concluded that the proposal could not be reconciled with National Planning Policy Framework or with Policy CP10 of the Winchester Local Plan, as it would impact on road safety and the local transport network and would not be sustainable. Only the access was to be considered at this stage, and if this requirement could not be satisfied then the application could not go ahead. Housing allocation should be Plan led, and the application site was a build out from existing

development, which was outside the development boundary and on a sloping site. If there had been a long term strategic intention to extend the boundary in this direction, Hampshire County Council and the City Council could have retained control of the land to the west of the roundabout, which could have provided an access, but this was not the case and it was not a good stretch of road for an access of any type. There was inadequate capacity in public sewers and only limited water supply on the site. It was also subject to flooding, which had a major impact in the area. In summary, Councillor Bell considered that the application was contrary to Local Plan Part 1, was detrimental to the landscape character of the site, affected the gap between the City and Pitt, would cause unacceptable stress on local roads and the site was liable to flooding.

In summary, Councillor Laming stated that there were strong local objections to the application. Winchester's Local Plan Part 1 was clear that housing targets should be Plan led and there was an adequate supply of land for housing, which did not include the application site, and there was no justification for the application. The infrastructure would be overwhelmed and Hampshire County Council Highways had recommended refusal over traffic. There were four sets of traffic lights and a roundabout within 1 mile and the proposals would affect Badger Farm Road, St Cross roundabout and Romsey Road. There would be additional school traffic and the proposals would cause major traffic disruption. The traffic jams could affect access for emergency vehicles and affect air quality. There would be harm to the character of a valued landscape. The development in the countryside would affect its tranquillity and sense of place. The CPRE had recognised the value of the landscape and that additional weight should be given to protect this. The need to protect the landscape outweighed the benefit of development for housing. As the site was located on chalk, there was some soil creep and the area was liable to flooding, which the development would make worse. The site was best suited for agriculture and the proposals would cause a visual impact. In conclusion, Councillor Laming advised that the reasons for refusal were supported.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse permission for the reasons and informatives set out in the Report and the Update sheet.

Item 2: - Alterations and additions to provide new hipped roof to existing 2 storey flat roof building and the formation of 5 flats - Cunningham House, Claylands Road, Bishops Waltham.  
Case number: 16/00218/FUL / W22675/02

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet, which referred to two letters of representation received from the agent acting for the applicant, one letter dated 2 February 2016, with the points arising addressed in the Officer's Report, and the second dated 19 July 2016, which supported the Officer's recommendation and associated conditions. It was additionally reported that the applicant had offered to make provision on site for five car parking spaces to be allocated to the five new flats, and that this would be tied by condition.

During public participation, Elizabeth Hiscock spoke in objection 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 with an additional condition with regard to car parking spaces to be allocated to the five new flats as referred to above (with exact wording delegated to Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman).

Item 3: - Variation of Condition no.4 of Application 14/01182/FUL - To allow the use of the outdoor area for children's play - Brooklands House 1637 - 1638 Parkway, Whiteley.  
Case number: 16/00772/FUL / WPP-05039992

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which provided details for the reasons for Whiteley Town Council's withdrawal of its objection to the application.

During public participation, Paul Cowley spoke in objection to the application and Jackie Barnett (applicant) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Achwal stated that she was objecting to the variation of condition 4. The applicant had ignored the condition that no outdoor activities should take place and had built a play area contained within a five foot fence. The area would be used for children up to four years of age. The applicant had removed trees from the Greenway in order to construct the fence. To grant the application would create a precedent as the owners of other business units had indicated that they would also wish to remove trees and install fencing. The application site was located 20 feet from local resident's housing and the noise from up to 30 children would be immense. The Environmental Health Officer reported that the outdoor activity would have an impact, but Councillor Achwal stated that the proposed control of hours would not be sufficient to mitigate this. She requested that the Committee visit the site before making its decision.

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 4: - Change of use of agricultural land to a pony paddock and the erection of a stable block with associated hard standing and access track- (Revised plan showing repositioning of stable block and further information) - Land East of Main Road, Otterbourne.  
Case number: 16/00686/FUL / W24458

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which detailed comments received in response to the revised plan and further information. These comments were from the Tree Officer, Environmental Health Officer, Otterbourne Parish Council and seven representations from five households. The Planning Officer's response proposed a revised condition 6 relating to the Storage and Disposal of Manure and a revised condition 9 which related to a Landscape Management Plan.

The Head of Development Management informed the meeting that the Tree Officer had also been asked to consider the inclusion of trees fronting Main Road, Otterbourne, within the Tree Protection Scheme. It was also clarified that of the three protected trees alongside the access roadway, two trees were inside the application site and one was outside.

During public participation, Will Jones, Otterbourne Parish Council, spoke in objection 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 and the Update Sheet and to include an additional condition relating to the control of lighting (with exact wording delegated to Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman).

Item 5:- Proposed demolition of existing garage and erection of detached dwelling - Well Cottage, Mincingfield Lane, Durley.  
Case number: 16/00940/FUL.

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which stated that an additional site plan and block plan showing the full size of the neighbour's (Anona) rear garden had been received; that amended drawing (500/47A) had been received showing the change from a Juliet balcony to a window on the rear elevation (and an additional planning condition in relation to this minor amendment to the fenestration would be added) and that a series of photos from Anona had been received.

During public participation, Stephen McGhee, Jane Pardoe and Lucien Warwick-Haller spoke in objection to the application.

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

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

Item 6: - Erection of 3no. dwellings with associated access and highway works, parking and turning space, landscaping and private amenity space - Land Between Alton Road and Marlands Lane, West Meon.  
Case number: SDNP/15/05317/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which detailed an additional comment relating to archaeology, which proposed an archaeological condition.

During public participation, Mike Fowler, Norma Bodtger and Roderick Davidson 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 and informatives set out in the Report and the Update Sheet.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the decisions taken on the Development Control Applications in relation to those applications inside and 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 (Cunningham House, Claylands Road, Bishops Waltham) an additional condition be included to tie the allocation of five car parking spaces to the five new flats with exact wording delegated to Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman.

(i) That in respect of item 4 (Land east of Main Road, Otterbourne), additional conditions be included relating to the Storage and Disposal of Manure (revised condition 6), to a Landscape Management Plan (revised condition 9) and an additional condition for the control of lighting, with exact wording delegated to Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman.

3. **PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS (FROM: 1 APRIL TO 30 JUNE 2016)**

(Report PDC1060 refers)

In reply to Members' questions, the Head of Development Management explained that the Council prioritised enforcement cases to make the best use of its resources. It was acknowledged that the enforcement process was complex and time consuming which in some cases led to a poor public perception of the service. Further recruitment to the Enforcement Team was currently underway to help strengthen the Team.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Report be noted.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned between 1:00pm and 2:00pm and concluded at 3.15pm.

Chairman