

PLANNING COMMITTEE

18 August 2016

Attendance:

Councillors:

Ruffell (Chairman) (P)

Evans (P)

Izard (P)

Jeffs (P)

Laming (P)

McLean (P)

Read (P)

Scott (P)

Tait (P)

Deputy Members:

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Byrnes and Learney

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Weston (Portfolio Holder for Built Environment)

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 21 July 2016 be approved and adopted.

2. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS SCHEDULE**
(Report PDC1062 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 PDC1062.

By way of personal statement, Councillor Evans declared that she had pre-determined her decision in respect of item 5 (Wykeham Court, Winchester Road, Wickham). She spoke on this item under public participation as a Ward Member, sitting apart from the Committee and taking no part in the vote thereon.

By way of personal statement, Councillor Laming declared that he had predetermined his decision in respect of item 2 (South Park Homes, Olivers Battery Gardens, Olivers Battery, Winchester). He sat apart from the Committee and took no part in the vote thereon.

By way of personal statement, Councillor Jeffs stated that in respect of item 3 (Friarsgate Car Park, Tanner Street, Winchester) he had been a Portfolio Holder when it was decided to close the car park, but he had not predetermined the decision in relation to this planning application and would therefore speak and vote thereon.

By way of personal statement, Councillors Izard and Read stated that in respect of item 3 (Friarsgate Car Park, Tanner Street, Winchester) they had both been appointed to the Council's Central Winchester Regeneration Informal Policy Group which had not yet met, but this did not prejudice their decision to speak and vote thereon.

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

Item 1: - Redevelopment of the site; demolition of existing dwelling. Erection of 15 no. dwellings (6 no. 2 bedroom, 9 no. 3 bedroom) (RESUBMISSION) – Teg Down House, 29 Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester.

Case number: 15/02886/FUL / W23778/02

In response to Members' questions, the Head of Development Management explained that the Chilbolton Avenue Local Area Design Statement (CALADS) would be reviewed after completion of the Local Plan Part 2 process, now that more of Chilbolton Avenue had been developed.

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

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission subject to a S106 agreement and for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Report.

Item 2: - Change of use to allow for the replacement of caravan storage area with 8 residential park homes.

South View Park Homes, Olivers Battery Gardens, Olivers Battery, Winchester

Case number: 16/00013/FUL / W14317/04

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet, which referred to the reason for refusal number 2 (affordable housing) being withdrawn as park homes were not dwelling houses that were subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) or affordable housing policy. In addition, 9 additional representations of support had been received since publication of the Report, none of which raised no new issues.

During public participation, Andrew Dowell 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.

Item 3: - Part demolition of Friarsgate Multi Storey Car Park to form a surface, ground and upper ground level surface car park.
Friarsgate Car Park, Tanner Street, Winchester
Case number: 16/01222/FUL / WPP-05174200

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which stated that an amended plan had been submitted on 11 August 2016 showing the correct site area outlined in red and that one further letter of objection had been received, raising similar issues to those covered previously together with concerns that the proposal would pre-empt the car parking review and a possible movement study for central Winchester. It was also stated that there were many empty spaces in Winchester's car parks.

During public participation, Chris Gillham and Phil Gagg spoke in objection to the application and Graeme Todd and Kevin Warren (from the applicant's Estates team) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Byrnes spoke on this item as the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Professional Services.

In summary, Councillor Byrnes stated that the application was not a proposal by the Council to build any new car parks, as there was already a 240 space car park on site although it could not be used as it had become unsafe. The application was to remove the unsafe portion of the building and re-commission the remaining which totalled approximately 30 spaces. It had been stated that there was plenty of spare capacity to in the City's car parks already, but any car park operating at 85% capacity or greater was considered full. At this level of occupancy, people were less inclined to find remaining spaces and would simply circulate around the one way system looking for alternatives, or go somewhere else altogether. The data published within the on-going parking survey had shown that some sites were operating at 96% or 97% capacity; this was higher than had been anticipated and demonstrated the pressure on the parking infrastructure. The Council had recently closed the Chesil Street Surface Car Park and the Upper Brook Street Car Park was scheduled for closure with the arrival of the new St Clements surgery, and therefore car parking in this part town had decreased.

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.

Item 4: - Outline application for the development of the site up to 45 dwellings (including 40% affordable housing and at least 8 self build units), public

access, open space and barn for conversion for community use, together with associated landscaping and parking. All matters to be reserved except access.

Land Adjacent The Down House, Harestock Road, Winchester

Case number: 16/01188/OUT

The Head of Development Management stated that policies CP18 and CP20 should be added to reason for refusal number 3.

During public participation, Patrick Cunningham, Littleton and Harestock Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application and Mr Welch (applicant) spoke in support and answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillors Byrnes and Learney spoke on this item as Ward Members.

In summary, Councillor Byrnes stated that the application was not suitable for approval for several reasons. It contravened a number of planning policies and principles, primarily that the application site was designated as a local gap in Local Plan Part 1 and should be protected, and that it was highly likely that Local Plan Part 2 would confirm that position and reinforce that there was no need for additional green field or exception site development in this location. The development would physically diminish the local gap as well as reduce the visual amenity and landscape character and would make a negative contribution to the local environment. The plans were also outside of the settlement boundary. It would adversely impact on the effectiveness of the landscape buffer between the edge of Harestock and the rural landscape surroundings, which prevented Littleton and Harestock becoming one single settlement. The addition of 45 units would add to issues of parking and speed limits along Harestock Road. Opposite the site was a children's nursery and within 150 metres two Care Homes and a popular football field. There was no parking proposed within the application site for users of the open space and this could lead to an increase in unsafe on street parking. The forthcoming Barton Farm development would increase traffic volumes and having further housing development would exacerbate an existing problem. There was support for providing more housing for people, but this application was in the wrong place and was of the wrong nature and would have a significant negative impact on local residents and undermine planning policies.

In summary, Councillor Learney stated that the application contained a good offer for public benefit, but it was outside of planning policy, which was bolstered by the conclusions of the Planning Inspector for Local Plan Part 2, who had concluded that there was no urgent necessity to review the boundary on the existing built up area. Other planning policy contraventions were outlined in the report. The application was not needed, it would diminish the local gap and an exception should not be made in this case.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Report subject to policies CP18 and CP20 being added to reason for refusal number 3.

Item 5:-Removal of condition 26 of 13/00212/FUL pedestrian access
Wykeham Court, Winchester Road, Wickham
Case number: 16/01048/FUL / WPP-05120302

The Head of Development Management explained that contact had been made with Hampshire County Council, who was responsible for the offsite highway works as required by the Section 106 and Section 278 Highways agreements to a length of Winchester Road, which would lead to safety improvements. It was reported that there remained some minor amendments to the offsite highways scheme which was close to finalisation.

During public participation, Christopher Williams spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Evans stated that the application was important locally, with all three local Ward Members in objection and also the Parish Council. The McCarthy and Stone development's principal entrance fronted onto Winchester Road and was not gated, with the rear used for deliveries and emergency access only. The access to Tanfield Lane was narrow and serviced in excess of 50 houses. The Montessori Nursery was also accessed by the Lane. There was no reason for residents of the McCarthy and Stone development to use the rear access to walk to The Square, nor was there a right of way to the golf course as the access was by consent. The McCarthy and Stone development had 21 parking spaces for 31 flats and there had been a case of the gate lock number becoming known to residents which had led to parking in Tanfield. To allow access would lead to extra traffic using the Lane, including bulky mobility scooters. The McCarthy and Stone residents would have been aware of the condition when moving into the development and there were highway improvements to be implemented (to Winchester Road) and the residents of Tanfield had been promised that the rear access to the McCarthy and Stone development would be just for emergencies and deliveries.

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

Item 6: - Siting of 18 shipping containers within the perimeter of the open
yard.
Mount Edgecombe, Forest Road, Denmead, Waterlooville.
Case number: 16/01381/FUL / W.

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which stated that the policy section should refer to the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan. There were no relevant policies that related to this application. In addition, Denmead Parish Council's comments were as follows: 'The Parish Council of Denmead raised a strong objection against the proposal and cited the following reasons: (a) The proposal would have an

adverse impact on the amenity of the area which can be easily seen from Creech Woods. (b) The proposal would be an overdevelopment of the site. (c) There appears to be new high fencing erected around the site without the necessary planning permission. (d) Other work also appears to be taking place within the site including the siting of a number of additional shipping containers and a large excavation’.

During public participation, Kevin Andreoli (Denmead Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Sonia Blackman (Applicant) spoke in support and answered Members’ questions thereon. In answer to a Member’s question, the applicant stated that if the application was granted, the containers would be painted an olive green colour.

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.

Item 7: - Construction of a single storey rear extension with associated decking and pergola. Garage conversion with associated external alterations. Replacement and alterations to windows, external cladding materials and roof. Internal alterations.
18 Rozelle Close, Littleton
Case number: 16/00982/FUL / WPP-05114196

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which stated that the applicant’s agent had drawn attention to the comments of a neighbour reported in the agenda as an objection. It had been pointed out that the neighbour was commenting on the render finish and drawing attention to a good example of the use of render elsewhere in the Close and not specifically raising objection. Thus the Report should be read as letters received from two neighbours, one objecting for the reasons stated in the officer report and the other commenting on the use of render.

During public participation, John Biddleconde spoke in objection to the application and Ryan Harris (Applicant) spoke in support 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.

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 4 (Land adjacent to the Down House, Harestock Road, Winchester) the application be refused

permission for the reasons set out in the Report subject to policies CP18 and CP20 being added to reason for refusal number 3.

3. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2164 – LAND AT TRAWSCOED, RARERIDGE LANE, BISHOPS WALTHAM**

(Report PDC1056 refers)

During public participation, Craig Tickner spoke in objection to the confirmation and answered Members' questions thereon.

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 2164 be confirmed.

4. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2165 – LAND AT TRELISSICK, COLDEN COMMON**

(Report PDC1057 refers)

By way of personal statement, Councillor Izard declared that he had pre-determined his decision in respect of this item and sat apart from the Committee and took no part in the vote thereon.

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which referred to a correction, in that TPO 2165 was made on 11 March 2016 and would expire on 10 September 2016 if not confirmed.

During public participation, Pam Glasspool, Colden Common Parish Council, spoke in support of the confirmation and answered Members' questions thereon.

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 2165 be confirmed.

5. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2177 – LAND AT TRELISSICK, COLDEN COMMON**

(Report PDC1063 refers)

By way of personal statement, Councillor Izard declared that he had pre-determined his decision in respect of this item and sat apart from the Committee and took no part in the vote thereon.

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which referred to a correction, in that TPO 2177 was made on 8 July 2016 and would expire on 7 January 2017 if not confirmed. It was also stated that the location map appended to the Report had some location name place inaccuracies and these were explained.

During public participation, Pam Glasspool, Colden Common Parish Council, spoke in support of the confirmation and answered Members' questions thereon.

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 2177 be confirmed.

6. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2166 – EASTCLIFFE, EAST HILL, WINCHESTER**
(Report PDC1058 refers)

Councillor Read left the meeting for consideration of this item and did not take part in the vote thereon.

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 2166 be confirmed.

7. **MINUTES OF PLANNING (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE HELD ON 14 JULY 2016**
(Report PDC1059 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee, held on 14 July 2016 (relating to The Anchorage, 75 Downs Way, South Wonston, Winchester; Old Orchard, 79 Downs Road, South Wonston, Winchester; Smallwood, Cross Way, Shawford, Winchester and Firgrove, 65 Anmore Road, Denmead), be received (attached as Appendix A to these minutes).

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned between 12:40pm and 2:00pm and concluded at 4.40pm.

Chairman