

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**13 October 2016**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Ruffell (Chairman) (P)

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

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

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Bell, Berry, Brook, Byrnes, Horrill, Hutchison, Learney, Stallard, Thompson, Warwick and Weir

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Weston (Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Built Environment)

---

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 15 September 2016 be approved and adopted.

2. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS SCHEDULE**  
(Report PDC1065 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 PDC1065.

**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 reprofiling 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' (RESUBMISSION) - Sparsholt College, Westley Lane, Sparsholt.

Case number: 16/01679/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which summarised the main points of an email received by Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) in support of the application and a letter received by the agent which referred to a number of points of clarification, together with the planning officer's response which included minor amendments to the legal agreement, the design specification of the Anaerobic Digester Plant (ADP) and the treatment of the timber cladding to the Educational Building. A section was included in the planning officer's response that considered the impact of the traffic movements on heritage assets. The Update Sheet also contained a change to the conditions to restructure them in the order of the action to be taken to act as reference for all parties to see what conditions must be complied with at any stage throughout the development process. A revised recommendation including the changes to the conditions was set out in Appendix A to the Update Sheet, Paper copies of three of the plans used in the presentation were handed out to ensure that members could clearly see the information they contained.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Council's Development Control Engineer addressed the Committee setting out the views of the Highway Authority, providing clarification regarding the proposed routing agreement preventing deliveries via certain villages, the results of the traffic impact assessment reviewing traffic flow and the proposed trip movements expected at the site. Reference was made to the meetings that had taken place between the Applicant and several Parish Councils where consideration was given to the proposed delivery route networks, in order to establish those to be best avoided. Members' questions were answered thereon.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Head of Economy & Arts addressed the Committee to help set the economic background context within which the application was being determined, specifically in relation to the benefits around employment opportunities and training in green technologies, in the context of the Council's desire to reduce carbon emissions across the District.

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

During public participation, Councillors Hutchison, Weir, Thompson, Learney and Bell spoke in support of the application in their capacity as Ward Members from the contiguous Wards of St Paul, St Barnabas and Badger Farm and Olivers Battery. A summary of their representations are outlined below:

In summary, Councillor Hutchison (St Paul) stated that, having visited the site and having seen the revised plans, she was impressed with the benefits the site could bring. This included improving agricultural training and research which she considered to be hugely important to the local economy in creating employment opportunities and providing financial savings for the college. In conclusion, she made reference to the landscape issues and emphasised that a footpath adjacent to the proposal would attract interest from those walking to and from the site and welcomed the opportunity for formation of a liaison group for local people.

In summary, Councillor Weir (St Barnabas) stated that policy guidance was clear that there was provision for growth in sustainable areas and that the proposed facility was important and beneficial for the whole of the Winchester District, by offering an educational, economic and financial contribution to the rural economy. She referred to the Council's priority to achieve low carbon developments and reduce emissions and considered that the anaerobic digester (AD) plant would allow for apprenticeships and 'hands on' working to enable growth by experience and improvement for such technologies to evolve in the future. Reference was made to the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) investment which was reliant on co-investment being secured, which had been satisfied by Ecotricity. However, failure to provide the AD Plant would result in no educational centre and the loss of an investment opportunity.

In summary, Councillor Thompson (St Paul) stated that she fully supported the application to permit the AD plant and educational building for future generations of farmers and students. She re-iterated the Council's priority to reduce its carbon footprint by achieving carbon free energy in line with the Government's 2020 carbon energy targets with the on-going effects of climate change and the need to invest in technologies like biogas in order to educate, demonstrate and learn what benefits are produced. She considered that Sparsholt College was well placed to provide such a facility and referred to the benefits outlined by the Assistant Director (Economy and Communities) as set out in the Report. In conclusion, Councillor Thompson suggested that the application addressed the concerns raised in the previous application and had received a high level of support, including from the City of Winchester Trust.

In summary, Councillor Learney (St Barnabas) stated that, although she was also a Parish Councillor for Littleton and Harestock Parish Council, she had not taken part in or attended any previous discussions in relation to this application. She stated that the Council would seek to assist economic diversity in rural areas. She welcomed the real impact on the local economy and stated that, realistically, all roads now had a diverse set of road users on them including tractors and trucks and that she considered the conditions

imposed within the application to be appropriate in giving some certainty to what additional impacts there may be. She referred to the traffic increase of 3.1% going onto the site which she deemed to have a minimal impact compared to those anticipated at other developments (such as Barton Farm).

In summary, Councillor Bell (Badger Farm and Olivers Battery) addressed the points raised by the Assistant Director (Economy and Communities) and reiterated that the LEP investment (totalling a local growth funding of £1.2m) had been secured from the Enterprise M3 Board to construct the Hampshire Centre for the Demonstration of Environmental Technologies and with co-investment this project would move forward. She stated that there was a responsibility to promote agricultural experience and encourage students towards 'real-life' work experience. In conclusion, Councillor Bell stated that she had attended the final presentation hosted by Ecotricity which included details of the proposed transport plan and that all parties had been invited to attend this event to express their concerns. She also welcomed the formation of a Liaison Board.

Councillors Horrill and Byrnes spoke in objection to the application as Ward Members. Councillor Berry also spoke in objection to the application in her capacity as Ward Member for the contiguous ward of St Barnabas. A summary of their representations are outlined below:

In summary, Councillor Horrill stated that the application should be refused locally as more than half of those in support of the application resided outside of the District. She considered that the application still included a commercial AD plant that was 24 times larger than that of a standard AD plant. She referred to the reasons for refusal of the previous application which she considered had not been overcome in full, including the submission of a masterplan for Sparsholt as a requirement of MTRA(5) and suggested that this be prepared prior to development. She felt that inadequate information had been made available regarding vehicle movements associated with the proposals and questioned the 'green' nature of the application with the pollution of the additional traffic movements outweighing any benefits. In conclusion, Councillor Horrill stated that although the success of the college in the Parish was valued, in her opinion, the application brought about huge environmental implications and was an inappropriate development against the policies contained in Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1).

In response to Councillor Horrill's representation, the Head of Development Management stated that whilst no masterplan had been submitted to accompany the application, the details related to the educational building and the AD Plant's educational aspect to the college's studies were in keeping with the aims of Policy MTRA(5) to improve the economic prosperity of the site and what it offers.

In summary, Councillor Byrnes considered the application to be an overbearing form of development which did not respond sympathetically to the surrounding area and did not meet need. The new industrial facility would increase traffic in the local area with a demonstrable adverse local impact. He

expressed concern regarding the monitoring of GPS traffic movements and queried the reliance on operators to report their own breaches. He made reference to the low carbon strategy and considered that although the Council had adopted this as a priority, it should continue to consider any application that synergised with existing policies and should not 'throw the baby out with the bathwater' and go against policies in order to achieve another. In conclusion, he stated that he considered that the application breached too many of the Council's LPP1 policies and urged the Committee to refuse the application.

In summary, Councillor Berry stated that with the volume of regeneration taking place in the Town area (i.e. the development of Barton Farm), there would be an increased pressure for recreational activities. She suggested that local residents would choose to visit the countryside and neighbouring villages for leisure and social purposes and felt that the countryside should be retained wherever possible and preserved as a local amenity. In conclusion, Councillor Berry stated that although she supported Sparsholt College and young farmers, this was a largely commercial venture where the College would benefit financially at the expense of the loss of countryside space and therefore she could not support the application.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons (and subject to the Section 106 agreement, conditions in order of implementation as set out in Appendix A of the Update Sheet and informatives), set out in the Report.

Item 2: - (AMENDED SCHEME 21/06/16) Erection of 99 residential units, associated public open space, residents car park, landscaping, access car parking and partial realignment of the Hambledon Road/Anmore Road junction – Land bounded by Tanners Lane, Kidmore Lane and Anmore Road, Denmead .

Case number: 15/02714/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet, which outlined a letter received from Denmead Village Association and the planning officer's response. In addition, amendments to the wording within the recommendation and conditions were set out, as highlighted in bold below; informatives to include reference to the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan (DNP) omitted in error within informative 3 to read: Denmead Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2031 (Made 2015): Policy 2(i) and Policy 3.

Recommendation:

S106 Heads of Terms:

The wording of one of the Heads of Terms changed from 'Provision of highway access to the land at Tanners Lane site' to '**Layout to accommodate a potential future access to the Tanners Lane site**'.

Conditions:

The wording of Condition 09, as follows:

‘Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted detailed information (in the form of SAP design stage data and a BRE water calculator) demonstrating that **the development as a whole** meets the Code 4 standard for energy and water (as defined by the ENE1 and WAT 1 in the Code for Sustainable Homes) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be built in accordance with these findings.’

The Head of Drainage answered questions from Members in respect of the drainage strategy and confirmed he was satisfied based on the information that had been submitted.

During public participation, Peter Ambrose (Chair of Denmead Village Association), Kenneth Williams and Councillor Langford-Smith (Denmead Parish Council representative) spoke in objection to the application and David Butcher (Applicant) and Steve Millard spoke in support of the application and all answered Members’ questions thereon.

During public participation Councillor Stallard and Councillor Brook spoke on this item as Ward Members.

Councillor Stallard made a personal statement that, due to illness she was not able to read her statement personally but that she had appointed Neil Lander-Brinkley to read her representation to the Committee on her behalf.

In summary, it was noted that Councillor Stallard considered that the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan (DNP) had not been given full weight in the delivery of this development proposal. She suggested that the development did not comply with the DNP and was opposed to its proposals and that the local plan inspector who had previously considered the site for development of ‘about’ 90 dwellings had given the clear case for a flexible mix with a plus or minus tolerance. Therefore, 99 dwellings was considered excessive. She stated that as a result of the 2015 Denmead Neighbourhood Plan Referendum, it was agreed that a large community space for a village green was essential as part of the development of this site and that this could not be achieved with the proposed application for 99 dwellings. Councillor Stallard suggested that to achieve 99 dwellings, previously proposed smaller houses had been changed to 1 bedrooled flats for which there was no demand in the area. This has resulted in a development that did not resemble one whole development area. She considered it essential for the implementation and maintenance of the Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) to be delivered on site and to ensure residents were aware of who held responsibility for this. In conclusion, Councillor Stallard urged the Committee to reject this application.

In response, the Principal Planning Officer (Strategic Planning) reported that within the DNP, the inspector had made a prefix to change ‘up to’ to ‘about’ in relation to the 90 dwellings on site. This allowed for a plus or minus to the number of dwellings of up to 10%, without harm to the development.

In summary, Councillor Brooks stated that she strongly objected to the application on the grounds that the development was contrary to LPP1 and due to concerns relating to poor drainage and issues in the area. She stated that the development was sited in an area liable for flooding, whereby drainage onto the highway already existed and the development would exacerbate this issue. An improved SUD system was required on site, similar to that used at the Berewood development to mitigate flood risks. Councillor Brooks considered that the current sewerage system could not accommodate the needs of 99 dwellings and suggested that, should the Committee be minded to approve the application, a condition be imposed to ensure drainage work commenced on site prior to the development so not to exacerbate the risk of flooding. Southern Water were already aware of the drainage concerns in this area. She stated that the application was contrary to the DNP and LPP1 in that the provision of recreational open space did not meet the standards contained in LPP1 with affordable housing also significantly smaller, showing clear disregard and lack of adherence to the DNP.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application for the following reasons: the provision of 99 dwellings on the site results in a cramped layout harmful to the character of the area contrary to the DNP and policies in LPP1 and LPP2. The size of the 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings proposed for the affordable housing falls below those set out in LPP1 and LPP2. No S106 legal agreement had been signed, and the proposal did not therefore secure 40% affordable housing; provision and future management of a multi use games area and open space and highway access onto Tanners Lane and the downgrading and extinguishment of part of Anmore Road, and therefore reasons for refusal were recommended in this respect. The exact wording of the reasons for refusal were delegated to the Head of Development Management, for finalisation in consultation with the Chairman.

Item 3: - Demolish existing garage block, poor residential extensions and erect a subservient extension to improve facilities for disability purposes with sanitary facilities at first floor and a new garage block –Corner Cottage, Woodman Lane, Sparsholt.  
Case number: 16/01581/FUL

During public participation, John Little spoke in objection to the application and Peter Matthews (Agent for Inter Space Design) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Horrill stated that she was speaking on behalf of the applicant and in support of the application which would provide necessary access for all the family to ensure facilities on one level to meet the physical needs of the applicant. The application was for a local family whose link to their wider family was crucial. Councillor Horrill stated that there had been general support for the application locally and urged the Committee to take

into account the need to make the property usable for all members of the family.

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

Item 4:- Demolish existing garage block, poor residential extensions and erect a subservient extension to improve facilities for disability purposes with sanitary facilities at first floor and a new garage block – Corner Cottage, Woodman Lane, Sparsholt.  
Case number: 16/01582/LIS

During public participation, Peter Matthews (Agent for Inter Space Design) 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.

Item 5: - Demolish existing garage block and poor residential extensions and erect a subservient extension to improve facilities for disability purposes with sanitary facilities at first floor and a new garage block. The extension to be thatched to match the existing with a simple clay tile link – Corner Cottage, Woodman Lane, Sparsholt.  
Case number: 16/01600/FUL

During public participation, Peter Matthews (Agent for Inter Space Design) spoke in support of the application.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to defer the decision to a meeting of the Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee to be held on Monday 31 October 2016 at 11.30am. The Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee would assess the relationship between the existing garage and proposed extension, in context with the listed building and surrounding area.

Item 6: - Demolish existing garage block and poor residential extensions and erect a subservient extension to improve facilities for disability purposes with sanitary facilities at first floor and a new garage block. The extension to be thatched to match the existing with a simple clay tile link – Corner Cottage, Woodman Lane, Sparsholt.  
Case number: 16/01601/LIS

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to defer the decision to a meeting of the Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee to be held on Monday 31 October 2016 at 11.30am. The Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee would assess the relationship between the existing garage and proposed extension, in context with the listed building and surrounding area.



## RESOLVED:

1. That the decisions taken on the Development Control Applications 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 granted for the reasons (and subject to the Section 106 agreement, conditions in order of implementation, as set out in Appendix A of the Update Sheet and informatives), set out in the Report;

(ii) That in respect of item 2 (Land bounded by Tanners Lane, Kidmore Lane and Anmore Road, Denmead) planning permission be refused for the following reasons: the provision of 99 dwellings on the site results in a cramped layout harmful to the character of the area contrary to the DNP and policies in LPP1 and LPP2. The size of the 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings proposed for the affordable housing falls below those set out in LPP1 and LPP2. No S.106 legal agreement had been signed, and the proposal did not therefore secure 40% affordable housing; provision and future management of a multi use games area and open space and highway access onto Tanners Lane and the downgrading and extinguishment of part of Anmore Road, and therefore reasons for refusal were recommended in this respect. The wording of the reasons for refusal delegated to the Head of Development Management for finalisation in consultation with the Chairman; and

(iii) That, in respect of items 5 & 6 (Corner Cottage, Woodman Lane, Sparsholt), the items be deferred to a meeting of the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee to be held on Monday 31 October 2016 at 11.30am in order to assess the relationship between the existing garage and proposed extension, in context with the listed building and surrounding area.

3. **MINUTES OF PLANNING (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE HELD ON 26 SEPTEMBER 2016**

(Report PDC1066 refers)

## RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee, held on 26 September 2016 (relating to The Anchorage, Northbrook, Micheldever), be received (attached as Appendix A to these minutes).

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned between 1:00pm and 2:00pm and concluded at 5:20pm

Chairman