

PLANNING (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE

24 November 2015

Attendance:

Councillors:

Ruffell (Chairman) (P)

Dibden (P)
Evans (P)
Izard (P)
Jefferies (P)

Johnston (P)
McLean (P)
Scott (P)
Tait (P)

Officers in attendance:

Mrs J Pinnock – Head of Development Management
Mr N Billington – Planning Officer
Mrs F Sutherland – Planning and Information Solicitor

1. **DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

By way of a personal statement, Councillor McLean explained that although he shared the same surname as the applicant, they were not related in any way.

Councillor Scott made a personal statement that this item was within his Ward. However, he had not been in discussion with the applicant or the residents raising objection and had therefore not predetermined the application. He took part in discussions and the vote thereon.

2. **(HOUSEHOLDER) ERECTION OF A SINGLE PERGOLA IN THE REAR GARDEN (RETROSPECTIVE)**
3 WOODFIELD DRIVE, WINCHESTER
CASE NUMBER: 15/01893/FUL / W16438/03

(Extract from Report PDC1037 Item 2 and Update Sheet of 12 November 2015 refers)

At its meeting held on 12 November 2015, the Planning Committee agreed that the above application be referred to the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee for determination, to allow Members to assess any possible overbearing caused by the structure on neighbouring properties, in accordance with Policy DP3. Public participation had taken place at the meeting of the Committee held on 12 November 2015 whereby Mairead Whiting and Bevan Smedley (residents of 5 Woodfield Drive and 14 Kilham Lane respectively) spoke in objection and Chris Ward (Agent) spoke in support. Councillor Green had also spoken on this item as a Ward Member.

Therefore, immediately prior to the public meeting, the Viewing Sub-Committee visited the application site where Members observed the location of the structure, and viewed the impact of the structure from the gardens of neighbouring properties at No. 5 Woodfield Drive and No. 14 Kilham Lane.

The Head of Development Management presented the application to re-familiarise Members of the proposal and clarified that the application had been taken to the Planning Committee for determination based on the height of part of the pergola structure, which at over 2.5 metres was not covered within permitted development and answered Members' questions thereon.

During debate, it was noted that whilst on site, Members had clarified the proximity of the structure on neighbouring properties and had taken the opportunity to assess the impact of the glare from the roofing materials on No. 5 Woodfield Drive.

The Committee considered that the distance of the structure from the objector's property at No.14 Kilham Lane did not represent material planning harm or result in a detrimental impact or loss of amenity.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse permission as Members considered that the structure had an overbearing affect, particularly in relation to the neighbouring property of No. 5 Woodfield Drive in its current form.

RESOLVED:

That the planning application in relation to No. 3 Woodfield Drive, Winchester (Case number: 15/01893/FUL refers), be refused for the following reason.

Reason:

The development by virtue of its size, siting and height results in an overbearing form of development harmful to the amenities of the occupier of No. 5 Woodfield Drive due to the close proximity to the boundary and glare, as a result of the roofing material. Contrary to saved Policy DP.3 of the Winchester District Local Plan 2006 and the High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document March 2015.

The meeting commenced at 11.00am and concluded at 11.45am

Chairman