

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**28 August 2003**Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
 Bennetts (P)
 Beveridge (P)
 Davies (P)
 de Peyer (P)
 Evans (P)
 Hatch (P)
 Hammerton (P)

Johnston (P)
 Nunn (P)
 Pearce (P)
 Pearson (P)
 Read (P)
 Sutton (P)
 Tait (P)

Others in attendance:

Councillors Craig, Pines and Porter

360. **MEMBERSHIP OF SUB-COMMITTEES**

RESOLVED:

1. That a Planning Development Control (Police HQ, Winchester) Sub-Committee be established to consider and recommend upon all re-development proposals for the Hampshire Police HQ site, Romsey Road, Winchester, and that the following Members be appointed to serve thereon for the remainder of the 2003/04 Municipal Year:-

<u>Lib Dem (5)</u>	<u>Conservative (2)</u>	<u>Labour (1)</u>	<u>Independent (1)</u>
Beveridge	Baxter	de Peyer	Busher
Evans	Read		
Hatch			
Johnston			
Sutton			

2. That the meeting be held on Tuesday 9 September 2003 at 2pm in the Guildhall, Winchester.

361. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**
(Report PDC338 refers)

The schedule of development control decisions arising from the consideration of the above report is circulated separately and forms an appendix to the minutes.

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 6 as he was a Member of the City of Winchester Trust which had commented on that application, and he spoke and voted thereon. Councillors Beveridge and Evans declared personal and prejudicial interests in respect of item 5, as they had given prior consideration to the site as Members of Cabinet. They both left the meeting during consideration of that item.

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 5 and 6 as he was a Member of the City of Winchester Trust which had commented on those applications, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Four items were the subject of public participation as follows:-

In respect of item 2 – land adjacent to 5/6 Bridgets Lane, Martyr Worthy, Mr Buchan-Hepburn spoke in support. After discussion, the Committee agreed to refuse the application for the reasons set out in the above report, subject to an additional reason regarding lack of contribution to public open space.

In respect of item 3 – Sutton Court, Bishops Sutton Road, Bishops Sutton, Mrs Nankivell spoke against the application. Following discussion, the Committee agreed to grant the application subject to the conditions set out in the above report, provided that there was submission of satisfactory details for the disposal of foul sewage.

In respect of item 5 – Garage Court at Fivefields Road, Winchester, the Reverend Canon Baston spoke against the application. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Craig and Pines (as Ward Members) supported the concerns already expressed and highlighted a number of related issues. In summary, they pointed out that the garages were all currently rented and most used for the storage of cars; the loss of this parking (and the apparent lack of any replacement) would cause on-street parking problems for residents and potential obstructions for the local buses. The alleyway to the side of the proposed building was already subject to misuse and the new development did nothing to improve the situation. Issues regarding crime and disorder and human rights did not appear to have been fully addressed and a wider ranging consultation exercise should be undertaken. Council officers had stated that the Council would manage the tree bank once development had been completed, but as this did not happen elsewhere, there were doubts whether such maintenance would actually take place with this scheme. Finally, there appeared to be very little consideration given to the real risk of land slippage, which was a serious concern once the tree root system and the bank had been disturbed during building works.

Following discussion, the Committee agreed to defer the application to allow:- a structural survey of the bank to be undertaken; further comments from English Nature to be considered regarding the ecology issues affecting the bank; clarification of any proposals for future maintenance of the bank by the City Council; an opportunity to consider the findings of the John Thompson Community Planning report issued that day; an improved proposal to minimise any mis-use of the alleyway; and consideration of traffic calming measures, possibly linked to the Safer Routes to School Initiative.

In respect of item 7 – Lone Barn, Easton Lane, Easton, Mr J Higgins spoke in support of the application. After discussion, the Committee supported the reasons for refusal as set out in the above report.

In respect of item 1 – Low Hill Farm, Portsmouth Road, Fishers Pond, it was agreed that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the above report, provided that a revised landscaping scheme was submitted showing a re-formed earth bund.

In respect of item 6 – 55 Dean Lane, Winchester, Councillor Porter (a Ward Member) drew attention to various contraventions which had taken place on this site. After discussion, the Committee agreed to grant the application subject to the conditions set out in the above report, and to amending Condition 03 to include the submission of a landscaping scheme.

RESOLVED:

1. That the decisions taken on the development control applications, as set out in the schedule which forms an appendix to the minutes, be agreed.

2. That item 5 be deferred for further investigation into the matters listed above.

362. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**
(Report PDC334 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 5 August 2003 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

After discussion, the Committee agreed that the issues listed in the minutes had been satisfactorily dealt with and therefore planning permission should be granted, subject to the conditions as circulated at the meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 5 August 2003 and the recommendation contained therein be approved, together with the list of conditions as circulated at the meeting, which now form an appendix to those minutes.

363. **TEMPORARY TIMBER HUTS AT PONDSIDE FARMHOUSE, NEW ROAD, MEONSTOKE (WAG253)**
(Report PDC335 refers)

RESOLVED:

That planning permission for the above development be refused for the following reason:-

The proposed development is contrary to policies C1 and E6 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review and Proposals C1, C7, EN5 and EN7 of the Winchester District Local Plan, and would be likely to prejudice the emerging countryside and natural environment policies of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that it would represent an undesirable intrusion into an area of countryside which has been designated an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 5.45pm.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**5 August 2003****Attendance:**

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

de Peyer (P)

Johnston (P)

Nunn (P)

Sutton (P)

Others in Attendance:

Councillor Rees

Officers in Attendance:

Mrs J Pinnock (Planner)

Mr N Culhane (Highways Engineer)

364. ERECTION OF 1 NO. THREE BEDROOM DWELLING WITH NEW ACCESS AT LAND ADJACENT TO 16 SHERIDAN CLOSE, WINCHESTER

The Sub-Committee met at 16 Sheridan Close, where the Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately 15 local residents and Councillor Rees as a Ward Member. Mrs Pinnock explained that both the applicant and their agent were unable to attend the meeting.

The Sub-Committee had been formed following consideration at the Planning Development Control Committee on 24 July 2003. Mrs Pinnock stated that the officers had recommended to Members the application's approval as it met current planning policies.

Mrs Pinnock explained that the application had proposed one detached three bedroom house on land adjacent to 16 Sheridan Close, Winchester with new access. She reported that the Committee had expressed concerns over the parking arrangements, emergency access into Sheridan Close, the effect of the levels on the site and the boundary treatment within the site.

Mrs Pinnock reported that the applicant had submitted revised plans following the 24 July meeting and had now proposed to provide three off-street car parking spaces on site – two for the new property and one for the existing 16 Sheridan Close. Mrs Pinnock stated that these spaces were likely to feature a drop in levels from the existing footpath within the Close.

The Sub-Committee viewed the site on which the applicant had pegged out the footprint of the new building and Members noted that this would stand approximately 2.4 metres from 16 Sheridan Close, following the proposed demolition of the existing lean-to outbuilding/storage area.

With regard to the levels at the site, it was noted that the applicant had not prepared the further information requested by officers, but Mrs Pinnock reported that the ridgeline of the new dwelling was proposed to be only 115mm shorter than the existing 16 Sheridan Close.

Members noted that the applicant had proposed that the existing hedging was to be retained along the front boundary, except where it was punctuated by the proposed parking. The boundary to the side between the application site and number 16, would have a 1.2m high close boarded fence, and a 1.8m high close-boarded fence was proposed for the rear boundary.

Mrs Pinnock stated that three letters of objection had been received concerning the application and that one of these had contained a petition, which included the signatures of 40 local residents. She summarised that their principal concerns had focused on the issue of car parking and road safety.

Councillor Rees spoke in opposition to the application. He commented that the estate had been originally created with careful consideration to the spaces between the buildings to offer views across Winchester and that this was threatened by this application. Councillor Rees made other comments against the application including the problems created by the site's levels.

In response to further comments from Councillor Rees, Mr Culhane explained that planning permission was not required to provide a dropped kerb, and that the applicant reserved the right, as did any other resident of the Close, to request a dropped kerb for the car parking spaces regardless of the outcome of the current planning application. He further explained that as the Close was not a through road, and therefore unclassified, this request was likely to be successful. Consequently this would reduce the potential for on-street parking as it was illegal to block an access.

At the invitation of the Chairman, several members of the public in attendance also spoke against the application. Some suggested that the new property was likely to become a house of multiple occupancy and would therefore create a greater pressure for car parking spaces in what they considered to be an already over-crowded Close.

The Chairman stated that the potential occupancy of the dwelling, or whether it would be commercially let, was not a material consideration. However, if the applicant intended to link the two properties at a future date, this would require planning permission.

Others commented on the access difficulties experienced by emergency vehicles because of the on-street parking, the potential disruption caused during the dwelling's construction, and the loss of light to the property at the rear.

In response, Mr Culhane explained that the application met the parking standards for a new detached dwelling. He suggested that the residents take this issue up with their Ward Members and the Council's Parking Office with a view to introducing a Parking Order in the Close. However he explained that this was likely to reduce the amount of on-street parking.

In conclusion, the Sub-Committee agreed in principle with the development of the dwelling, but sought further information from officers on car parking, the site's levels, the loss of light to neighbouring properties and the possibility of increasing the gap between the proposed dwelling and 16 Sheridan Close.

RECOMMENDED

That the application for the development of a three bedroom dwelling with new access adjacent to 16 Sheridan Close be approved, subject to the satisfactory conclusion of the following issues:

- a.) car parking
- b.) the site's levels
- c.) loss of light
- d.) the preservation of gaps between properties

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 10.30am.

Chairman

(NB: a list of conditions as submitted to and approved by the Planning Development Control Committee held on 28 August 2003 is attached as Annex 1)

ANNEX 1**List of conditions as submitted to and approved by the Planning Development Control Committee held on 28 August 2003**

THAT PROVIDED THE APPLICANT IS PREPARED TO MAKE APPROPRIATE PROVISION FOR PUBLIC OPEN SPACE THROUGH THE OPEN SPACE FUNDING SYSTEM, THEN PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:-

Amended Plans received on 18th August 2003

Conditions/Reasons

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. No development shall take place until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwelling hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure that the development presents a satisfactory appearance in the interests of the amenities of the area.
3. The parking spaces hereby approved shall not be used for any other purposes than the parking of cars.
Reason: To ensure the provision and retention of the parking spaces in the interests of the local amenity and highway safety.
4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order, with or without modification), no windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall, at any time, be constructed in the rear elevation of the dwelling hereby permitted.
Reason: To protect the amenity and privacy of the adjoining residential properties.
5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Classes A, B, C, D and E of Parts 1 of Schedule 2 of the Order, shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To protect the amenities of the locality and to maintain a good quality environment.

Informatives:

1. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB3, H1, T2, R2
Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: H.1, EN.5, T.9, RT.3
Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit:
H.2, DP.3, T.1, T.2, RT.3
2. All building works including demolition, construction and machinery or plant operation should only be carried out between the hours of 0800 and 1800 hrs Monday to Friday and 0800 and 1300 hrs Saturday and at no time on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Where allegations of noise from such works are substantiated by the Environmental Health and Housing Department, a notice limiting the hours of operation under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 may be served
3. No materials should be burnt on site, where allegations of statutory nuisance are substantiated by the Environmental Health and Housing Department, an Abatement Notice may be served under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The applicant is reminded that the emission of dark smoke through the burning of materials is a direct offence under the Clean Air Act. 1993.
4. The applicant is advised that the materials indicated on the plans are not hereby approved. In accordance with condition 02 of this planning permission details and samples of the proposed materials must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.