

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (ANTRIM HOUSE) SUB-COMMITTEE**21 August 2003**Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Bennetts (P)

Evans (P)

de Peyer (P)

Johnston (P)

Nunn (P)

Pearson (P)

Sutton (P)

Tait (P)

Officers in attendance:

Mrs S Proudlock, Planning, Team Manager (DC West)

1. PROPOSED NEW BOARDING HOUSE FOR WINCHESTER COLLEGE, ANTRIM HOUSE, ST CROSS ROAD, WINCHESTER

(Report PDC333 refers)

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting the applicant's architect (Mr Deans from Architecture PLB) and three members of the public.

The Chairman declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in this item as her sons had attended Winchester College several years previously. She continued to participate in the meeting and to vote thereon.

Mrs Proudlock explained that the Planning Development Control Committee had considered the application on 24 July 2003 and had deferred its decision pending further investigation by this Sub Committee.

The application proposed the partial demolition of Antrim House (for which Conservation Area Consent was not required) and the erection of a new boarding house, comprising accommodation and facilities for 65 students, houses for the Housemaster and his assistant, and a flat for the matron.

It was noted that the Conservation Officer was satisfied with the retention of Antrim House (but with the unattractive extension removed) and regarded the new design as attractive, with sympathetic use of materials.

It was also noted that eight letters of objection had been received which, in summary, objected to the proposals on the following grounds:-

- contrary to policies EN1 and EN2
- detriment to neighbouring properties
- loss of open space
- detriment to view
- loss of public amenity
- too large and imposing
- precedent

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Deans from Architecture PLB addressed the Sub Committee. He explained that the new application would retain the medical centre within Antrim House, and the flat roofed extension built in 1982 would be removed. The area of the proposed building was smaller than the original application and had been reduced from 3,000sq.m. to 2,400sq.m. There was dormitory style accommodation planned for boys in years 1 and 2, with individual study bedrooms, a mix of single and twin rooms, proposed for boys in years 3, 4 and 5. Other rooms included a kitchen, dining area, lounge and games room.

The proposed building would be 12m from the largest tree on the site, which was a copper beech. More trees would be introduced at the end of the proposed Housemaster's dwelling to strengthen the tree line along St Cross Road.

In answer to a Member's question regarding policies EN1 and EN2, Mrs Proudlock advised the Sub Committee that the policy did not preclude development within these areas of open space. In certain circumstances where there was a specific need such as additional buildings for educational establishments such developments could be undertaken provided it could be accommodated without harming the overall appearance of the open area.

A Member asked if Winchester College intended to establish a central dining area in the future. In response, Mr Deans advised that he understood the central dining proposal was an alternative to this application at Antrim House. He continued that Winchester College was prepared to accept a condition stating that no other development be allowed in Kingsgate Park.

In answer to Members' further questions, Mr Deans confirmed that the proposed Housemaster's dwelling had been reduced in size from 280sqm. to 200sq.m and was now 4 bedrooms within 2 storeys, reduced from 5 bedrooms within 3 storeys. He also confirmed width measurements of the proposed villa of 12.6m, and the library of 11.5m.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Chair of the Residents Association of Hanover Lodge addressed the Sub Committee. She advised that the residents broadly supported the revised proposal, although they were concerned that other applications to develop in similar areas may arise if permission was granted. In response, Mrs Proudlock explained that all applications must be considered on their individual merits and that the possible creation of a precedent was not, of itself, a valid reason for refusal.

Another member of the public, representing local residents, addressed the Sub Committee. She was concerned that the scale of the proposal was too large and the design poor, and requested that detailed plans be placed on view in Kingsgate Park so that local residents could see how much of Kingsgate Park would be lost.

Mr Keeley suggested that it may be useful to mark out the proposed buildings on site. He continued that he was not concerned about the views of the park as there were many trees. However, he was concerned that the low pitched roof may appear flat from the ground and would prefer the pitch to be increased.

During debate, several Members expressed concern at the loss of part of Kingsgate Park and the overall height and size of the Housemaster's dwelling. It was suggested that representatives from Winchester College be invited to the next meeting, as it

would be useful to know its policy with regard to accepting girl students in future and also the issue of centralised dining.

It was also suggested that the Sub Committee reconvene at a future date for a site visit followed by a public meeting. Mr Deans agreed to contact Winchester College to investigate this possibility.

RESOLVED:

That the application be deferred for further information from Winchester College and a site visit be arranged to view the proposed buildings, which should be marked out on site prior to the visit.

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 3.20pm.

Chairman