

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**23 October 2003**Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

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

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

Others in attendance:

Councillors Allgood, Mitchell and Wagner

573. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (POLICE HEADQUARTERS, WINCHESTER) SUB-COMMITTEE**
 (Report PDC362 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Police Headquarters, Winchester) Sub-Committee held on 29 September 2003 (attached as Appendix B to the minutes).

The Chairman referred to a letter received from Mr P Kernaghan, the Chief Constable for Hampshire Constabulary, addressed to the Chief Executive of the City Council, which set out various reasons in support of the application. A copy of this letter was circulated to Members and the public at the meeting, and a copy is held on the planning file. It was reported by the Chairman that the Chief Executive would be meeting with the Chief Constable to answer points raised in the letter and to seek progress in resolving issues relating to the application.

Councillor Pearson stated that, although he was not a Member of the Sub-Committee, he had been in attendance for its meeting.

Following debate, the recommendations to refuse the application were agreed as set out subject to the deletion of the words "visual amenities of the area generally and of the occupiers of such properties in particular", at the top of page 4 which had been repeated from Recommendation 1.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Police Headquarters, Winchester) Sub Committee held on 29 September 2003 be approved and adopted.

574. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC354 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 22 September 2003 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

The Director of Development Services reported that the Sub-Committee had agreed to grant planning permission subject to no further objections on the amended plans being received. However, objections to the amended plans had been received from Littleton and Harestock Parish Council, who had requested that the top of the mast be painted a suitable colour. The Director pointed out that this request was covered by Resolution 7 which stated that the mast be painted olive green and therefore the request of the Parish Council had been met.

The Committee, therefore, agreed to grant planning permission as set out.

RESOLVED:

That having taken into consideration the comments of Littleton and Harestock Parish Council as set out above, the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub Committee held on 29 September 2003 be approved and adopted.

575. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC361 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 6 October 2003 (attached as Appendix C to the minutes).

In respect of the application at Greenhill Close, Winchester, the Committee agreed that a condition be added to provide a fence for the protection of the amenity of gardens for neighbours during the construction period.

It was also noted that both the Greenhill Close and Sparkford Close, Winchester, applications were subject to appeal and, therefore, the Committee needed to decide the action it would have taken should the applications not have been the subject of an appeal.

RESOLVED:

That should the applications at Greenhill Close and Sparkford Close, Winchester, not be the subject of planning appeals, the recommendation for approval in respect of 14 Greenhill Close, Winchester, and the recommendation for refusal in respect of 15 Sparkford Close, Winchester, be approved and adopted as set out in the above report.

576. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (ANTRIM HOUSE) SUB-COMMITTEE**
(Report PDC363 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Antrim House) Sub-Committee held on 7 October 2003 (attached as Appendix D to the minutes).

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item as his wife was employed by the College and withdrew for its consideration.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Antrim House) Sub-Committee held on 7 October 2003 be approved and adopted.

577. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE**
(Report PDC365 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 9 October 2003 (attached as Appendix E to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 9 October 2003 be received.

578. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (CHILBOLTON AVENUE, WINCHESTER) SUB-COMMITTEE**
(Report PDC364 refers)

The Chairman noted that this item had not been notified for inclusion on the agenda within the statutory deadline due to the short amount of time available to prepare the Sub-Committee minutes from the meeting taking place on 13 October 2003.

The Chairman agreed to accept the item as a matter requiring urgent consideration because of the need to approve the minutes at the earliest opportunity.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to the Sub-Committee's recommendation for refusal, as set out.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester) Sub-Committee held on 13 October 2003 be approved and adopted.

579. **SINGLE STOREY LINK EXTENSION BETWEEN 12 AND 14 FORDINGTON ROAD, WITH ONE AND A HALF STOREY EXTENSION TO REAR WITH ROOMS IN ROOF**
(Report PDC357 refers)

The Director of Development Services presented to the meeting a block plan and street scene perspectives that had been submitted by the applicant in support of the application. He also informed the Committee that the applicant had indicated that he would appeal against a decision for refusal.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused for the reasons set out below:

The proposal results in the linking of two pairs of semi-detached properties in a street of distinctly separate semi-detached dwellings. The proposal will alter the character and appearance of the street to its detriment. The proposal is contrary to Policy UB3 of the County Structure Plan, Proposal EN5 of the Winchester District Local Plan, and Proposal DP.3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review.

580. **DEED OF VARIATION IN RESPECT OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF TWO DETACHED HOUSES WITHIN THE CURTILAGE OF DAWN HOUSE, SLEEPERS HILL, WINCHESTER**
(Report PDC366 refers)

RESOLVED:

That a Deed of Variation be entered into between Winchester City Council and the owner(s) of Dawn House to release the land falling within the red line of planning permission W08583/08 from the scope of an earlier legal agreement, dated 23 October 1997, and to allow this land to enter separate ownership(s) from the remainder of the land.

581. **ENHANCEMENT OF EXISTING GARDEN WITH REFURBISHMENT OF PATIO, TIMBER BRIDGE OVER HA-HA, ERECTION OF SHED, TRELIS AND COMPOST BINS (PART RETROSPECTIVE) AT 3 SWANMORE PARK, PARK LANE, SWANMORE (REF: W17333/04 AND W17333/05LB)**
(Report PDC356 refers)

The Director of Development Services reported that the Council's Arboricultural Officer had been consulted in relation to the alleged unauthorised tree removal on the site. His report was that the trees were not subject to a Tree Preservation Order, nor were they in a Conservation Area, therefore, no action was required.

It was also noted by the Committee, that the lay-by at the site was in the ownership of the applicant and that the Park was a world-renowned historic garden and a reason for refusal relating to this was within the recommendation.

RESOLVED:

That the applications be refused (for W17333/04 and W17333/05LB) due to the reasons set out below:

1. The proposal is contrary to Policy E15 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review) and Policies HG4, HG23 and EN5 of the Winchester District Local Plan in that it would:
 - (a) by reasons of its siting, scale and design result in a detrimental impact on the setting of a Grade II Listed Building;
 - (b) by reason of its siting, scale and design, result in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of a historic garden identified within the Hampshire Register of Historic Parks and Gardens.

582. **PROPOSED VARIATION OF SECTION 106 AGREEMENT, SILKSTEAD FARM, HURSLEY**
(Report PDC367 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to enter into a Deed of Variation to state that public open space funding has been paid and to include a revised site plan to that which is contained in the original Section 106 Agreement entered into on 23 December 1997.

583. **PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS**
(Report PDC359 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

584. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**
(Report PDC360 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 items 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 21 and 22 as he was a Member of the City of Winchester Trust which had commented on those applications, and he spoke and voted thereon. He also declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 9 (as he had been party to the decision of Cabinet to release the site for development) and item 21 as his wife was employed by the applicant (Winchester College). In the case of item 9, he remained in the meeting as the item stood deferred and was not debated by the Committee. In the case of item 21 he withdrew from the meeting.

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 21 and 22 as he was a Member of the City of Winchester Trust which had commented on those applications, and he spoke and voted thereon. In addition, item 15 related to an application submitted on behalf of Hampshire

County Council which would involved the Mede Croft Opportunity Centre of which he was a Governor and therefore, he declared a personal and prejudicial interest and left the meeting during consideration of that item.

Councillor Evans declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 9 (as she had been party to the decision of Cabinet to release the site for development) and remained in the meeting as the item stood deferred and was not debated by the Committee. In addition, in respect of item 27, she stated that Wickham Parish Council had objected to the application, but she had taken no part in the Parish Council's discussion of that application, and she spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Johnston stated that, in respect of items 4 and 5, Kings Worthy Parish Council had objected to the applications, but he had taken no part in the discussion of the Parish in these items, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Bennetts declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 20, as his home adjoined the application site, and he withdrew from the meeting during consideration of that item.

Councillor Hammerton declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 2, as she was a Non-Executive Director of the Mid Hampshire NHS Trust that represented the interests of the Dentist Practice. Following consideration, including debate on the concerns of objectors raised about the parking situation, the Committee agreed the application as set out in the Officer's recommendation.

Mr D Dimon, Principal Planning Officer, stated that he had a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 2, as he was a patient at the Riverside Surgery, Alison Way, Winchester, and he continued to participate in the presentation of this item.

In the public participation part of the meeting, the following items were discussed:

In respect of item 2 – Riverside Surgery, Alison Way, Winchester, Mr Davies spoke against the application and Dr Russell, spoke in support.

In respect of item 8 – 13 Cathedral View, Winchester, Mr Hunt spoke against the application, and Mr Mullan, spoke in support. The Director of Development Services stated that seven further letters of objection had been received, and these reiterated points raised in the original letters of objection, as set out in the Officers' report. He added that the City of Winchester Trust no longer objected to the proposal. Following debate, the Committee agreed to the recommendation as set out.

In respect of item 11 – The Elms, Tanners Lane, Denmead, Mrs Payne spoke in support of the application and against the Officers' recommendation for refusal. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Allgood (as a Ward Member) spoke on this item. In summary, he made reference to the differences in scales on the site and that the outbuildings would be removed. The house was isolated from neighbouring properties and he rejected claims that the proposals would be harmful to the environment. There had been no neighbour objections, and the proposals would not affect inward views as there was a high hedge facing Tanners Lane. He did, therefore, support the application to grant permission. After taking these issues into consideration, the Committee agreed to refuse the application as set out.

In respect of item 14 – Milnthorpe, Sleepers Hill, Winchester, Mr Dudgeon spoke in support of the application, and against the Officers' recommendation for refusal.

Arising out of consideration for this item, and the Highway Engineer's recommendations for refusal, it was noted that Hampshire County Council was dealing with a number of piecemeal planning applications for the Sleepers Hill, Chilbolton Avenue areas of Winchester. The Committee suggested that a full development brief was required, which could generate funds from developer contributions to undertake a comprehensive traffic scheme for the area. The Committee agreed that this matter should be taken up with the County Council. In agreeing to refuse the application as set out, the Committee requested that the Director of Development Services resolve with Hampshire County Council the highway issues relating to this application and address the wider issues of the traffic implications in this area of Winchester generally, as a matter of urgency.

In respect of item 15 – Construction of new build, Early Years Centre, Sports Ground, Bereweeke Road, Winchester, Mr I Parker (Head of Estates at Hampshire County Council), Mr P Jenner (Head of Westgate School), and Mrs M Lancaster (Chair of Governors at the Early Learning Centre) spoke in support of the application and against the Officers' recommendation for objection as set out in the report. The Director of Development Services reported that a letter from Sport England had now been received. He stated that this was a material planning consideration and copies were circulated at the meeting to Members and to the general public. The conclusion of Sport England was, in summary, that this application could be treated as an exceptional case in that it generated £770,000 to be used for sports development, which could be tied to the application by a Legal Agreement. Therefore, Sport England did not wish to raise an objection to the application. It was now the recommendation of the City Council, therefore, that no objection be raised to the application.

In addition, the Highways Engineer drew the Committee's attention to the traffic generation impact of the proposals which he stated would be the equivalent of approximately 30 houses being constructed on Bereweeke Road. Should this have been a housing scheme, then a contribution of £60,000 towards the Andover Road Traffic Strategy would have been required from the County to be used for pedestrian and cycle enhancement on Andover Road. He asked the Committee to include a request to the County Council for a contribution of this amount as part of any granting of planning permission.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Mitchell, (as a Ward Member) spoke in support of the application. He stated that the principal objection had now been addressed, and that the facility was needed by the community and that no objection should be raised to the application.

Following debate, the Committee agreed a revised recommendation that no objection be raised to the proposals, and also that a condition be included to seek a contribution from the County Council for highway works equivalent to the sum of residential development on the site and that the improvements to indoor sports facilities at the redundant swimming pool, and improvements to the Gym on the nearby Winton House Site, with timetable facilities available to Westgate School and feeder Primary School, together with the use of the pool and fitness suite by the local community in the evenings, weekends and holidays, be guaranteed by means of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.

In respect of item 20 – Old Shawford Goods Yard, Shawford Road, Shawford, Mr Duguid and Mr Boundy spoke against the application, and Mr Walters spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Bailey (as a Ward Member) spoke of the concerns of the local people at the proposals to regularise what was an

unacceptable use of the site. To the north of the site was residential use and the washing of Porta-loos was not regarded as being acceptable as a neighbouring use. There was also concern at the hours of operation as suggested. In response, the Director of Development Services stated that the hours of operation were standard as suggested by the Environmental Health Department and that the B1C and B8 use as suggested were suitable to be carried out adjacent to a residential area. In agreeing the application, the Committee also commented that enforcement action should be taken against the unlawful actions on the site at the earliest opportunity.

In respect of item 25 – Twyford Stores, High Street, Twyford, Winchester, Mr Cooper spoke in support of the application and against the Officers' recommendation for refusal. Following debate, the Committee supported the representations made by Mr Cooper that permission be granted and agreed to delegate permission to the Director of Development Services to agree suitable conditions to accompany the granting of permission for an A1 Business Use.

In respect of item 27 – Old House Hotel, The Square, Wickham, Fareham, Mr O'Connell spoke against the application and Mr Scott spoke in support. The Director of Development Services stated that a further letter of objection had been received by the owner of Wickham House, together with other objections. The Committee agreed that its Viewing Sub-Committee should visit the application site on Thursday, 6 November at 9.30am to assess the potential for overlooking from the proposals, the impact on the Burgage plots, which had been identified as a special feature for preservation in the Wickham Village Design Statement, together with issues of car parking associated with the proposals.

In respect of item 26 – Linden Lea, Chapel Road, Swanmore, the Director of Development Services reported that the points of objection raised by neighbours had now been addressed. The Committee supported the Officers' recommendation for approval as set out.

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 the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee visit application site number 27 at 9.30am on Thursday, 6 November 2003 and that Councillors Busher, Hatch, Pearson, Read and Sutton be appointed to serve thereon.
3. That in respect of item 14 – Milnthorpe, Sleepers Hill, Winchester, the Director of Development Services be requested to resolve with Hampshire County Council the highway issues relating to this application and to address the wider issues of the traffic implications in this area of Winchester generally, as a matter of urgency.

585. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

RESOLVED:

That the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business because it is likely that, if members of the public were present, there would be disclosure to them of 'exempt information' as defined by Section 100 I and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

<u>Minute Number</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Description of Exempt Information</u>
586 & 587	Northfields Farm, Twyford – Humphrey Farms Ltd	Any instructions to counsel and any opinion of counsel (whether or not in connection with any proceedings) and any advice received, information obtained or action to be taken in connection with:- (a) any legal proceedings by or against the authority, or (b) the determination of any matter affecting the authority, (whether, in either case, proceedings have been commenced or are in contemplation). (Para 12 to Schedule 12A refers).

586. **LAND AT NORTHFIELDS FARM, TWYFORD – HUMPHREYS FARMS LTD**
(Report PDC368 refers)

The Committee considered a report which provided further information about a possible challenge by way of judicial review by Twyford Parish Council against the decision to grant planning permission for the conversion of redundant agricultural buildings to light industrial research and design studio, warehouse and storage uses at SJD Humphreys Holdings, Northfields Poultry Farm, Northfields, Twyford, Winchester. Counsel's opinion had now been obtained by the City Secretary and Solicitor and details of the course of action proposed by the City Secretary and Solicitor were set out in the exempt minute. Further, a copy of Counsel's opinion obtained by S J D Humphreys Holdings, was circulated to Members at the meeting and had been released to the City Council, as a privileged document and could not therefore be given wider circulation. (Detail in exempt minute).

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 6.00pm

EXEMPT MINUTES – NOT FOR PUBLICATION

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

23 October 2003

587. **LAND AT NORTHFIELDS FARM, TWYFORD – HUMPHREYS FARMS LTD**
(Report PDC353 refers)

The City Secretary and Solicitor circulated at the meeting to Members only a copy of Counsel's opinion received by S J D Humphrey Holdings, Northfields Farm, Twyford, in respect of their application. This opinion had been prepared by John Hobson, QC.

The City Secretary and Solicitor stated that the City Council's Counsel's opinion had concluded that it would be better if the application was re-determined by the Committee at a future meeting.

In reply to Members' questions, the City Secretary and Solicitor advised that Twyford Parish Council's Counsel's opinion had not been seen by representatives of Humphreys Holdings and that Twyford Parish Council were still entitled to seek Judicial Review, even though the decision notice had not been issued by the City Council.

The City Secretary and Solicitor continued that should the Committee seek re-determination, then a definitive view from the Chief Building Control Officer and also on highway issues from Hampshire County Council would be obtained before the application was reconsidered.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Wagner (as a Ward Member), stated that he was a member of Twyford Parish Council but had not been involved in issues relating to the consideration of this item by the Parish Council. He informed Committee that a concern for the Parish Council was that they wanted the wider issues of Humphrey Holdings' operation at Twyford to be considered, to include the feed mill, and that a development brief was required, in order, for example, that issues relating to environmental health concerns could also be addressed. He agreed with the comments of certain Committee Members that if the application was re-determined, then expectations would be raised.

Following debate, it was agreed that the Committee should not re-determine the application, and that the original decision made on 18 June 2003 to approve the application should stand.

The City Secretary and Solicitor confirmed that the permission would not be issued until the Section 106 Agreement had been completed. It was only when the permission was issued that the time limit for judicial review began to run.

RESOLVED:

That the application should not be re-determined by the Committee.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB COMMITTEE**22 September 2003**Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)

Davies (P)

Pearson (P)

Read (P)

Sutton (P)

Others in attendance:

Councillors Learney and Porter

Officers in attendance:

Miss E Norgate (Principal Planning Officer)

588. ERECTION OF 22.5 METRE HIGH LATTICE TOWER WITH ASSOCIATED ANTENNAE (OVERALL HEIGHT 24 METRES) EQUIPMENT CABIN AND FENCED COMPOUND ADJACENT TO EXISTING ELECTRICAL SUB-STATION.

The Sub-Committee met at the application site at the Scottish and Southern Electricity (SSE) Harestock Sub Station, off the B3049 at Harestock, Winchester. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Higgins from Mason D Telecoms representing the applicant SSE Telecommunications plc and Mr Steel and Mr Griffiths from SSE plc Telecommunications.

Miss Norgate explained that a full planning application had been submitted by SSE Telecommunications plc (the mast was to be for Hutchinson 3G ("3")) for the erection of 22.5 metre high lattice tower with associated antennae. This comprised of 3 antennae and 3 dishes. The overall height was to be 24 metres. There was also to be an equipment cabin and fenced compound measuring 7 by 13 metres adjacent to the existing electrical sub-station. Miss Norgate reported that further to concerns raised by the Council's Landscape Architect regarding the potential damage to the root system and canopies of some of the trees in situ, the applicant had submitted an amended application. The plans were circulated to the Sub-Committee and Miss Norgate explained that they showed a change in the position of the mast and reduction in size of the concrete plinth. Miss Norgate commented that the Landscape Architect had confirmed that the amended proposals were now satisfactory. Mr Higgins demonstrated the position of the mast and a cherry picker was raised to the full height of the proposals.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting a Ward Member for Littleton and Harestock, Councillor Learney and a Ward Member for St Barnabas, Councillor Porter. Also present was one local resident.

Miss Norgate advised that the purpose of the proposal was to provide third generation coverage to Harestock and Weeke and to the B3049 and the surrounding road network. It was noted that the applicant had provided a certificate of compliance with the ICNIRP guidelines. Letters of objections to the proposals had been submitted from Sparsholt Parish Council, City of Winchester Trust and from 7 local residents. Reasons for objection included intrusiveness on the landscape, detrimental to character of the area, the perception of health concerns and the poor access to the site.

The Sub Committee noted that the structure was higher than the surrounding trees (although the trees would obscure the compound and cabinets and most of the structure). However, the mast would be partially visible from the approach to Winchester along the B3049 and from the nearest properties and the Salters and Dean Lane housing developments approximately 150 metres away.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Higgins explained that regarding alternative sitings and sharing by other operators, this site provided the better footprint of the required coverage. He explained that part of their response to the concerns of the Landscape Architect regarding the impact of the tree root systems and canopies was to reduce the size of the concrete plinth foundations to measure 3.8 metres by 3.8 metres from 5.8 metres by 5.8 metres. This would limit the future capability of operator sharing to two.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Porter addressed the Sub Committee. Councillor Porter stated that she was disappointed regarding the excessive height of the mast and the limitations of the structure to support other operators.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a local resident, Mr Andrews addressed the Sub Committee. Mr Andrews stated that he considered that operators should continue to co-ordinate their coverage roll-out and share structures wherever possible.

The Sub Committee discussed the proposals and noted that officers recommended refusal of the original application. Some Members considered that the original application may be preferable, as this site was a key location where operator sharing should be encouraged. Therefore, the larger foundations to allow for a greater degree of potential operator sharing might be desirable, although they noted the concerns of the Landscape Architect.

However, on balance, the majority of Members agreed to approve the application as the future prospect of a larger concrete base and replacement of the structure to allow for the incorporation of other operators on the mast could be explored if and when necessary. The Sub-Committee also agreed that the applicant be requested to ensure that the mast, antennae and palisade fencing be all painted a suitable green colour.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to no further objections on the amended plans and to the following conditions:

1. 1FUL
1FULR
2. L130(5)
L130R
3. L050
L050R
4. L020
L020R
5. X050
X050R
6. X060
X060R
7. That the mast, cabinet, antennae and palisade fencing hereby permitted shall be painted Olive Green (220) from colour chart BS381C unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 10.40am.

Chairman

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (POLICE HEADQUARTERS, WINCHESTER)
SUB-COMMITTEE****29 September 2003**Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
Beveridge (P)
Davies (P)
Evans (P)Hatch (P)
Johnston (P)
Read (P)
Sutton (P)Others in Attendance

Councillor Bennetts

Officers in AttendanceMr D Dimon (Principal Planning Officer)
Mr J Hearn (Planning Team Leader)
Mr H Bone (Assistant City Secretary (Legal))

589. **MINUTES**
(Report PDC348 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 9 September 2003 be noted.

590. **REFURBISHMENT OF EXISTING BUILDING, INCLUDING RE-CLADDING OF ELEVATION, NEW RECEPTION, AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW OFFICE BUILDING AT POLICE HEADQUARTERS, ROMSEY ROAD, WINCHESTER**
(Report PDC341 refers)

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting five representatives of the applicant, Councillor Bennetts as a Ward Member, and three members of the public.

Mr Dimon explained that following comments made at the previous meeting, Members had spent the day further considering the application. They had visited the AutoDesk and Novartis Offices in Farnborough and, although both of these buildings were new-builds, the architect and representatives of the glass manufacturers were able to explain to Members the similarities between some of these buildings' glass elevations and the proposals for the Police Headquarters (HQ).

Following the visit to Farnborough, Members viewed the main building of the existing Police HQ from St Giles Hill, the junction of Taplings Road and Bereweke Avenue and Cheriton Road. Members then met representatives of the Police Authority at the Headquarters who explained the location and further details of their application.

Mr Hearn reminded the Sub-Committee that the application sought to re-clad the nine storey Police HQ tower in reflective glass, and in the grounds of the HQ build a new three storey office building on the site of two semi-detached houses (currently used as offices) and to improve car parking provision.

In response to a Member's question, Mr Bawden, who represented the Police, stated that the impact of internal lighting in the tower would affect its night-time appearance, as it did at present, and added that most night working would be conducted from the lower, west wing of the HQ.

Other Members were concerned regarding the visual effect the opening windows would have on the smooth glass appearance of the building as the Police did not propose to install air conditioning. Whilst discussing the appearance of the glass cladding, some Members considered that the effect of reflections would vary depending on sunlight conditions and where the building was viewed from. Members were also concerned about the visual effect likely to be created by the aluminium composite panelling that would clad the window-less ends of the tower.

With reference to the proposed car parking on site, Members noted from their site visit the large number of cars that were parked informally on grass verges, roundabouts and at narrow entrances. Mr Bawden explained that the proposals sought to increase the area of hard standing to properly accommodate the current number of cars that parked on site. A new car park would be created on the site of the temporary office buildings following decant to the proposed three-storey office building.

From visiting the site, Members noted that an informal car park between the proposed location of the new offices and West End Terraces was well screened by trees and bushes and were concerned that any rationalisation of this parking area could be more visually intrusive to local residents.

Mr Dimon stated that the car parking proposals were contrary to both the current and emerging Local Plans that sought to reduce the number of car parking spaces at employment sites in sustainable locations.

Members noted that the Police's submitted travel to work plan had been considered by officers at the County Council and the possibility of a legal agreement to enforce its proposals was being investigated.

The Sub-Committee discussed the proposals for a new three storey office building on the site of the existing two semi-detached pairs of 1950s residential properties. The application proposed that this building would be constructed 30-40 metres from the residential properties in West End Terrace and the boundary of the Conservation Area.

In response to Members' questions, Mr Dimon confirmed that the construction of large new office buildings in this location was contrary to the policies of the Local Plan. The applicant's representatives nevertheless stated that they considered the proposals to be mainly replacing existing temporary office space and that the top

floor of the tower block was already in ancillary office use so its conversion to offices should not be considered to be 'new office space'.

Members also noted that only approximately 40% of the site was developed and further questioned whether other alternatives had been investigated. Mr Hearn commented that officers had held discussions with the applicant to consider relocating the Police HQ elsewhere or redeveloping the current site.

Members also noted that most of the comments received and outlined in the report recommended a complete re-build to allow for the removal of the tower block. However a representative of the Police explained that any redevelopment option would be at least twice as expensive and that the South Eastern Regional Design Panel had advised that there would be no funding available from the Government's "Better Public Buildings" Initiative.

Councillor Bennetts spoke as a Ward Member and recommended that the views of local residents should be carefully considered and that consideration should be given to erecting the new office building adjacent to the east end of the main tower block as per the Police's original intention. Members noted that if constructed next to the main building, the new offices could take advantage of the change of gradients that fell away from the main tower and that its impact on West End Terrace would be diminished.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a member of the public commented on the proposal's effect on the properties in West End Close and the trees on site. Mr Bawden confirmed that, if the application was granted, it was intended that all but one of the trees on the site would remain.

At the conclusion of the debate, Members appreciated the financial constraints that limited the Police's options for development but with regard to the proposal to re-clad the tower block, the majority agreed that the detrimental visual effect of this upon Winchester and the nearby Conservation Area would be unacceptable.

With regard to the proposals for the new offices and formalised car parking, Members agreed that this was contrary to planning policies and should therefore not be permitted.

RECOMMENDED:

That the Planning Development Control Committee be recommended to refuse the application for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development is contrary to policies UB3, E.16, E19, of the Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996-2011 (review) and to proposals W.1, W.3, W.10, HG.6, HG.7, EN.5 and EN.7 of the Winchester District Local Plan and proposals W.1, E.3, E.4, HE.4, HE.5, DP.1, DP2, DP.3, DP.5, of the Emerging Development Plan – Winchester District Local Plan Review and Revised Deposit in that it would:-

- (a) Having regard to the extremely prominent elevated siting and high rise form of the existing building, result in the unacceptable increased visual prominence of the structure to the detriment of the setting of Winchester and its conservation area.
- (b) Result in a new building the size, siting, form, design and finish of which would not be of an appropriate quality to contribute positively to

the urban design and setting of the city or to the character of the conservation area. Consequently it would not accord with the objectives of the Winchester 'Conservation Area Project' Supplementary Planning Guidance or the Governments 'Better Public Buildings' initiative. Moreover, in view of its juxtaposition to neighbouring residential properties it would detract from the visual amenities of the area generally and of the occupiers of such properties in particular.

- (c) The new office space to be provided is contrary to the office restraint policies of the development plan and would be likely to be harmful in terms of increased housing and transport pressures.

2. The provision for additional formal parking areas as proposed would detract from the visual amenity of the site and in the absence of any information to the contrary, be likely to prejudice the strategically important tree belt that is within the conservation area on its eastern side. Furthermore, such provision cannot be reconciled with national planning policy guidance in PPG13 in that it would undermine the objectives of the applicant's green travel plan to make the best possible use of opportunities to reduce reliance on the private car. The over provision of on-site car parking would encourage reliance on the private car when alternative means of transport are or can be made available given the site's sustainable location. The over reliance on the private car would result in an unacceptable increase in the number and length of car journeys to the detriment of the environment and the locality. The proposal therefore conflicts with the sustainability objectives of the development plan as set out in policies T1, T2, T4, of the Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996-2011 (review) and to proposals T.9, of the Winchester District Local Plan and proposals T.1 and T.4, of the Emerging Development Plan – Winchester District Local Plan Review and Revised Deposit.

The meeting commenced at 2.45pm and concluded at 3.45pm.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**6 October 2003**Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

de Peyer (P)

Hatch (P)

Johnston (P)

Sutton (P)

Others in Attendance:

Councillors Bennetts and Pearce for Minute 1 only

Councillors Beveridge, Mather and Tait for Minute 2 only

Officers in Attendance:

Ms A Fettes (Senior Planning Officer)

Mr N Culhane (Engineer)

591. **ERECTION OF 1 NO. THREE BEDROOM DWELLING AND ASSOCIATED PARKING AT 14 GREENHILL CLOSE, WINCHESTER, HAMPSHIRE (CASE NUMBER 03/01814/FUL).**

The Sub-Committee met at the application site. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Councillors Bennetts and Pearce as Ward Members, the applicant's agents Mr and Mrs Hauser and approximately thirteen members of the public and local residents.

Ms Fettes explained that the application sought permission to develop a three bedroom dwelling. The house would be built onto the end of the existing row of terraced houses on the side garden of 14 Greenhill Close. The proposal was for a two-storey building that was similar in character to the surrounding buildings and, in response to comments, Mrs Hauser confirmed that the bricks would match those of the existing buildings.

Ms Fettes advised that the new building was to be five metres wide, which was one metre narrower than the rest of the terrace. To compensate for the lost space, the building would be stepped forward from 14 Greenhill Close by 0.5 metres which echoed the style of 18 and 20 Greenhill Close.

It was noted that the ridgeline of the roof would be 0.5 metres taller than 14 Greenhill Close but Mrs Hauser stated that this increased height would not be visible from the road.

Members and the public were concerned about the parking implications of the scheme. Mr Culhane explained that the applicant, who also owned 14 Greenhill Close, had agreed to transfer the garage allocation of number 14 to the new property

and that, beyond the space in the garage, the occupants of the new dwelling would have no rights to residents' and visitors' parking permits. Whilst Ms Fettes added that the applicant proposed to erect a cycle storage area, Mr Culhane commented that the site was in a sustainable area and with the above conditions the application could not be refused in parking and highways terms.

In response to comments, Mrs Hauser confirmed that the existing trees and bushes would remain and that the application would be subject to a landscaping agreement to minimise overlooking.

The Sub-Committee discussed the potential disruption that was likely to be caused during the construction process and Mr Hauser confirmed that excavations for the new building's foundations would be minimal and that the external shell of the building would be completed within two months.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Pearce spoke as a Ward Member. He was concerned that the footpath leading to the construction site was very narrow. However Mr Hauser explained that the builders intended to use small machinery and that if necessary excavations could be barrowed from the site.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a number of the public spoke against the application. The owner of a nearby property was concerned that the builders would use her front garden as a short cut as it was adjacent to the footpath and it was suggested that during the construction period, this garden could be temporarily roped off. Members also recommended that if the construction process caused any nuisance, this should be reported to the applicant's agents, the City Council or the local Ward Members.

Other comments were raised concerning overlooking, the probability that the house would be rented to multiple tenants, the danger caused to local children during the construction process, parking problems and the lack of public consultation regarding the application.

In response to requests, the Sub-Committee viewed the likely impact of the proposals from the rear gardens of a property in Greenhill Close and a nearby property in West Hill Park.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Members acknowledged the concerns of the local residents but on balance agreed with the officers' recommendation that the application be approved subject to appropriate landscaping to minimise overlooking.

RECOMMENDED:

That the Planning Development Control Committee be recommended to approve the application.

1FUL
 1FULR
 M010 (dwelling)
 M010R
 B050 (A, 1)
 B050R
 B070 (first, west, dwelling)
 B070R

The garage outlined in red on the approved drawings shall be used solely in conjunction with the dwelling hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure the permanent availability of parking for the property

Details of the cycle store should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of works. The works hereby permitted will be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the details are appropriate to the character of the area.

Additional condition:

L050

L050R

HCSP: UB3, T4, R2

WDLP: EN5, H1, T9, RT3

EWDLPD: DP1, DP3, H2, T4, RT3

592. **ERECTION OF 6 NO. ONE BEDROOM FLATS AND NEW PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AT 15 SPARKFORD CLOSE, WINCHESTER, HAMPSHIRE SO22 4NH (CASE NUMBER 03/01812/FUL)**

The Sub-Committee met at the application site. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Councillors Beveridge, Mather and Tait as Ward Members, the applicant's agents Mr and Mrs Hauser, and approximately eleven members of the public and local residents.

Ms Fettes explained that the application sought permission to erect a three storey building to comprise of 6 one bedroom flats. The building would continue the existing 1970s terracing at the western end of 15 Sparkford Close at the same height, but with a one metre step back. The concrete tiled roof would be of the same materials and at the same angle as the remainder of the terrace. Mrs Hauser stated that the new building would use similar materials in a style that would be sympathetic to, but not mimic, the existing terraces. Mrs Hauser added that the living room rear windows would feature Juliet balconies.

Ms Fettes summarised that the application met planning policies and recommended its approval to Members subject to conditions.

Mr Culhane explained that the application was sited in the outer zone of permit controlled parking. However under the terms of current traffic regulation order in force, the new occupants would not be eligible for residents' nor visitors' parking permits and that no off site parking would be created. In response to Members' comments, Mr Culhane explained that to extend the parking restrictions beyond 6pm would require a change to the Traffic Order. It was noted however that the proposals incorporated a cycle store and locks.

Members were concerned about the narrow pedestrian access that was proposed to the new building and noted that this land was currently used by the occupants of 15 and 16 Sparkford Close to allow access into their garages.

The Sub-Committee also considered the lack of light that would reach the new development and Ms Fettes stated that the tall trees to the rear and the north would not effect this, although at certain times of the day other properties in the Close

would suffer from a lack of light. Mrs Hauser added that none of the mature trees would be removed as a consequence of the application.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Ward Members spoke on the application. Councillors Beveridge, Mather and Tait commented on the loss of the gaps between the terraces. Councillor Mather added that the densities of the Close were already high and Councillor Beveridge commented on the likely parking problems the flats would generate.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a number of the public spoke against the applications. They commented on the loss of gaps, over-development, parking problems, overlooking, loss of light, and that the proposal did not reflect the character of the Close.

At the request of the owner, the Sub-Committee viewed the probable impact of the building from the garden that ran along the side of the proposed building. Members were concerned that three living area windows of the proposed development would overlook this area.

In conclusion, Members agreed to recommend that the application be refused because of the loss of light to neighbouring properties, the loss of the gaps between the terraces, that it was out of character, overlooking, and that the residents of the proposed development would have a poor outlook onto the blank side wall of 15 Sparkford Close.

RECOMMENDED:

That the Planning Development Control Committee be recommended to refuse the application for the reasons stated above.

1. The proposed development is contrary to policies UB3, T4, T5, H2, H11, R2, E16, E19 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan, EN5, EN6, EN7, EN9, H1, H7, RT3, T9 and W1 of the Winchester District Local Plan and DP3, DP5, H2, H7, RT3, T3, T4, W1 and W6 of the Emerging Winchester District Local Plan Review and Revised Deposit in that it would:

a) by reason of its siting and design, introduce increased overlooking of the rear garden of 11 Sparkford Close, and overlooking of the rear garden of 16 Sparkford Close, to the detriment of neighbours' amenities;

b) by reason of its siting and design, result in an excessive building bulk which would adversely affect the amenities of the neighbouring properties

c) by reason of its massing and siting, result in the loss of a gap between properties, to the detriment of the spatial characteristics of the area;

d) by reason of its siting and design and its relative position with 16 Sparkford Close, result in a poor outlook for occupiers of the proposed development.

2. The proposal is contrary to the policies of the Hampshire County Structure Plan and the Winchester District Local Plan in that it fails to make adequate provision for public recreational open space to the required standard, and would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the area. The proposal would also be likely to prejudice the Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review), the Winchester District Local Plan and the emerging Winchester District Local Plan (Review), in that it would undermine this Plan's Policies for recreational open space provision within the District.

(No Open Space)

HCSP: UB3, T4, T5, H2, H11, R2, E16, E19

WDLP: EN5, EN7, EN9, H1, H7, RT3, T9, W1

EWDLP: DP3, DP5, H2, H7, RT3, T3, T4, W1, W6

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 11.35am.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (ANTRIM HOUSE) SUB-COMMITTEE**7 October 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:

Mr N Mackintosh, Principal Planning Officer (DC West)

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

(Report PDC333 refers)

Prior to the public meeting, Members of the Sub Committee had visited Kingsgate Park and viewed the proposed buildings marked out on site.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting representatives from Winchester College, the Headmaster, Mr Cookson, and the Works Bursar, Mr Wells. Also, the applicant's architect, Mr Deans from Architecture PLB, and three members of the public.

Mr Mackintosh 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.

Mr Mackintosh advised that the Winchester with Eastleigh Architects Panel had been consulted, and had recommended that as far as layout, design and external appearance were concerned, the proposal be approved. He explained that although English Heritage had also been consulted, a response had not been received prior to this meeting. It was anticipated that a response would be received before the next meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee.

Mr Mackintosh also advised Members that the College had agreed to contribute towards the Council's Public Open Space Funding System, in respect of the three dwellings incorporated into the scheme, and that Policies EN2 and RT2 of the Winchester District Local Plan would need further consideration. He suggested that,

as a result of their site meeting, Members were now in a position to assess the effect of the proposal on the amenity of the EN2 area. Policy RT2 had been addressed by the College stating that Kingsgate Park is not a public park, although the public could use it and other College grounds, and that the existing sports facilities would be relocated elsewhere on their campus. A Draft Campus Development Plan would be given further consideration by Members at a later date.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Cookson addressed the Sub Committee and explained that the proposal for a new boarding house would add approximately 60 pupils, which he believed the College could accommodate as it had almost enough teaching space to manage the increased numbers without diluting academic standards. He continued that the Campus Development Plan covered the next 12 years, as it was expected that the costs of building the proposed boarding house would be met within 8-12 years.

In answer to a Member's question regarding the possibility of further applications for boarding houses being submitted in the future, Mr Cookson explained that it was unlikely, as the College would not have enough teaching space and other facilities to accommodate larger numbers of pupils.

A Member was concerned at the height of the Housemaster's dwelling and queried whether the Matron's flat could be accommodated elsewhere in the scheme. In response, Mr Deans explained that the size of the proposed buildings had already been kept to a minimum and that a two storey building would look out of place among the other three storey buildings.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Chair of the Residents Association of Hanover Lodge addressed the Sub Committee. She advised that the Residents Association was concerned that, if approved, the College may put forward further applications for other College buildings within Kingsgate Park, such as a central dining hall.

Members were also concerned and asked for assurance from Mr Cookson that the remainder of the Park would continue to be used for recreational purposes. Mr Cookson advised that there was no intention to build further on the Park, and explained that although one football pitch would be lost, it had already been relocated to another site.

In answer to Members' questions regarding landscaping on the site, Mr Deans advised that although several existing trees would be lost, they would be replaced by new trees planted along the wall to St Cross Road, along the side of the site to views from Kingsgate Park, within the central courtyard and a gravelled area to the rear of the proposed buildings.

The Chairman summarised that although dwellings opposite would lose some views of the Park, there had been few complaints and it was generally agreed that the application should be allowed.

RECOMMENDED:

That, subject to no adverse comments from English Heritage and the appropriate provision for public open space through the Open Space Funding System, then planning permission be granted, subject to the following conditions:-

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 or site preparation prior to operations which has any effect on disturbing or altering the level of composition of the land, shall take place within the site until the applicant or their agents or successors in title has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation to be submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the archaeological interest of the site is properly safeguarded and recorded.

3. No development shall take place until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the buildings 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.

4. No development shall take place until details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include the following, as relevant:

- existing and proposed finished levels or contours:
- means of enclosure, including any retaining structures:
- car parking layout:
- hard surfacing materials:
- details of the breach to be made in the wall fronting St. Cross Road.
- schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate:

Reason: To improve the appearance of the site in the interests of visual amenity.

5. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out before the use hereby permitted is commenced and prior to the completion of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed with the Local Planning Authority. If within a period of five years after planting any tree or plant is removed, dies or becomes, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged, defective or diseased another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally approved shall be planted at the same place, within the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscape in accordance with the approved designs.

6. The existing trees shown as being retained on the approved plan shall not be lopped, topped, felled or uprooted without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. These trees shall be protected during building operations by the erection of fencing at least 5 metres from the tree trunks in accordance with BS 5837.

Reason: To retain and protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the area.

7. Any part of the building exposed by the demolition work shall be made good and the safety and stability of the part of the building which is to be retained secured.

Reason: In the interests of the preservation and character of the conservation area.

8. Any alterations and repairs to brickwork shall be carried out utilising matching materials, brick bond and jointing details to those on the existing building. A lime putty mortar shall be used unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To maintain the character of the listed building.

9. Details of provisions to be made for the parking and turning on site of operative and construction vehicles during the period of development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and fully implemented before development commences. Such measures shall be retained for the construction period.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

The meeting commenced at 2.30pm and concluded at 3.15pm.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB COMMITTEE9 October 2003Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)

Davies (P)

Pearson (P)

Read (P)

Sutton (P)

Officers in attendance:

Miss A Fettes (Senior Planner)

594. **10 METRE POLE MAST SUPPORTING 2 NO. ANTENNA WITH 2 NO. CABINS AT GROUND LEVEL AT LAND ADJACENT TO B3047 AND A31 WINCHESTER ROAD, ALRESFORD – PRIOR NOTIFICATION APPLICATION FROM VODAFONE.**

The Sub-Committee met at the application site at land adjacent to the roundabout at the B3047 and A31 Winchester Road, Alresford. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr McKay from Waldon Telecom on behalf of the applicant, Vodafone. Also present was Mr Smorfilt representing Tichborne Parish Council together with a local resident.

Miss Fettes explained that a prior notification application that had been submitted by Vodafone for the erection of a 10 metre high monopole supporting two antennae and two cabins at ground level and associated hard-standing. The overall height of the structure was to be 12 metres. The equipment cabin was to measure 1.1 by 1 metre by 2 metres and the electricity cabin to be 1 by 1 metre by 0.3 metres. Miss Fettes also confirmed that hard-standing from the road to the proposed mast and cabins was to measure approximately 3.7 metres by 10.5 metres. It was noted that the applicant had provided a certificate of compliance with the ICNIRP guidelines.

Miss Fettes advised that the purpose of the proposal was to complete third generation mobile telecommunications coverage to the vicinity. It was explained that T-Mobile had permission for a similar proposal granted on 3 December 2001, however this had never been implemented.

Miss Fettes advised that one letter of objection had been submitted from Ovington Parish Council, stating that the structure was visually intrusive as it would be visible from Ladycroft situated approximately 240 metres to the north-west. The Highway engineer had no objection to the proposals.

Further to questions from the Sub-Committee, Mr McKay demonstrated the positioning of the proposals and he explained investigations regarding alternative siting. He clarified why his clients believed that this site was the best in terms of providing the required coverage and the least intrusion on the landscape and impact on trees.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a local resident addressed the Sub Committee. He was opposed to the positioning of the proposals due to his concern of health risks associated with the third generation telecommunications technology and also the visual intrusion of the structure. He suggested alternative siting to the south west of this site.

In their consideration of the application, Members noted the proposed positioning of the cabinets to the left and right of the mast. It was considered that it would be appropriate for the cabinets to be positioned behind the mast, as they would then appear less prominent when viewed from the highway.

On balance, the majority of Members agreed to approve the application, as it was the least visually intrusive option for siting to gain the required coverage. The Sub-Committee also agreed that the applicant be requested to paint the mast a suitable green colour to match the existing street furniture in the vicinity. In addition, the cabins should be painted a darker green to blend in with the foliage to the rear of the verge. Furthermore, it was requested that the applicant liaise with the Director of Development Services regarding the possible siting of the cabins to the rear of the mast structure and if deemed necessary this be considered in conjunction with the Chairman of the Sub-Committee.

RESOLVED:

1. That prior approval of the details of the siting and appearance be given.
2. That the applicant be requested to paint the mast and cabins an appropriate green colour in consultation with the Director of Development Services.
3. That the applicant liaise with the Director of Development Services regarding the possible siting of the cabins to the rear of the mast structure and if deemed necessary, this be considered in conjunction with the Chairman of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub Committee.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 10.20am.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (CHILBOLTON AVENUE, WINCHESTER) SUB COMMITTEE**13 OCTOBER 2003**Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)

Beveridge (P)

Davies (P)

Hatch (P)

Nunn (P)

Pearce

Pearson (P)

Sutton (P)

Others in attendance:

Councillor Love

Hampshire County Councillor Dickens (for the site visit only)

Officers in attendance:

Mr J Hearn – Team Manager (Planning)

Mrs J Pinnock – Planning Officer

Mr S Dunbar-Dempsey – Landscape Architect

Mr B Draper – Arboricultural Officer

Mr N Baldwin – Housing Officer

Mr N Culhane – Engineer

595. PLANNING APPLICATION FOR 53 DWELLINGS ON LAND TO REAR OF 8-22 CHILBOLTON AVENUE, WINCHESTER

(Report PDC358 refers)

Members of the Sub Committee visited the application site prior to the meeting in the Guildhall, Winchester to familiarise themselves with the issues involved.

Members observed on the site visit number 10 Chilbolton Avenue that would be demolished to provide space for a new access to the development from Chilbolton Avenue. A new replacement house would be constructed adjacent to the new entrance as replacement for the property demolished. With respect to the replacement house, Mr Hearn stated that the character of the street frontage to Chilbolton Avenue was one of large houses with gaps in between, and this was achieved by having a single storey element to the sides of the properties. However, the proposed replacement house was a large two storey dwelling which would be close to number 8 Chilbolton Avenue and would appear quite cramped. Elevations were displayed to Members and Mr Hearn commented that the replacement dwelling provided an opportunity to obtain a dwelling of more architectural merit.

Mr Culhane explained that responsibility for the standards for the new entrance onto Chilbolton Avenue rested with Hampshire County Council. To achieve an entrance to the required standard a visibility splay of 4.5 metres by 120 metres was required. From the evidence submitted, the County were not satisfied that the splays could be achieved due to the mature trees that fronted Chilbolton Avenue effecting sight lines. The applicant Linden Homes Limited, would need to provide a solution for this situation.

Members proceeded to view the rear gardens of numbers 8 to 22 Chilbolton Avenue where the route of the proposed internal access road had been marked out on site. The position of the housing units was explained to Members. It was observed that the site had a change in levels, falling away from Chilbolton Avenue towards Greenhill Road. The rear gardens were well treed and contained many specimen shrubs. A blanket Tree Preservation Order had been placed on the site as a safe guard prior to negotiating the trees to be removed. From the rear garden of number 22 Chilbolton Avenue it was explained that a number of mature trees on the boundary of Greenhill Road would be removed and that at this point four storey dwellings would be constructed with balconies to face towards number 24 Chilbolton Avenue, which was presently used as a nursing home.

Members also observed that from the rear boundary of Orchard House, Sarum Road, that there would be a 10 metre gap to the new development. This housing would be in two separate blocks of four and three, three storey units with high roofs and balconies with integral garage beneath. It was the officers' opinion that these properties were too close to Orchard House and would lead to overlooking and would be overbearing.

Members also viewed the application site from the rear gardens of 148, 150, 154 and 162 Greenhill Road. From the garden of 162 Greenhill Close it was explained that this property would back onto a four storey gable, which would be partially screened to a mature treed hedge, but that it was of a deciduous nature and would be bare in the winter when the reduction in light from the evening sun would be at its most significant. It was the officers' opinion that a development of this height in this position would be overbearing. This situation was repeated for other properties in Greenhill Road. At the position of numbers 148 and 150 Greenhill Road, although there was slightly more depth to the rear gardens, it was proposed at this point of the boundary of the new development to remove the mature trees which would lead to further exposure of the four storey blocks.

During the site visit, it was also explained to Members that the opportunity existed to place a pedestrian footpath between numbers 154 and 156 Greenhill Road to provide access to the proposed new development, which would save a significant time for pedestrians and cyclists accessing West Down and Western Schools from the new development. Without a pedestrian access it was estimated that from Chilbolton Avenue the distance to be walked would be approximately 520 metres and from the furthest point of the internal access road this could be nearer 750 metres. The access road that could be utilised had planning permission to serve two modest semi detached dwellings to be constructed on the site of the present garage block and therefore in the view of the Engineer, vehicle movements would be minimal for the balance of gain that could be achieved in creating a pedestrian and cycle access.

At the meeting at the Guildhall, Winchester the Chairman welcomed to the meeting representatives of the applicant, Linden Homes Limited, Councillor Love as a Ward Member, and approximately 30 members of the public.

Councillors Beveridge and Davies declared a personal interest (but not prejudicial) as they were members of the City of Winchester Trust that had commented on this application and they remained in the meeting and participated throughout.

Mr Hearn presented the scheme to the meeting and explained that it would contain sixteen units of affordable housing with the remaining thirty seven units being for private sale.

The Officers supported the contemporary approach proposed by the applicant and the materials to be used were slate to the roof, with elevations to incorporate zinc and cedar boarding.

Mr Hearn also explained to the Sub Committee the Tree Retention Plan. The trees proposed to be lost included a number of ornamental trees, which would normally not present a problem, but some of these provided protection to neighbours and to lose these was unsatisfactory. Further work on the arboricultural aspects of the application was required.

Mr Culhane explained the highway considerations of the application. He stated that the City Council had responsibility for the internal highway arrangements and that for the access to Chilbolton Avenue and wider issues, Hampshire County Council acted as the highway authority. However, he had spoken to Hampshire County Councillor Dickens during the earlier site visit and she had provided an outline of the issues to take into consideration. As previously mentioned a visibility splay of 4.5 metres by 120 metres was required at the access point into Chilbolton Avenue, but it had not been demonstrated by the applicant that this could be achieved. There were also wider traffic implications to be considered including the impact at the junction of Romsey Road and Chilbolton Avenue, which would require improvements, and also at the Chilbolton Avenue Stockbridge Road junction. Another consideration was the access with Sarum Road where a simple T junction had been shown but a ghost island with a pedestrian refuge and right turn lane would be preferable. However, this was difficult to achieve but could be done in consultation with the Police and a wide load route. Contributions from the applicant for off site highway improvement works would be required. There were a number of highway issues to be addressed, which had led to highway reasons for refusal in respect of the application.

Mr Culhane continued that there were a number of issues on the internal highways arrangements that needed to be addressed, but these could be resolved. The scheme proposed 1.5 car parking spaces per dwelling, which was in keeping with County standards, with five occasional visitor car parking spaces also being provided on the access road.

The Sub Committee noted that there was also a number of other potential development proposals for the Chilbolton Avenue area. It would be preferable if a comprehensive highway study was obtained with all potential developers making financial contributions to bring about a comprehensive highway improvement scheme to the area.

Mr Baldwin stated that there had been a meeting with the applicant on the mix of dwellings for affordable housing and that these would be reconsidered in the light of these discussions.

With respect to open space, Mr Dunbar-Dempsey explained that there was a requirement for 1000sq metres of play space, but the present scheme resulted in a slight short fall, which could be overcome through negotiation. The short fall was between 100 and 200 sq. metres.

In response to Members' questions, Mr Hearn explained issues relating to policy EN1 and the effect the proposals on the character of the area. He explained that there would be an impact of the introduction of 53 dwellings through their height and the loss of trees. Balanced against this was the fact that the proposal would be in a private garden which was an appropriate route for development and at the right height and with the correct trees being retained, the proposed development would not impact on the public realm and therefore would not affect the character of the area. It did not set a precedent, as each scheme needed to be looked at on its own merit. The proposals were self contained as the nursing home at number 24 Chilbolton Avenue was classified as a facility and service and could not be demolished.

A number of Members questioned whether a mini development brief for the whole Chilbolton Avenue area was required in view of the development pressure in the area. Mr Hearn stated that a great deal of analysis work on the suitability of the site for the present development proposal would be required and this could form the basis of informing officers of the potential for development in the area.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Love, a Ward Member stated that the report set out the neighbours' concerns, including his own comments. He asked the Sub Committee to take into consideration the amenities of those living in Greenhill Road, and particularly the treatment of the hedges and trees bordering the development site. He also stated that the proposals, with their high buildings and steep roofs were out of character for the area and therefore not in accordance with planning policy.

For the applicant, Linden Homes Limited, their Agent, Mr M Hawthorn stated that there had been dialogue over the application with the planning officers for eighteen months. However, a meeting in the previous week had raised a number of new issues and it was the applicant's desire that the application be deferred so that these could be addressed. Clear guidance on landscaping and highway issues had now been received and needed to be addressed.

The Chairman invited comments from the members of the public on the application. These comments are comprehensively set out in the report and those raised at the meeting are summarised below.

Neighbouring residents spoke of their concerns at the impact of PPG3 and the effect of the character of the area; the impact of additional vehicles on Chilbolton Avenue and its junction with Stockbridge Road and Romsey Road, together with the Sarum Road cross roads; and the effect on the privacy of residents of Greenhill Road.

Additional points related to the inappropriate appearance and design of the proposed properties due to their excessive height with roof balconies leading to the potential of over looking. Also of concern was the high density and lack of play areas and small gardens and the potential conflict between young children and cars within the development. It was also thought that the provision for car parking on the site would be inadequate and also that there would be traffic congestion at the entrance to Chilbolton Avenue.

It was also commented that the development would be out of character and that the architecture was inappropriate with the use of materials being industrial in nature and not appropriate to a residential environment. The loss of trees and of green space and the impact on wild life were also of concern. An additional point was the impact on long views as the site was prominent when viewed across Winchester. The present two storey houses were concealed, but the proposed four storey high dwellings when combined with the loss of trees would create an adverse visual impact on long distance views.

Residents of Greenhill Road also spoke of their concerns of the effect on the environment, the loss of enjoyment of amenity, the loss of sunlight, potential for over looking and loss of privacy. There was also concern of the potential for increase of noise nuisance.

There was also a comment that the proposals did not meet the requirements in PPG3 in that the proposals did not improve the quality of life or the attractiveness of the local area. The density of 44.3 dwellings per hectare was too great in a leafy suburb. It was also thought that the site was not sustainable in terms of the government's definition.

A resident also spoke of her concerns of the conflict of pedestrians and vehicular traffic using the proposed access from 154 and 156 Greenhill Road, through the garage compound (which now have planning permission for two semi detached bungalows) and the proposed development.

There was additional concern at the time it would take vehicles to be able to access Chilbolton Avenue at peak times and the inadequacy of car park provision within the development.

In conclusion of the public comments, there was recognition of the wider development pressure within the local area and perhaps the need for a more comprehensive approach to planning for development within the area.

In response, representatives for the applicant stated that the use of land within the urban areas was in accordance with government's guidance and that they would be happy to address the issues as raised by local residents and the Sub Committee.

Also in reply to points raised, Mr Hearn stated that the provision of a footpath link to Greenhill Road would be the subject of a safety audit and although it would save new residents a lot of time in accessing, for example local schools, it would not take place if the safety audit proved it to be unsafe.

Mr Culhane stated that many of the highway points raised were issues for consideration by Hampshire County Council and would be addressed by a traffic impact study and also by the safer routes to schools policies.

In discussing the wider issues of development in the local area, Mr Hearn stated that following recent public consultation on changes to PPG3, pre-inquiry amendments to the revised policies of the Winchester District Local Plan were being considered. However, in terms of assessing the site under consideration, it should be assessed on its merits by present policies.

In assessing the application, members of the Sub Committee were of the opinion that the proposed height of the new dwellings, the potential for overlooking, the proposed density of development and issues of car parking together with the boundary treatment to Greenhill Road were out of character with the local area and that the application should be refused as set out in the officers' recommendations.

The Sub Committee commented that the house types were unimaginative and that the impact on trees and landscaping within the site could be improved by the retention of the taller trees for the protection of long views. A revised scheme was required which addressed these issues to allow the proposed dwellings to fit in well with the surrounding area.

In conclusion the Sub Committee agreed to refuse the application as set out.

RECOMMENDED:

That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed development is contrary to policies UB1, UB3, T4, T5, T6, H8, R2, of the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review, proposals H.7, EN.1, EN.5, EN.7, EN.8, EN.9, EN.12, RT.3, RT.6, T.9, T.10, T.11, W.1, W.27, W.29, of the Winchester District Local Plan and proposals H.5, RD06.17, DP.1, DP.3, DP.5, DP.6, RT.3, T.1, T.2, T.3, T.4, T.5, T.8, W.1, W.6 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review (Revised Deposit 2003), in that:
 2. it is out of character with surrounding existing development in terms of the height and massing of the buildings and will have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the area;
 3. it will result in the loss of trees and vegetation which are of amenity value which will have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the area;
 4. it will result in the loss of trees and vegetation which provide amenity value to neighbouring residents and which would provide potential screening from any new development on the application site;
 5. it will result in an development which will be overbearing, overshadowing and would create overlooking of neighbouring residential properties;
 6. inadequate sight lines and radii are provided at the junction of the new access road and Chilbolton Avenue;
 7. it does not make adequate provision for on-site and off-site public open space;
 8. the position and massing of the replacement house at number 10 Chilbolton Avenue and its associated garage would adversely impact in visual terms on the character of the street scene along Chilbolton Avenue;
 9. it does not make adequate provision for affordable housing;

10. it fails to provide a satisfactory footpath link to the adjacent site (land to the rear of 152 – 154 Greenhill Road) and a pedestrian link at the end of the cul de sac to Chilbolton Avenue;

11. the proposed layout is unsatisfactory in highway design terms for the following reasons and will cause danger and inconvenience to highway users and to pedestrians:

- the access to the replacement house at number 10 Chilbolton Avenue is in an unacceptable position;
- the new access road in from Chilbolton Avenue is not of a satisfactory width and design;
- the design of the internal roads and parking areas have a number of deficiencies;

12. Any other reasons of completion of consultations with the highway Authority.

The meeting commenced at 11.00am until 1.00pm on site and then recommenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 4.05pm in the Guildhall, Winchester.

Chairman