

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

26 November 2003

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

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

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

Deputy Members:

Councillor Jeffs (Standing Deputy for Councillor Baxter)

Others in attendance:

Councillors Campbell, Cook and Nelmes

733. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Committee held on 24 July 2003 numbered 269 – 282 (less exempt minute), 27 August 2003 numbered 349 – 354, 28 August 2003 numbered 360 – 363 and 24 September 2003 numbered 419 – 437 (less exempt business) be approved and adopted.

734. **PLANNING (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**
(Report PDC372 refers)

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

Further to the Sub-Committee meeting, the Director of Development Services reported that further representation had been received from the Wickham Society objecting to the application, and details of their objection were summarised for the Committee. He continued that the owner of the neighbouring property, Wisteria House, had also written stating that they had a right of way and a parking space on the access to the proposed construction; this point had been explored with the Council's Highways Engineer, who had advised that it would still be difficult to sustain an objection on highway grounds. In addition, at the request of the Sub-Committee the Council's Building Control Officer had inspected the boundary retaining wall to

the neighbouring property, Wickham House. The wall had been found to be in good condition and could be preserved, provided certain construction methods were used to retain its structural integrity.

Further to points raised in debate, the Committee agreed to amend Condition 7 to stipulate that the trellis to be incorporated on the boundary wall should match that existing at the neighbouring Wickham House and that Condition 6 be amended to state that it relates to 4 units at ground level only to prevent a mezzanine floor being included.

RESOLVED:

That subject to the above amendments to Conditions 6 and 7, the minutes of the meeting of the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 6 November 2003 be approved and adopted.

735. **UNAUTHORISED RESIDENTIAL USES AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS AROUND WINCHESTER (GARNIER ROAD; ITCHEN NAVIGATION; AND NEARBY)**
(Report PDC369 refers)

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item as one of the residents of the unauthorised residential uses was personally known to himself, and left the meeting during the item's consideration.

The Director of Development Services circulated at the meeting an updated plan showing the latest known positions of various unauthorised residential uses principally in the St Michael's Ward area of Winchester.

In the public participation part of the meeting, Mr A Pendragon and Mr Williams spoke on this item. In summary, Mr Pendragon stated that enforcement had already commenced as legal action was being taken to remove himself from his site by 2 December. He had previously requested the Council to make arrangements for the removal of health hazards from the site, but this had not been carried out and was now cited as a reason for eviction. He stated that the points made in the report were a sham when legal proceedings had already commenced for eviction (it was later clarified that the notice of eviction had been served by Hampshire County Council in respect of the park and ride site and that the City Council had prepared a witness statement on behalf of the County). Mr Williams stated that the dome structure which he occupied was precise in its construction. He made reference to other unauthorised residential user sites stating that some are occupied by homeless persons, some of whom had drug and alcohol related problems, and were unable to be assisted by the night shelter. Mr Williams stated that he carried out works of cleaning ivy off trees, removal of overhanging branches and also removal of dog fouling, which otherwise would result in a cost to the local authority.

Arising in debate, a Ward Member for the St Michael's Ward commented that the dome structure occupied by Mr Williams could possibly have been in occupation for in excess of 10 years and could accrue immunity from planning enforcement powers. The Director of Development Services replied that this situation would be established following an investigation should the Committee decide to approve the recommendations.

Members also discussed the provision of alternative sites for travellers and those wishing to live an alternative lifestyle, which were not available at the moment but the City Council was actively pursuing such options.

Cabinet would be asked to authorise legal action to secure removal of the unauthorised "dome" structure and associated uses from land owned by the City Council at Garnier Road at its meeting to be held on 3 December 2003.

The Committee agreed to support the recommendations as set out but requested the Director of Development to report to its meeting in March 2004 on the latest situation.

RESOLVED:

That the action in accordance with the options set out in paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3 of the report be authorised to secure cessation of the unauthorised uses of land.

736. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS**
(Report PDC371 refers)

In the public participation part of the meeting, Mr Parry spoke in objection to the making of the Tree Preservation Order in respect of TPO1798 – Upper Chilland House, Lower Chilland Lane, Martyr Worthy.

RESOLVED:

That having taken into consideration the representations received, including those made in the public participation part of the meeting by Mr Parry, Tree Preservation Orders 1798 and 1806 be confirmed.

737. **PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS**
(Report PDC370 refers)

The Director of Development Services was requested to consider including trends on appeal decisions within future reports.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

738. **PLANNING (COMMITTEE SYSTEMS REVIEW) INFORMAL MEMBER/OFFICER WORKING GROUP – CONSIDERATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS**
(Report CAB725 refers)

The Committee noted that this report had previously been considered at the meeting of Cabinet held on 5 November 2003, and Members had also been requested to bring with them to the meeting copies of the Cabinet minutes that related to this item.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Cook (Portfolio Holder for the Environment, Economy and Development) stated that the proposals would be for a six month period when they would be then reviewed, and that initial feedback from the Parish Councils were that they were pleased with the proposals. He continued that questions to be addressed included financial provision for the equipment to bring about improvements to the Walton Room and also points of clarification with the Planning Officers on the presentation of reports.

Arising out of discussion, Members of the Committee also stressed the importance of providing proper training to parish councils to ensure that only points of substantial concern were referred to Committee and similarly that the present triggers for reports

to come to Committee should be reviewed, for example, where multiple objections were generated from the same household.

It was also agreed that the Director of Development Services should circulate to Members in advance of the meeting details of the number of public speakers that were anticipated at meetings of the Committee to allow Members to plan their diaries.

RESOLVED:

That the resolution of Cabinet held on 5 November 2003 relating to Report CAB725 be noted.

739. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**
(Report PDC373 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 Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as a Member of the City of Winchester Trust in items 2, 12, 19 and 20.

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as a Member of the City of Winchester Trust in items 2, 12, 19 and 20 and also a personal and prejudicial interest in item 12 as his wife worked for Winchester College, and he left the meeting during consideration of this item.

Councillor Evans declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in item 17 as Wickham Parish Council had objected to the application, of which she was a Member, but she had not taken part in the Parish Council's planning consideration of this item.

Councillor Hatch declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in item 18 as Whiteley Parish Council had objected to the application, of which she was a Member, but she had not participated in the Parish Council's planning consideration of this item.

Councillor Busher declared a personal (and prejudicial) interest in item 10, as the applicant had been personally known to her for a number of years, and she left the meeting during consideration of this item.

Councillor Pearson declared a personal (and prejudicial) interest in item 14 as the applicant was known to himself and he left the meeting during consideration of this item. He also declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in item 16 as he was a Member of the Swanmore Society who had made representation on this application.

In the public participation part of the meeting, the following representations were made.

In respect of item 5 – 96 Olivers Battery Road South, Olivers Battery, Winchester, Mr Bartlett spoke against the application and Mr Newcombe spoke in support of the application and against the Officer's recommendation for refusal. The Committee agreed that its Viewing Sub-Committee should visit the application site in order that the potential impact in terms of mass and overbearing could be assessed in relation to the neighbouring property.

In respect of item 11 – land to the rear of Wina and Pinewood, Churchill Avenue, Bishops Waltham, Mr Frampton spoke against the application and Mr Buchanan spoke in support. Following debate, the Committee supported the granting of permission subject to Condition 6 being amended to read: "the four bedroom houses hereby approved shall not be built until such time as the two bedroom houses are under construction," and that an additional informative be added to require the applicant to contribute to the costs of bringing Churchill Avenue up to an acceptable standard for maintenance.

In respect of item 12 – Winchester College, The Mill, Kingsgate Street, Winchester, Mr Hawkins spoke in objection to the application and Mr Wells spoke in support. The Committee agreed the application subject to the inclusion of a condition that details of artificial lighting be submitted to the Local Planning Authority, and that the colour of the fence (as covered by Condition 2) should be agreed by the Local Planning Authority. In addition, an informative be added that, if possible, a landscape scheme be incorporated to the boundary area.

In respect of item 14 – Fanstones, Swanmore Park Lane, Swanmore, Mr Hecks spoke in objection to the application and Mr Wheeler-Bennett spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Campbell, a Ward Member, spoke on this item. In summary, she stated that this application had generated considerable representation. There was concern at the commercial possibility of the proposals, and if the stables were granted permission for personal use only, how this could be controlled. She questioned whether commercial use could include the use of the facilities by friends as the size of stables for 5 horses appeared excessive for a single person's use. There was also the potential for commercial use of the foaling box, with the potential sale of horses. The application required a suitable legal agreement to specify personal use. The application site was in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and potentially the new National Park. She also raised questions on the accessibility of the facility to local bridleways, which would either be by private agreement with neighbouring landowners or using a busy public highway. She asked Committee to ensure that the facilities would not be used for commercial use; that the foaling box be deleted (so as to prevent commercial use) and that the size of the stable block be reduced and that its colour and cladding be controlled by condition. The Committee agreed that its Viewing Sub-Committee should visit the application site to assess the conflicts of the application with planning policy, the potential for impact from the proposed size of the stable block and to clarify questions on access.

In respect of item 16 – Methodist Church, Chapel Road, Swanmore, Mr Ford spoke in objection to the application and Miss Selby spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Campbell, a Ward Member, spoke on this item. In summary, she stated that improvement works to the Methodist Church were overdue and she generally supported the application. However, the entrance to the building now to be in Spring Lane, presented a problem. Access problems on the winding road with its right-angled bend and the possible need for traffic to turn needed to be addressed. It was acknowledged that a number of user groups of the church would walk to events but the use of Spring Lane was still problematic. In response, the Director of Development Services stated that the traffic engineer had been consulted and was of the opinion that the traffic arrangements would work and that an objection could not be raised on this single issue. The proposal had the benefit of moving traffic off the principal access road. The Director also explained that the green transport plan was voluntary only and would not be secured by a legal condition. Following debate, the Committee supported the proposal as set out, and the Chairman encouraged Councillor Campbell to contact the traffic engineer directly with her points of concern.

In respect of item 19 – land forming Documentation House, Northgate House and land at Rear of Staple Gardens, Winchester, Mr Weeks and Mr Cambel spoke in objection to the application and Mr Deans spoke in support. In introducing the report, the Director of Development Services reported that he was now satisfied with the arrangements for service lorry access; the police had requested a condition that the proposed pedestrian route needed correct lighting and a management agreement in order that pedestrian security was achieved, and that the Council's Enablement Officer was satisfied with the inclusion of 19 one bed units of affordable housing to be managed by the Winchester Housing Group, and these units would be located close by their existing scheme at 20/21 Staple Gardens. In addition, it was reported that there had been 19 further letters of objection with points raised the same as those already documented in the report. The Director continued that the parking spaces on site would be reduced from 71 to 46 and that arrangements for construction traffic would be agreed with the applicant before works commenced on site. The Director concluded that English Heritage consultation was still awaited, with an issue being the impact of the proposals on the library which was a listed building.

In answer to Members' questions, the Director stated that the management company would be controlled by a Section 106 Agreement.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Nelmes, a Ward Member, spoke on this item. In summary, she stated that she was pleased that the architects had taken on board many of the points raised at previous Sub-Committee meetings to consider this application. However, she was concerned that no parking provision had been made for the affordable housing units, and this could be problematic if one of these units was made available for a disabled person, as there would be no provision for parking of any adapted vehicle for the occupier. She asked that this be included within the scheme. The Director of Development Services replied that this provision could be made for the affordable housing. Arising out of discussion, the Director of Development Services stated that he would explore with the management company the potential for including CCTV within the pedestrian access to increase security on the site. The Director was also requested to clarify access arrangements for parents with young children, together with access for emergency vehicles, particularly fire engines into the scheme.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to support the scheme as set out, subject to no material planning objections being raised by English Heritage, in which case the scheme would be brought back to Committee for re-consideration.

In respect of the development control applications that were not subject to public participation, the Director of Development Services reported that, in respect of item 2 – 5 Victoria Road, Winchester, the City of Winchester Trust had now withdrawn its objection.

In respect of item 10, the Chairman withdrew from the meeting for its consideration and the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Sutton, took the Chair for this item.

In respect of item 13, the Director of Development Services reported that representation had been received from Curdridge Parish Council regarding removal of trees from the site and there had been 5 further letters of objection referring to, in summary, the affect on character, policy objections, highway drainage and the further loss of trees. The Director stated that these matters had been taken into account in the recommendations and that planning permission was recommended subject to the inclusion of a condition for a contribution to Public Open Space and that in Condition

4, the reference to "and hedgerows" should be deleted. He added that a watching brief on the trees on the site would be undertaken.

In respect of item 15 – Barton Edge, Worthy Road, Winchester, the Director of Development Services reported that Hampshire County Council had requested an off-site highway contribution towards the Winchester Movement and Access Plan, and this request was supported by the Committee. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Nelmes, a Ward Member, commented on the potential for pollution from cars to the front kitchen windows of the properties facing the development.

In respect of item 18 – Central Site, Parkway, Whiteley, Councillor Hatch, a Ward Member for the Whiteley Ward, stated that in the report's assessment, she now had the latest figures for traffic movements on Whiteley Way accessing junction 9 of the M27. On Mondays to Fridays, this was 23,000 traffic movements; on Saturdays 19,000 and on Sunday 14,000. She asked that Hampshire County Council be requested to keep the City Council up to date on its surveys of traffic movements.

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 sites 5 and 14 on Tuesday, 9 December 2003 commencing at 9.30am and that Councillors Busher, Davies, Hatch, Pearce and Sutton be appointed to serve thereon.

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 7.15pm.

Chairman

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

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Hatch
Pearson (P)Read (P)
Sutton (P)Others in attendance:

Councillors Clohosey and Evans

Officers in attendance:Miss E Norgate – Principal Planning Officer
Mr I Elvin – Transport Engineer.**740. DETACHED 4-BED HOTEL ANNEXE TO REAR – OLD HOUSE HOTEL, THE SQUARE, WICKHAM (CASE NO. 03/02035/FUL)**

The Sub-Committee met at the Old House Hotel, The Square, Wickham. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Councillors Clohosey and Evans as Ward Members, a representative of Wickham Parish Council, the applicant - Mr Scott, and his agent Mrs Jezeph, together with three local residents, including Mrs O'Connell from the neighbouring property, Wickham House.

The application site was located to the rear of the Old House Hotel in The Square, Wickham. The hotel was a red brick building with a tiled roof, which was Grade II* listed and fell within the Wickham Conservation Area. Access was to the side of the building, where the gravel track dropped to a blockwork garage with a shallow pitched roof, which was granted planning permission in 1997. Beyond this, and a brick built retaining wall, was land in the ownership of the neighbouring property, Wickham House. The retaining wall was approximately 2 – 3 metres in height.

The proposal was for a detached 4-bed hotel annexe to be located to the rear of the site, 23 metres from the main building, and would entail the removal of the existing garage. This would provide 4 en-suite bedrooms to the main hotel, which currently had 10 bedrooms.

The application part of the site was lower than the main building, and the proposal was to be cut down into the ground in order to reduce its height. The annexe was to be an "L"-shape, single storey design, with fully hipped roofs and a central ridge. The proposed materials were brick with natural timber boarding and plain clay tiled roof. This application followed a previous application for a 6-bedroom annexe spread over two floors, which was refused under Officers' delegated powers in May 2003.

The site was within the Wickham Conservation Area and the settlement boundary. The most relevant policies for the application in the current Winchester District Local Plan were RT12, which encouraged the improvement of tourism facilities in the settlements subject to a number of criteria, including that the proposal should be appropriate to the settlement, the character of surrounding development, and the type of accommodation to be provided, that there should be adequate access and related car parking facilities, and that it accorded with EN5 and other relevant policies. The revised Local Plan Policy RT14 was relevant in that it encouraged the improvement of hotel facilities in the settlements, subject to them being appropriate to the settlement, the surrounding character and the facility to be provided in that it should be well related to public transport and that it accorded with DP3 and other relevant policies. The Wickham Village Design Statement was adopted in 2001 as supplementary planning guidance and the Wickham Conservation Area technical assessment had recently been approved by Council.

Miss Norgate informed Members that the key issues for this application were the impact on the Wickham Conservation Area and the setting of the listed building, parking, drainage and impact on amenities of adjoining properties.

The Sub-Committee viewed the access to the site, noting that six car parking spaces were provided to the side of the hotel for staff and customer parking. When the spaces were full, overflow parking took place in The Square. Mr Elvin commented that, in his 3 visits to the application site, on each occasion there had been spare parking spaces to the side of the hotel.

The Sub-Committee proceeded to view the application site, which had been marked out by the applicant in terms of its footprint. The applicant's agent displayed to the Sub-Committee plans of the application, together with details of elevations, including views from the neighbouring Wickham House and Wisteria House.

In response to Members' questions, Miss Norgate explained that the proposals were 6.3 metres in height to the roof ridge and that, due to the cutting in of the foundations into the slope, the existing drive would be slightly higher than the proposed annexe. The drive would be separated by a retaining wall and path. Facing the rear garden of Wickham House, which partially wrapped itself around the application site, there would be two patio doors, opening onto a small patio, which would face the rear garden. The annexe would be slightly set back from the boundary wall and, at its highest point, the patio doors would exceed the height of the existing boundary wall by approximately 1 metre.

Miss Norgate explained that the treatment of this boundary was a very important element of the application, and the Council had retained control that a landscaping scheme would be submitted to the City Council to address a proper boundary treatment, especially to reduce the impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property at Wickham House and inward views from the water meadows and railway embankment to the south.

In answer to questions from members of the public, the applicant's agent explained that the height of the building at 6 metres was necessary to provide a sufficient roof pitch to accommodate clay tiles to the roof and that its form would be broken down into 3 elements to break up its bulk. This would be further reduced by the incorporation of a hipped roof on the elevations facing the neighbouring properties. The incorporation into the roof of velux windows was to provide light into the bedrooms, as was the incorporation of patio doors on the southern elevation. Mr Scott added that screening would be incorporated to reduce the visual impact and

that the usual practice of hotel guests was to go out during the daytime and return to their room in the evening when sitting out and using the patio was more unlikely to cause overlooking of the neighbouring property.

The Sub-Committee also noted that 3 further parking spaces would be provided adjacent to the proposed annexe, with sufficient manoeuvring room to allow the cars to be turned. Mr Elvin commented that there were no highway objections to the application.

The Sub-Committee also noted that a wall would be incorporated between the hotel and the proposed annexe to provide further screening, which would be further enhanced by the landscape scheme. This would provide sufficient screening to this elevation.

The Sub-Committee proceeded to view the application site from the rear first and second storey windows of the neighbouring property, Wickham House, and also from its garden. The importance of providing a proper landscape scheme for screening was recognised, and it was suggested by a Member of the Sub-Committee that open trellis work could be incorporated along the boundary of the raised retaining wall to match that already used within the garden of the neighbouring property at Wickham House.

On returning to the Old House Hotel, Mr Scott stated that the annexe was necessary to safeguard the future financial viability of the hotel and that the affect on neighbours, including overlooking problems, could be overcome by the incorporation of landscaping.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Clohosey added that he was not opposed to the application provided the issue of overlooking was resolved by the incorporation of a good landscaping scheme to the boundary overlooking the rear garden of Wickham House. Councillor Evans added that she agreed that the viability of the hotel should be preserved but she did have concerns at the precedent of rear development within the burgage plots and at the inward views from the railway line. In addition, the parking problems in The Square needed to be addressed between the Parish Council and the City Council's Parking Department. She also remained concerned at the opportunity for overlooking that remained from the rear patio doors facing the rear garden of Wickham House.

A representative of Wickham Parish Council stated that he concurred with the concerns of Councillor Evans and was particularly worried that there should be no future development on the site of additional units. He also had concern about the party wall and the impact of the roof of the proposed annexe. He, too, wished to see the retention of a hotel within The Square at Wickham.

A local resident commented that, in his opinion, the architectural merit of the proposed design was not of a sufficiently high standard. A condition that quality materials be incorporated was not sufficient in itself to offset the poor quality of approach to the architecture that was being proposed. He commented that this was not untypical of the Wickham area and that a public debate with the City Council should take place to enhance the quality of architectural design within the rural areas. A further local resident added that the Wickham Village Design Statement had concluded that the burgage plots should be preserved and that development was, therefore, inappropriate.

In response, Miss Norgate stated that the assessment of the application was a question of balance. The Officers had concluded that an extension to the Grade II* listed building should not be encouraged, and that dialogue with the applicant had taken place to achieve the present scheme, which achieved a balance between preserving the economic viability of the hotel whilst keeping impact on the historical setting of the application to a minimum. As part of this approach, the Council had kept control on the materials and the incorporation of a landscape scheme and had tried to reduce the scale of impact of the proposals so that it should not compete in design with the very high standard of buildings that surrounded it. It was also noted that the present 1977 garage on the application site was of a poor design and quality and that this would be removed as part of the application.

Mr Elvin added that, under Government advice in PPG.13 the peak use for the operation of the hotel would not coincide with that of the retail use of The Square, in that hotel users were more likely to require car parking in the evening when the retail use of The Square was not at its peak. At the request of the Sub-Committee, it was agreed that further dialogue needed to take place between the Parish Council and the Council's Parking Department to address local concerns over parking in The Square. It was also noted that the Government guidance on leisure use and tourism would also make it difficult to sustain an objection on highway grounds at appeal.

In its assessment of the application, the Sub-Committee noted the negotiation that had taken place between the applicant and the Planning Department to reduce the scale of the proposals. It was also accepted that a landscape scheme was an important element of the application and that the incorporation of trellis work to match that incorporated in the garden of the neighbouring Wickham House would be of benefit. It was also agreed that, due to the difference in height between the application site and the fall of approximately 3 metres to the rear garden of Wickham House, that the Council's Building Control Department should survey the proposals to ensure that there was no slipping of land as a result of development, and, if this appeared likely, then the applicant would be requested to undertake their own survey. It was also suggested that dialogue take place between the Parish Council and the Planning Department on parking concerns in Wickham Square, and that the comments of the local resident on issues concerning architectural design were noted and were being presently debated by the City Council.

In conclusion, therefore, the Sub-Committee recommended approval of the application as set out below, subject to the stability of the retaining wall being assessed by the Council's Building Control Department and that the landscape proposals be agreed to reduce the impact of overlooking over the neighbouring garden of Wickham House (and the neighbour, Mr & Mrs O'Connell, be consulted on the materials to be incorporated, including matching trellis if possible).

RESOLVED:

That subject to the stability of the retaining wall being assessed by the council's Building Control Department and that the landscape proposals be agreed to reduce the impact of overlooking over the neighbouring garden of Wickham House, planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:-

01 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.

01 Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

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

02 Reason: To ensure that the development presents a satisfactory appearance in the interests of the amenities of the area.

03 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.

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

04 Detailed proposals for the disposal of foul and surface water shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the commencement of the development hereby permitted. The approved details shall be fully implemented before the building is occupied.

04 Reason: To ensure satisfactory provision of foul and surface drainage.

05 A detailed scheme for landscaping, tree and/or shrub planting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The scheme shall specify species, density, planting, size and layout. The scheme approved shall be carried out in the first planting season following the occupation of the building or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. If within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, any trees, shrubs or plants die, are removed or, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or defective, others of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, in the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

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

06 The building hereby permitted shall only be used for guest accommodation in association with the primary planning use of the site being C1 hotel.

06 Reason: To prevent uses arising, which may be inappropriate or over intensive for the site.

07 Details of the boundary treatment to the south-east (rear) boundary of the site shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority within 2 months of the date of this permission. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the occupation of the building hereby permitted.

07 Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the neighbouring property.

Informatives

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: E14, E16, UB3, T4, T5, T6
Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: EN5, HG3, HG6, HG7, HG23, T9, RT12
Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: DP3, HE2, HE5, HE16, T1, T4 RT14

02. All building works including demolition, construction and machinery or plant operation should only be carried out between the hours of 0800 and 1800 hours Monday to Friday and 0800 and 1300 Saturday and at no time on Sunday's or 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.

03. 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.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 11.05am

Chairman