

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**5 February 2004**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

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

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

Others in attendance:

Councillors Bailey, Bidgood, Carter and Nelmes

---

1025. **PLANNING (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC385 refers)

The Committee considered the application relating to industrial buildings, Lambourne Close, Sparsholt, as set out in minutes of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 21 January 2004 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 4 February 2004).

The Director of Development Services reported that further to the Sub-Committee meeting, Sparsholt Parish Council had written in support of the application and one further letter of support had been received from a member of the general public.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 21 January 2004 relating to industrial buildings, Lambourne Close, Sparsholt, be approved and adopted.

1026. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC381 refers)

The Committee noted the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 16 December 2003 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes). Arising from debate, the Director of Development Services reported that training for Council Members on telecommunications issues, including those relating to Tetra masts would shortly be arranged.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 16 December 2003 be received.

1027. **PLANNING (KNOWLE HOSPITAL) SUB-COMMITTEE**  
(Report PDC387 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning (Knowle Hospital) Sub-Committee meeting held on 6 January 2004 (attached as Appendix B to the minutes).

The Director of Development Services reported that, in respect of the application for Phase 9 of the development at Knowle Village, further to comments made by Members at the Sub-Committee meeting, the applicant had submitted amended plans for consideration. The Officers would submit these to Members in due course following consideration. In addition, the Director of Development Services stated that consultation would take place with the Chairman on whether a further meeting of the Sub-Committee was required, or whether the amended application could be brought directly to Committee for determination.

Further to a Member's comments, it was also agreed that in addition to points raised above, the issue of the provision of pavements should also be negotiated with the applicant.

The Director of Development Services continued that, in respect of construction works to upgrade access road to sewage treatment works – land north of North Park Farm, Mayles Lane, Knowle, it had been determined subsequent to the Sub-Committee meeting that Mr Cooper did not own the surrounding land as stated in the minutes. Therefore, following further consideration by the Officers, this application would be brought to Committee for determination at a future meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning (Knowle Hospital) Sub-Committee held on 6 January 2004 be approved and adopted.

1028. **PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS**  
(Report PDC382 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

1029. **BEECH CROFT, BOURNEFIELDS, TWYFORD**  
(Report PDC388 refers)

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as a Member of the Winchester Housing Group who was party to the application.

The Director of Development Services clarified that although the Northfields and Beechcroft sites were in different ownerships, both could be included within the variation to the legal agreement as proposed.

RESOLVED:

That the variation to the legal agreement be approved.

1030. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**  
(Report PDC384 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 4 and 7.

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as a Member of the City of Winchester Trust in items 4 and 7.

Councillor Pearson declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in item 3 as he was an ex-Member of Soberton Parish Council who supported the application.

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

In respect of item 1 – 30 Kestrel Close, Bishops Waltham, Mrs MacDonald spoke in support of the application. Following debate, the Committee agreed to approve the application and delegated authority to the Director of Development Services in consultation with the Chairman to agree appropriate conditions.

In respect of item 3 – St Peters Parish Church, School Hill, Soberton, Mrs Fickry spoke against the application; Mr J Highland representing Soberton Parish Council spoke in support, and Mr N Chapman, Church Warden, also spoke in support. Following debate, the Committee agreed that its Viewing Sub-Committee should visit the site on 16 February 2004 in order that issues relating to the proposed extension's relationship with neighbouring properties, and the design of the building could be assessed on site.

In respect of item 4 – Racquets, Lankhills Road, Winchester, Mr Hutchings spoke against the application and Mr C Mitra spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Nelmes, a Ward Member, spoke on this item. In summary, she stated that Lankhills Road was narrow and was inadequate for two cars to pass side by side. Refuse lorries already had to reverse into Lankhills Road to gain access and there was no room for turning. In addition, with the majority of traffic not keeping to the speed limits on the main access into Worthy Road, the proposed visibility splays would be inadequate. For pedestrian access, the pavements were narrow and the combination of extra units of accommodation and associated vehicles would lead to additional vehicular movements within a tight and inadequate access. If the full visibility splays were achieved, then there would be a cutting back of vegetation, which would lose an element of screening to the site. In addition, as the application site was on a hill and three storeys in height it would become visible to inward views and would be alien to its surroundings. The issue of vehicle movements of visitors to the proposed dwellings was also of concern. Following consideration, the Committee agreed to refuse the application and delegated authority to the Director of Development Services, in consultation with the Chairman to agree reasons for refusal.

In respect of item 5 – 1 to 6 Norton Close, Southwick, Fareham, Mr Nicholls spoke against the application and Mr Wildig spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Carter, the Ward Member, spoke on this item. In summary, Councillor Carter stated that the Ministry of Defence had built the flats in the 1960s for naval personnel. As 1960s buildings, they were utilitarian in appearance and poor in design. The area was lacking in facilities and the problems of the area would be increased with the forthcoming closure of H M S Dryad, which was a significant local employer. There were, therefore, questions over the need and sustainability of the proposals. There was also an issue in respecting the privacy of nearby properties in that a substantial planting of evergreen trees to reduce the possibility of overlooking of neighbouring properties would be required. He requested the Committee to consider whether its Viewing Sub-Committee should visit the site. In considering the application, the Committee agreed that the Viewing Sub-Committee should visit the site on 16 February 2004.

In respect of item 7 – Flat 3, 17 Southgate Street, Winchester, Mr T Jones spoke against the application. Following consideration, the Committee agreed to support the Officer's recommendation as set out.

In respect of the items not subject to public participation, at the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Bailey spoke in respect of item 6 – Land adjacent to Ashcroft, 3 Shepherds Lane, Compton. In summary, she stated that Compton and Shawford Parish Council had raised objection to the application as the Sub-Division would create two very small plots, which would be out of character with neighbouring properties. The new development would also be overbearing on 3 Shepherds Lane and would present Fermain (the neighbouring property) with a two storey brick wall on their boundary. She added that there was also concern at the access onto Old Shepherds Lane, and that the extra traffic generation would be of concern. Following consideration of the points raised in the report and by Councillor Bailey, the Committee supported the application as set out.

The Committee noted that item 2 – Land opposite Moorhill Coach House, St Annes Lane, Shedfield, had been deferred so that a comprehensive report could be brought to the Committee's next meeting following the close of the period for public consultation. In addition, in respect of item 10 - Church Height, Shoe Lane, Upham, the Director of Development Services reported that the Conservation Team were now satisfied with the accuracy of the drawings submitted. The Committee supported the application 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 sites 3 and 5 on Monday 16 February 2004 commencing at 9.30am with the membership as appointed at the meeting of the Committee held on 4 February 2004.
3. That the Director of Development Services, in consultation with the Chairman, be delegated authority to agree reasons for refusal in respect of item 4.

1031. **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 100I and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

<u>Minute Number</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Description of Exempt Information</u>
1032	Land at Northfields Farm, Twyford, Humphreys 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).

1032. **LAND AT NORTHFIELDS FARM, TWYFORD, HUMPHREYS FARMS LTD**  
(Report PDC389 refers)

The Committee noted that this item had not been notified for inclusion on the agenda within the statutory deadline.

The Chairman agreed to accept the item as a matter requiring urgent consideration, in view of the need for the Committee to give guidance on whether a formal decision notice should be issued to grant planning permission for the conversion of redundant agricultural buildings to light industrial research and design studio, warehouse and storage uses at S J D Humphrey Holdings, Northfields Poultry Farm, Northfields, Twyford, Winchester.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Bidgood, a Ward Member, spoke on this item. In summary, he made reference to a number of inaccuracies within the report, which he stated he would take up with the City Secretary and Solicitor outside of the meeting.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to the recommendations as set out.

RESOLVED:

That having taken into account the comments made by Twyford Parish Council, Members noted the letter faxed from Twyford Parish Council on 30 January 2004 and that it be agreed that the formal decision notice be issued.

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 6.20pm

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB COMMITTEE

16 December 2003

Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)  
Busher (P)  
Johnston (P)

Pearson (P)  
Sutton (P)  
Read (P)

Officers in attendance:

Mrs S Proudlock (Team Manager (DC West))

---

1033. **TEMPORARY INSTALATION (12 MONTHS) OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT COMPRISING 22 METRE HIGH POLE TO SUPPORT THREE ANTENNAE AND ONE 600MM TRANSMISSION DISH, ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT CABIN AND GENERATOR IN FENCED COMPOUND (RETROSPECTIVE) FOR AIRWAVE MM02 - RAGLINGTON FARM, BOTLEY ROAD, SHEDFIELD.**

The Sub-Committee met at the application site at Raglington Farm, Botley Road, Shedfield. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Holt from LCC, the agent representing the applicant Airwave MM02 Limited.

Mrs Proudlock explained that a full planning application had been submitted on behalf of Airwave MMO2 for the temporary erection (12 months) of telecommunications equipment as detailed above. Members were reminded that this was a retrospective application following notification to the Council's planning enforcement team as the equipment had been erected without planning permission. A number of representations had been received raising concerns including the visual intrusion of the mast and perceived associated health risks.

The Sub-Committee noted that the mast was visible from the A334 although this would be reduced by tree foliage. The nearest residential property was located 194 metres from the site and the applicant had provided a certificate of compliance with the ICNIRP guidelines.

Further to questions, Mr Holt explained that the applicant had obtained permission in May 2003 to share the existing '02' mast situated close by. However, satisfactory legal agreements with the landowner had not been achieved in time for the necessary testing of the network. Therefore, the temporary installation had been erected. He reported that preliminary works on permanent structure had now been completed and his client was satisfied that the issues regarding legal consents were

to be overcome imminently. Therefore his client advised that the 12-month consent requested could be substantially reduced.

Mr Holt explained that all temporary equipment would be removed by the end of the consent period. Referring to the earlier consent given for the sharing of the permanent structure, Members were reminded that all equipment would be housed in existing cabinets.

In conclusion, Members supported the application. However, it was agreed that the Chairman write to the Chief Executive of MM02 to remind them of the necessary consultative procedures prior to the construction of such equipment. Furthermore, it was requested that the Director of Development Services notify Shedfield Parish Council, local Ward Members and residents of the circumstances surrounding the application. Further to discussion and consultation with the applicant's agent, it was agreed that a satisfactory end-date to the temporary period of consent should be 31 March 2004.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. 1TEM((31 March 2004)(the mast and the associated equipment hereby permitted shall be removed)

1TEMR

The meeting commenced at 9.40am and concluded at 10.05am.

Chairman



**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (KNOWLE HOSPITAL) SUB-COMMITTEE**

**6 January 2004**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Bennetts (P)  
Clohosey (P)  
Davies  
Evans (P)

Hatch (P)  
Pearson (P)  
Read (P)  
Sutton (P)

Officers in Attendance:

Mrs S Proudlock (Team Manager Planning)  
Ms M Newton (Landscape Architect)

---

1034. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Davies and de Peyer.

1035. **ERECTION OF 41 NO. DWELLINGS COMPRISING OF 5 NO. TWO BEDROOM, 12 NO. FOUR BEDROOM AND 24 NO. THREE BEDROOM DWELLINGS, ASSOCIATED GARAGES AND PARKING, SECTION OF DISTRIBUTION ROAD, PUMPING STATION AND LANDSCAPING AT KNOWLE VILLAGE (DETAILS IN COMPLIANCE WITH OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION W14097/33) PLANNING APPLICATION W14097/34**

(Oral Report)

The Sub-Committee met at the portacabin at Knowle Hospital and the Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately 10 members of the public together with representatives of the applicant, Berkeley Homes.

Mrs Proudlock explained that Phase Nine of the development of Knowle Village comprised of the erection of 41 dwellings, of which 5 were two bedroom, 12 four bedroom and 24 three bedroom dwellings with associated garages and parking. Phase Nine also included the construction of a pumping station, landscaping and part of the distribution road.

Mr Shepherd, on behalf of Berkeley Homes, explained that the character of the development within Phase Nine would be more fragmented and be more rural in nature than the centre of the village. It was proposed that the style of the buildings would be simple and that they would use timber window frames and garage doors, brick, reconstituted stone and that some key buildings would have rendered gables. The application also proposed that the siting of the buildings should be less formal to underline its more organic, rural character.

The siting of the distribution road had been agreed with the County Council in the masterplan. However, in order for this road to be adopted by the County, its gradient would need to be limited by extensive ground levelling. Ms Simes, Berkeley Homes' Landscape Architect, explained that this would be achieved through the creation of an embankment onto Mayles Lane that descended away from the development. At its extreme the embankment would be 8 metres above Mayles Lane, and it was proposed that this be stepped and landscaped with trees of varying ages on the flat step, the berm (that would have a width of 2 metres), and smaller plants on the one-in-two gradient slopes. This, Ms Simes suggested, would through time replace the existing tree cover that had to be cleared for the construction.

Members commented on the drainage at the embankment and Mr Shepherd stated that this would be dealt with naturally as far as possible and by the pumping station off Mayles Lane. With regard to Members' concerns regarding the stability of the embankment, Mr Shepherd confirmed that Berkeley Homes would be advised by the Council's Building Control officers.

Ms Newton explained that she had calculated the gradient to be one-in-one between each berm and that there were significant gaps in the existing vegetation that would make the development very prominent from views along Mayles Lane for some time. In response to a comment from a member of the public, it was agreed that the Sub-Committee should visit this part of the village to assess its likely impact. The Sub-Committee also heard from members of the public who were concerned at the scale of the embankment and from those who stated that the embankment could not be, through its inaccessibility, considered part of the public open space. However, Mr Shepherd commented that the 10 metre verge from Mayles Lane to the start of the embankment would be landscaped and available for public use. He added that across the whole development the provision of open spaces exceeded the area set out in the masterplan.

Berkeley Homes intended the open spaces in the area to be connected through a "green link" that lead down to an ancient woodland, Dean Copse, that was within their area of ownership. Mr Shepherd proposed that this woodland, through minimal disturbance, would be made more accessible to the public by the creation of a footpath accessible from the development and from Mayles Lane.

It was noted that the boundary between Mayles Lane and the development would be marked by the existing wrought iron fence along part of the development and that elsewhere Mr Shepherd stated that the thick vegetation and steep gradient of the bank made any further fencing unnecessary.

The Sub-Committee discussed the parking facilities for the new development and Mr Shepherd explained that the application proposed between one and two spaces per dwelling and was compliant with Government policy. He further explained that these spaces would be as low key as possible and tucked back behind the buildings. He added that the loop roads that served these properties were designed for shared pedestrian/vehicle use with no footpaths and no space for on-street parking. Some general car parking spaces would be provided and retained by the management company and these would be surfaced with rolled chippings to produce a hard wearing grey finish.

A Member expressed concern that the parking facilities were inadequate to serve what was an essentially rural and unsustainable location. This view was echoed by members of the public who also commented on the potential dangers that shared pedestrian/roadways would have for children and the lack of car parking spaces for visitors. In response, Mr Shepherd explained that the shared roadways had been successful at the Poundbury model village in Dorset.

In response to Members' questions, Mr Shepherd explained that this phase of the development contained a higher percentage of affordable housing, but taken as a whole, 64% of Knowle Village came within the definition of affordable housing.

Members expressed a concern for the level of disturbance associated with the construction and Mr Shepherd explained that this would be limited through conditions and that construction traffic would not access Mayles Lane.

It was suggested that the nature of the larger dwellings to be constructed in this phase of the development was likely to attract a number of families as occupants. Members therefore discussed the case to establish a play area within Phase Nine and Mr Shepherd explained that whilst this was not in the application, the siting of play areas would be determined through negotiation with residents.

Members were also concerned by the proximity of some of the dwellings to existing trees and Ms Simes confirmed that the applicant was reviewing this.

Mrs Proudlock reported that the Environment Agency, Southern Water, and the Archaeology Department had not objected to the application. However, the Council were still awaiting comments from the Police, English Heritage, the County Council and Fareham Borough Council.

A representative of the Parish Council addressed the Sub-Committee and stated that no further work should be granted planning permission until the completion of the community centre at the chapel. In response, Mr Shepherd explained that the chapel's flooring had been ordered and would be laid in the near future. Although OFSTED had required additional screening within the chapel for pre-school activities, Mr Shepherd stated that once the flooring was complete, the chapel would meet the specifications of the community centre as set out in the masterplan. He explained that whilst negotiations continued between Berkeley Homes, OFSTED and conservation officers concerning the screens, the chapel would be opened as a community centre following the completion of the flooring. He added that it would be administered by Berkeley Homes until the residents' association was able to take on its operation.

In conclusion, Members thanked the representatives of Berkeley Homes and the public for their contributions to the debate and recommended that officers should further consider the concerns raised. It was also agreed that a site visit should be arranged to evaluate the impact of the embankment onto Mayles Lane.

#### RECOMMENDED:

1. That further negotiation take place with the applicants particularly in respect of the embankment, the access road, parking issues, and the provision of children's playareas.
2. That further consideration be given to a site visit to access possible impact of the development from Mayles Lane.

1036. **CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPLICATION W08655/13: CONSTRUCTION WORKS TO UPGRADE ACCESS ROAD TO SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS – LAND NORTH OF NORTH PARK FARM, MAYLES LANE, KNOWLE**  
(Oral Report)

Mrs Proudlock explained that the application sought to upgrade the maintenance access to the sewage treatment works along an informal track. The sewage treatment works were located outside the boundaries of the former Knowle Hospital. She explained that the Council's arboriculturalist had stated that this would result in some, but not a substantial, loss of trees that would require re-planting. Whilst the Environment Agency had not commented on the application, the Highways Agency had expressed its concerns about the access road's egress onto Mayles Lane.

The Sub-Committee heard from Mr Cooper who owned the surrounding land. He stated that the upgrade was unnecessary as the plant had always been accessed by another track leading through North Park Farm which he stated required no upgrade nor loss of trees. In response Mr Shepherd explained that Berkeley Homes had been denied access along this track by one of the owners.

However, Members agreed that the application should be deferred to gather further information about land ownership issues and that a site visit should be arranged to assess the track's egress onto Mayles Lane.

**RECOMMENDED:**

That application be deferred pending further information and that a site visit be arranged to assess egress onto Mayles Lane.

1037. **VOTE OF THANKS TO MR NANGREAVE**

The Sub-Committee noted that Mr Nangreave, who was unable to attend this meeting, was due to leave the Council and take up a new post at Eastleigh Borough Council. Members wished to express their thanks to Mr Nangreave for his hard work at Winchester City Council and in particular for the expert guidance he had given Members and the leading role he had taken in the Knowle Village development.

The meeting commenced at 7.00pm and concluded at 9.00pm.

Chairman