

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL | PDC 384 |
| PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE | |
| Development Control Applications | 05.02.2004 |

THE AVAILABILITY OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

In deciding what recommendation to make on each of the following applications, the Director of Development Services has had regard to all documents contained in the application file. The following list specifies the categories of documents which may be found on such a file although in any particular case there may be no documents in that category.

1. Application form, required certificates, plans and drawings.
2. Correspondence between the Planning Department and the Applicant or the Applicant's agents.
3. Correspondence, including correspondence between the Planning Department and other Departments of the Council or other Authorities.
4. Notes of site visits, meetings and discussions.
5. Representations received from any party.
6. Amended plans and drawings.

Background papers may be inspected prior to the meeting to which this report is made and for 4 years thereafter beginning with the date of the meeting.

THE STATUS OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

Members of the public are reminded that, as will all reports submitted to Councillors for decision:

- The recommendations contained in a report are those made by the officers at the time the report was prepared. Circumstances may cause a different recommendation to be made at the meeting.
- The officers' recommendations may not be accepted by the Committee.
- A final decision is only made once Councillors have formally considered and determined each application.

THE REASONS FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Applications are referred to Committee for any of the following reasons. The letter at the beginning of each recommendation indicates the reason for referrals.

- 'M' A Councillor registers a request that a planning application be referred to Committee.
- 'P' A Parish Council submits representations contrary to the Officer recommendation.
- 'C' The Case Officer or Team Manager considers the application to be controversial or potentially controversial or the application is for a major development..
- 'O' Four or more representations are received which are contrary to the Officer's recommendation.
- 'D' Any planning applications submitted by or on behalf of a Member or Officer of the Council which they have notified to the Director of Development Services.

THE CONDITIONS ATTACHED TO RECOMMENDATIONS

Many of these conditions are shown in code, as this saves on costs. Details of the conditions are circulated to all Parish Councils and are held in the Planning Department

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004
Changes to the recommendation in the summary may have occurred you are advised to
check the recommendation in the attached main report

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE SUMMARY

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Item No: 01 | Location: 30 Kestrel Close Bishops Waltham Southampton Hampshire SO32 1RN |
| | Case No: 03/02833/FUL |
| | Ref No: W10751/02 |
| | Recommendation REF |
| Item No: 02 | Location: Land Opposite Moorhill Coach House St Annes Lane Shedfield Hampshire |
| | Case No: 03/01339/FUL |
| | Ref No: W18185/01 |
| | Recommendation PER |
| Item No: 03 | Location: St Peter's Parish Church School Hill Soberton Hampshire |
| | Case No: 03/02562/FUL |
| | Ref No: W18621 |
| | Recommendation REF |
| Item No: 04 | Location: Racquets Lankhills Road Winchester Hampshire SO23 7AE |
| | Case No: 03/02311/FUL |
| | Ref No: W12896/05 |
| | Recommendation PER |
| Item No: 05 | Location: 1 - 6 Norton Close Southwick Fareham Hampshire |
| | Case No: 03/01437/FUL |
| | Ref No: W18418 |
| | Recommendation PER |
| Item No: 06 | Location: Land Adjacent To Ashcroft 3 Shepherds Lane Compton Hampshire |
| | Case No: 03/02852/FUL |
| | Ref No: W18676 |
| | Recommendation PER |
| Item No: 07 | Location: Flat 3 17 Southgate Street Winchester Hampshire SO23 9AA |
| | Case No: 03/02763/FUL |
| | Ref No: W02572/07 |
| | Recommendation PER |
| Item No: 08 | Location: Mud Island Nurseries Southwick Road North Boarhunt Fareham Hampshire PO17 6JF |
| | Case No: 03/02830/FUL |
| | Ref No: W11132/16 |
| | Recommendation PER |
| Item No: 09 | Location: Rosemary Cottage Manor Road Durley Hampshire SO32 2AF |
| | Case No: 03/02741/FUL |
| | Ref No: W05804/06 |
| | Recommendation PER |

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

Item **Parish** Bishops Waltham
01 **Conservation Area:**
Case No: 03/02833/FUL
Ref No: W10751/02
Date Valid: 25 November 2003
Grid Ref: 454452 117795
Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Mr Simon Avery
Applicant: Mr And Mrs R Macdonald
Proposal: Double garage to front/ side of property
Location: 30 Kestrel Close Bishops Waltham Southampton Hampshire SO32
1RN

Officer Report

History

W10751: Two storey rear extension single storey garage extension: REF: 09/09/1988

W10751/01: Two storey and single storey rear extensions: PER: 13/01/1989

Policy

Development plan

HCSPR: UB3

WDLP: EN5

Emerging development plan

WDLPR DP3

Other material considerations

None

Consultations

Highways Engineers – No objections subject to a condition restricting the future use of the garage

Representations

Parish Council – Support

Assessment

This property is a detached house of red bricks with brown concrete pan tiles on the roof and red clay tiles over the porch and bay window. It is on the junction of Winchester Road and Kestrel Close. Opposite the property there is a new terraced development and there is a large grassed verge in front of this. To the south and west are similar detached houses. There is also a wide verge on Winchester Road adjacent to the site. There are trees along this verge to the west of the property. There was an integral garage on the south west side of the house but this has been converted into a room. There is a tarmac drive to the front and a lawn to the side and rear. The property has been extended to the rear. The front boundary, and the boundary adjoining No 29 to the south are both enclosed by 1 metre high close boarded fencing while the side adjacent to Winchester Road is enclosed by 1.8 metre high fencing. The land level slopes down from Winchester Road toward Kestrel Close.

This proposal is for a separate garage to be sited forward of the dwelling in the front right-hand corner of the garden. It will be 5.2 metres wide and 5.5 metres deep and measure 4.4 metres high to the top of the pitched roof. It will be constructed of materials to match the brickwork and roof tiles of the main house.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

The proposal will have no impact on the adjoining properties to the south or west, and the highway engineer has indicated that there is no highway objection.

However, the concerns with this proposal are that it would be a large structure on a prominent front corner of a junction and therefore would be out of character with the local environment and would be visually intrusive.

Out of Character

The other houses in the near vicinity on Kestrel Close all have integral garages and none of them have large built structures in their front gardens. They also mostly have low front fencing and these characteristics, along with the large open verge opposite the site, give the street a relatively spacious, open appearance, and this is an important part of its character. To erect a garage in this forward position would detract from this and would be out of character with the surrounding development. It could also set a precedent.

Visual Intrusion

This garage would be alongside the boundary adjacent to Winchester Road and would be substantially taller than the side fencing here. It would also be very close to the front boundary on Kestrel Close which only has low fencing. Therefore it will be very visible from the main Winchester Road and from Kestrel Close itself and this is exacerbated by the drop in levels from Winchester Road to the bottom of Kestrel Close. Its prominent position also means that the structure would obscure the important open views of the Close and the landscape beyond.

Conclusion

Therefore this proposal is contrary to Policy EN5 of the WDLP in that it is not in sympathy with the appearance and character of the local environment and it is visually intrusive by reason of its scale, mass and siting in relation to adjoining spaces and views and your officer would recommend that it is refused.

Recommendation

O - THAT PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:-

Conditions/Reasons

01 The proposed development is contrary to Policy UB3 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan, Policy EN5 of the Winchester District Local Plan, and may prejudice the Proposals of the emerging Winchester District Local Plan (Review) in that it is not in sympathy with the appearance and character of the local environment and it is visually intrusive by reason of its scale, mass and siting in relation to adjoining spaces and views.

Informatives

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB3

Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: EN5

Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: DP3

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

Item **Parish** Shedfield
02 Conservation Area:
Case No: 03/01339/FUL
Ref No: W18185/01
Date Valid: 22 May 2003
Grid Ref: 455962 113568
Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Lisa Booth
Applicant: Mrs Diane Thompson
Proposal: Stable block comprising 2 No. stables with tackroom and haybarn
Location: Land Opposite Moorhill Coach House St Annes Lane Shedfield
Hampshire

Officer Report

History

W18185 – Stable block comprising 2 no. stables with tackroom and haybarn – Refused 21/03/03

Policies

Development plan

HCSP(R) – UB3, C1, C2

WDLP – EN.5, C1, C2, C24, RT.8, T9

Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: DP3, C1, C27, RT10, T2

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Village Design Statement – None

Other – None

Government Policy

PPGs – PPG7 – Annex F

Circulars - None

Consultations

The same access arrangements apply as per the previous refused application W18185. Therefore, comments from the Engineering Department dated 04/03/03 still apply, and are given below. However, the applicant has stated in her supporting letter that the stables will be accessed by foot and not by any vehicles.

Engineers – No highway objection subject to model condition H070 being applied together with a condition restricting private use of the stables. It was evident that the existing unsurfaced access suffers from an accumulation of mud, potholes and rutting. If the application is permitted and the existing access is left unattended, the increase in trip generation together with the turning manoeuvres will cause the situation to significantly deteriorate. It is highly likely that the edge of publicly maintained carriageway will be weakened and consequently break up, thereby adding to the dangers to users of the adjoining highway. In order to prevent this from occurring the existing access for a distance of 15 metres approx. should be upgraded to provide a private vehicle access having a non-permeable and non migratory surface. It is also advisable for a suitable vehicle driveway to be constructed between the access junction and the stable block together with an on site turning area, in order to facilitate ease of access by cars pulling horse boxes.

Representations

Letters have been sent to objectors advising of the submission of the amended plans and any representations received in connection with the amended plans will be summarised at the Planning Development Control Committee.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

Assessment

The site is approx. 2 hectares fronting St Anne's Lane. It consists of a field, which is elevated up from the road and continues to slope up for approximately 230m. There is minimal boundary treatment around the site, apart from a laurel hedge of approx. 5m in width and 5m in height along the boundary with the road frontage. At the top of the site there is a band of trees separating the fields from those behind.

The proposal was originally for the erection of a stable block consisting of 2 stables, hay barn and tack room to the far end of the site against the back drop of the existing trees. However, Members will be aware that the application was the subject of a Viewing-Sub Committee on 10 September 2003, where various issues were discussed regarding the application. Members agreed at the meeting to defer any recommendation to the Planning Development Control Committee pending further information from officers with regard to manure collection, rights of way at the top of the field and consideration of repositioning the stables at the bottom of the field. Officers maintain a concern with the proposed revised position adjacent the road. However, the amended plans have been submitted in response to Members request at the Viewing-Sub Committee.

The applicant has stated that the disposal of manure from the field will be removed by a specialist company once a fortnight, and will be placed within a walled area, which is positioned at the furthest point from the nearest property (Moorhill Coach House). This is shown on the amended plans submitted, which also shows the repositioning of the proposed stables at the bottom of the field adjacent to the existing Laurel bush, which is to be retained. Any problems that may arise from possible smells, etc from the manure are covered by separate Environmental Health legislation.

Also shown on the amended plans is a 1 metre wide gap at the top of the field on the applicants own land to allow pedestrian access to the footpath across the golf course at the rear of the field. Public footpath no.3 can be accessed from the junction of Winchester Road and St Annes Lane, and runs some distance from the rear of the applicant's site.

The stable building measures 15m by 3.6m with an additional concrete hardstanding measuring 15m by 5.1m. It is to be used for sheltering the applicant's own horses and for minimal recreational purposes. The nearest dwelling to the amended proposal (Moorhill) is located 50m away.

The field was previously used for market gardening and has now been left to pasture. The area for grazing will be fenced with post and rail fencing around the perimeter of the field, with hedgerow proposed to be planted to the front boundary and further planting to either side of the stables to afford some screening. Means of access is also to be considered and the plans also show an area of land to be used as off-road parking.

Therefore, your Officers recommend that permission be granted subject to conditions.

Recommendation

O - THAT PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:-

Conditions/Reasons

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

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

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

02 The building shall be used solely for the stabling of the applicants own horses and associated hay, feed and tack storage, for private recreational use unless the Local Planning Authority gives prior written approval for an alternative use. The site shall not be used for livery, training, commercial breeding or any other commercial purpose.

02 Reason: To define the permission for the avoidance of doubt, and in the interests of the amenities of the area.

03 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.

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

04 No floodlighting whether free standing or affixed to an existing structure, shall be provided on the site at any time.

04 Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the locality.

05 Details of the facilities for the storage of horse manure and its means of disposal from the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the use of the stables is commenced. The facilities shall be provided and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details.

05 Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the locality.

06 The proposed access parking area shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with specifications to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be constructed using a non-migratory surfacing material.

06 Reason: To ensure satisfactory means of access.

07 Prior to the commencement of work, the following details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details:

a) details of fencing and gates.

07 Reason: To protect the character and appearance of the area.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

Informatives

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB3, C1, C2

Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: EN5, C1, C2, C7, C24, RT8, T9

Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: DP3, C1, C6, C27, RT10, T2

02. This permission is granted for the following reasons:

The development is in accordance with the policies and proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), planning permission should therefore be granted.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

Item **Parish** Soberton
03 **Conservation Area:**
Case No: 03/02562/FUL
Ref No: W18621
Date Valid: 21 October 2003
Grid Ref: 460958 116795
Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Lisa Booth
Applicant: PCC And Churchwardens
Proposal: Single storey extension to side to provide meeting room, parish office and facilities with external stairs to roof storage
Location: St Peter's Parish Church School Hill Soberton Hampshire

Officer Report

History

None

Development Plan Policies / Government Planning Policies

HCSP(R) UB3, C1, C2, E7, E14
WDLP EN5, C1, C2, C7, HG1, HG2, HG3, HG20, HG23,
WDLP(R) DP3, DP5, DP6, C1, C6, C7, HE1, HE2, HE14, HE16

Consultations

Conservation - Had previous correspondence with applicants. Application contrary to PPG15 and above policies. The following issues were raised by the LPA in Nov 2002:

- Using the west doors is the only viable option
- Creating a new door in the north wall is not appropriate since it involves destruction of historic fabric
- No over riding concerns with regard to the re-siting of the box. Wherever the extension is placed there will be extensive archaeological concerns.
- It is considered that it would be preferable to construct an entirely separate building, in any case any link should be insubstantial and ephemeral.
- If it is considered that an extension is appropriate it should be of its period, with materials complimenting those of the church.
- There are magnificent views to the west, it is considered that any proposal should take account of this in the design.

In June 2003 after extensive talks with the Conservation section, they stated that "if additional accommodation is required and the need for that accommodation substantiated we would prefer to see a separate building. In addition we do not believe that any of the schemes to date would be acceptable. In addition we do not believe that sufficient justification has been provided to show why an attached extension is the only option. Despite the letter from David Brock from English Heritage we continue to hold the view that an attached extension to this church would be unacceptable and would not be approved by ourselves."

Letters of objection were received at the preliminary enquiry stage.

Archaeology - Sensitive site lying next to 11th Century church within medieval churchyard. Proposal will entail significant ground reduction to the north of the church in order to achieve a finished floor level comparable with that of the church interior.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

The build-up to the north of the church is indicative of the extent of activity in this area since the medieval period, such activity comprising the burial of human remains. Several tombstones will be moved, human remains impacted and a programme of archaeological work will be required in mitigation of devt. Impact of devt. on remains cannot be assessed at this stage. However, an archaeological evaluation to determine the impact of the development on archaeological remains has been carried out, but a report on the results not yet received. However, a visit to the site revealed a depth of 0.95-1.2m of disturbed ground, which shows articulated human remains dating to the late post-medieval period (probably 19th century) being located at this depth. The archaeological contractor and agent have confirmed that the depth of the proposed raft foundation lies some 300mm above this level. View is that significant archaeological remains will not be impacted by the proposed development. Any impact on remains can be mitigated by a programme of archaeological work (watching brief) secured by condition (A010).

Engineers - Use of hall as Sunday school whilst services occur in the main building is unlikely to create a material increase in traffic. However, it is planned to use the new building as a meeting room for 35 people, formal and informal church and parish gatherings, social events, etc creating a facility for community use. Many of these are additional activities that will lead to additional traffic being generated at other times during the week other than Sunday. App. form states parking as existing. However, it appears that no on-site parking is to be provided. Concerned that the proposal if permitted will increase the amount of on-street parking on the public highway network in the vicinity, which will add to the hazards of road users and be detrimental to highway safety. HCC parking standards indicate that 1 parking space per 10 sq.m. of open hall area, which results in 3 on-site spaces. Mindful of the description of the potential uses of the building it would be beneficial to provide a parking facility in excess of this. Normal average weekly church attendance is 40 people. I suggest that HCC's req. of 1 space per 5 people is applied, then a total of 8 spaces should be provided. A car park facility of this size would not only cater for the new building being used separately to the church, but should also reduce the impact of on street parking during Sunday Services.

(NB: The applicant's stated verbally that the green in front of the church is used for car parking, and therefore no additional parking facilities are required and should not be a reason for refusal. The Engineering Department has been informed of this information and will reassess the situation. An update will be given to Members at Committee)

English Heritage - No objection

Representations

5 letters of objection from local residents - Question the need; already existing facilities that can be used within close walking distance, Village Hall already used for weddings, events, etc, was also once used for the Sunday School; 'need' originates from sale of vicarage, a pity that this was not properly considered; Is a need for toilet, water supply, etc but could be provided without need for a major structure; vestry could be used as office; where are the items currently stored?; 25% increase in floor area; Massive and grandiose scheme not justified by the modest needs; Parking and traffic issues - concern over the increase caused by additional uses proposed, no parking proposed, concern re: access by emergency vehicles due to parked cars; Any extension would impact on the church as a landmark; Height seems excessively high for a single storey structure.

Parish Council - Support - Members of the PC have been involved in the design process and considered carefully both the siting and design of the proposals. As your officers may be aware a number of alternatives have been considered and rejected as being unsuitable. It is felt by both myself and other council members that the current option respects the setting of the church its historic structure and the wider landscape.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

We also understand that both English Heritage and the Church Commissioners Historic Buildings Officer do not object to the proposals. In the event of a committee meeting the Parish Council will attend and speak in favour of the application. Finally, it is our view that the need case has been proven both in terms of practical facilities and community needs.

Assessment & Other Material Considerations

The site consists of a Grade I listed church and graveyard area, located within the AONB and countryside. There is a dwelling neighbouring the church to the north of the church and open fields surrounding the side and rear. An open area is situated to the front of the church boundaries, within the church ownership and a public footpath is accessed in front of the church gates running through the fields. There are hedges and trees along the boundaries.

The proposal is to extend the Grade I listed, St Peters Parish Church on the north elevation with a single storey extension with storage space in the roof. This is accessed by external stairs. It is to provide a meeting room, office, kitchen and toilet facilities, with a new entrance lobby. A new stone footpath would link round the entire rear of the church from the west door to the extension. Due to differences in floor levels and outside ground levels the extension will need to be dug into the ground, which will mean the removal of some graves.

There is a statement of need for this facility. This suggests that the need is due to the vicarage being sold off in 2002, which means there are no toilets, meeting rooms, kitchen or toilet facilities, Parish Office or storage adjacent to the church. The new vicarage is now located about 1 mile away, so is felt cannot be used. However, some parishioners of Soberton have indicated, by way of objection to the scheme, that they feel that there is no need for this extension and that the facilities can be provided by using the facilities of the Village Hall. However, the applicant's feel that this Hall (and another local hall) are not within a satisfactory distance for Church linked activities (such as Sunday School) and they are too large and well used to be suitable or regularly available for small gatherings. The existing Church has no water supply or drainage and no toilet. It may be possible to provide this facility within the church itself. It is felt that the other facilities to be provided are duplicating those, which are to be found within the Village Hall itself and that at this time that no over-riding justification for the need for additional facilities for a small village.

If the extension were to be provided, and the additional uses taken up, then it is considered that an additional 8 car parking spaces would be required. There is no parking at present and it is clear that there is no available space for the provision of these spaces.

The Conservation Section has had preliminary discussions with the applicants before the submission of the application and has stressed many times that the Local Planning Authority would not support this application. English Heritage has objected to the scheme, but the proposal is contrary to many Local Plan policies and advice given in PPG15. The proposal is detrimental to the character, design and setting of this Grade I listed building and it does not compliment the character of the surrounding area in terms of siting and building design.

The existing church, as well as being a Grade I listed building, is also within the East Hampshire AONB and is situated next to a very well used public footpath and the church and graveyard can be seen from many viewpoints in the public realm. The scale, mass and siting of the extension is not considered to be in sympathy with the local environment or the existing building and will be detrimental to views from the surrounding countryside. The garden area of the neighbouring property, Moor Hill, is situated approximately 17m from the edge of the proposed extension. It is felt that if the extension were to be used for the functions stated by the applicants, such as hiring out for parties, wedding receptions, etc, there may be a problem with noise and disturbance to the occupiers of this property.

Therefore, your officers recommend that the application be refused.

Recommendation

O – THAT PLANNING PERMISSION BE REFUSED FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:-

Conditions/Reasons

01 The proposal is contrary to PPG15; Policies UB3, C1, C2, E7, E14 and T4 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan; Proposals EN5, C1, C2, C7, HG1, HG2, HG3, HG20, HG23, T9 and T9 of the Winchester District Local Plan; and Proposals DP3, DP5, DP6, C1, C6, C7, HE1, HE2, HE14, HE16 and T4 of the Winchester Local Plan Review and Revised Deposit in that:

- (i) the extension is detrimental to the character and design of this Grade I Listed Building;
 - (ii) it is detrimental to and adversely affects the character and setting of this Grade I Listed Building;
 - (iii) this building does not protect the essential landscape and character of the area, and they have not shown that this building is essential;
 - (iv) it does not safeguard the important landscape of the churchyard or its archaeological and historic features and does not complement the character of the surrounding area in terms of siting and building design;
 - (v) it is not in sympathy with the local environment in terms of scale, mass, and siting in relation to the existing building and views of it from the countryside;
 - (vi) it does not include increased car park provisions;
 - (vii) it does not retain the landscape, ecological and historical features of the graveyard;
 - (viii) is detrimental to the historic building and its setting;
 - (ix) this building does not protect the essential landscape and character of the area and the East Hampshire AONB;
 - (x) it does not respond positively to the local environment in terms of design, scale and character
 - (xi) it does not maintain important views and skylines
 - (xii) it does not maintain the openness of the graveyard and the setting of the Grade I Listed Building.
-

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

Item **Parish** Winchester Town
04 Conservation Area:
Case No: 03/02311/FUL
Ref No: W12896/05
Date Valid: 19 September 2003
Grid Ref: 448064 130448
Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Mr Neil Mackintosh
Applicant: Mr And Mrs C Hall
Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling and replace with a three storey block of 4 no. three bedroom dwellings, 2 no. two bedroom dwellings and 2 no. one bedroom ground floor flats with associated garages
Location: Racquets Lankhills Road Winchester Hampshire SO23 7AE
(As amended by plans received on 6 October 2003 and on 18th November 2003)

Officer Report

History

W12896/04 – demolition, erection of 8 flats, withdrawn march 2003

Policy

Development plan

HCSPR – H1, H5, H7, UB3, T2, T6, R3

WDLP - H1, H7, EN5, EN13, T9, RT3

Emerging development plan

WDLPR – H2, H7, DP3, DP10, DP11, T2, T4, RT3

Other material considerations

PPG 3, 13

Consultations

Highways – no objection subject to conditions. The Highway Authority does not consider that significant works are required to serve these additional units but the visibility splay at the Lankhills Road/Worthy Road require improvement.

County Engineer – no objection, subject to a financial contribution of £16,000 towards WMAP.

Recommend a Grampian condition to restrict occupation of the development prior to improved visibility splays being provided

Arboriculture – no trees worthy of protection, front hedge is of very high screening value and a scheme is required to ensure suitable planting is undertaken

Landscape – provided that off-site highway improvements are not required, no objection to proposals

Urban Design – a net residential density of 30 dph would be much more appropriate, much of the landscaping would be lost, the proposed building would be a very good demonstration of contemporary architecture but there remain doubts over whether this dramatically different style is appropriate in this particular setting

Representations

CoWT – a good presentation of an interesting scheme. The site is currently screened by trees but the new structure could become visible from a distance.

Objections from - Lankhills Road (5), Hydeacre, Woodlands Court (2), Donnington Court (8), The Tollgate (7), Hyde Street (4), Arthur Road (3) and Egbert Road (1)

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

'The proposal would erode the spacious character of the area and would be a significant detrimental intrusion in the street scene. It would affect the neighbours' amenities, through overlooking, increased noise and disturbance from traffic and by being overbearing. Together these concerns indicate that the proposal is over-development. There is still a highway safety problem.'

Assessment

The proposal is to demolish 'Racquets', a bungalow on a 0.15ha site, and erect a block of flats and town houses, comprising 2x1-bed, 2x2-bed and 4x3-bed units. The resulting density would be 54 dph.

Racquets is situated on the corner of Lankhills Road and Worthy Road. It is hardly noticeable, as it is well screened by trees and hedges. Lankhills Road is very narrow, with poor visibility at the junction, and serves just 5 houses.

The proposed building is contemporary in design and the dwellings are on three floors. Access is from Lankhills Road and a large garage/amenity building is proposed. This not only provides covered car parking and a recreational area but has also been designed to prevent overlooking of Rooksacre, the property to the rear. A total of 12 car parking spaces would be provided ie.1.5 per dwelling. Undercover cycle storage areas are also included in the scheme. The proposal complies with the Council's 'Better Mix' Policy, in that 50% of the units are small dwellings.

The Government is committed to making more efficient use of land by maximising the re-use of previously-developed land, and this is reflected in the LPA's emerging Review of the Winchester District Local Plan. As a rough guide 30-50 dwellings per hectare are recommended. The architect of this scheme would argue that this has been marginally exceeded as a result of the Council's desire to incorporate small units. A recent survey shows that there is a significant shortfall of 1 and 2-bed units in the Winchester area.

A previous similar application was withdrawn, as the Lankhills Road/Worthy Road junction was considered to be inadequate. Subsequent proposals for improvement were later considered unnecessary by the County Highway Authority and improvements of the visibility splay is all that is considered necessary. This situation suits your Landscape Officer as trees will not have to be removed.

Many of the objectors complain that the scheme will result in loss of privacy, due to overlooking, As a result of these representations the architect has designed out this possibility by removing balconies, reducing glazed areas and by angling some of the windows.

As already stated the design of the main building is contemporary and many objectors consider the design, materials, scale and mass of the proposal would be out of keeping with the surrounding area and have a deleterious effect upon the street scene. The area is mixed in character, consisting of Edwardian and 1930's houses interspersed with more modern flatted development. The site is just beyond the older, Victorian suburb of Hyde. The 8 flats would be contained within a building that is 33m long, 11.75m wide and 10.25m at its highest point. The proposed surfacing materials are stucco and render with a zinc, profiled roof. The garage/amenity building would also be stucco and render but under a clay tile roof. A landscaping scheme has been agreed. Urban design advice is that the architecture is good but that it might be considered inappropriate for this particular setting. Your officers consider that the design would not be unacceptable in the street scene, bearing in mind the mixed character of Worthy Road and the presence of other flatted developments adjacent to that road, for example Donnington, Woodlands, Faringdon and Regent Courts to the East and North.

Your officers conclude that this is a redevelopment scheme that makes the most of the available site and complies with the requirements of PPG3 and your Better Mix Policy. Whereas it may be considered to be out of character with the adjacent large houses on large plots the character of the street that it fronts, Worthy Road, is of such disparity that a building that is of 21st Century character will not be out of place. Indeed, it may be considered to be a building that is indicative of its time and that enhances this approach to Winchester.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

Recommendation

O - PROVIDED THAT THE APPLICANT IS PREPARED TO MAKE APPROPRIATE PROVISION FOR PUBLIC OPEN SPACE THROUGH THE OPEN SPACE FUNDING SYSTEM AND TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS THROUGH THE WINCHESTER MOVEMENT AND ACCESS PLAN, THEN PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:-

Conditions/Reasons

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 visibility splays of 2.4m by 90m have been provided at the junction of Lankhills Road and Worthy Road

02 Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

03 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.

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

04 All work relating to the development hereby approved, including works of demolition or preparation prior to operations, shall only take place between the hours of 0800 and 1800 Monday to Friday and 0800 and 1300 Saturdays and at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

04 Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining properties during the construction period.

05 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Classes A,B,C,D and E of Part One of Schedule 2 of the Order, shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

05 Reason: To protect the amenities of the locality and to maintain a good quality environment.

06 Details of measures to be taken to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site during construction works being deposited on the public highway 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 duration of the construction period. No lorry shall leave the site unless its wheels have been cleaned sufficiently to prevent mud being carried onto the highway.

06 Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

07 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.

07 Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

08 The proposed access and drive, including the verge crossing shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with specifications to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

NOTE A licence is required from the Hampshire Highways Winchester Office prior to commencement of access works.

08 Reason: To ensure satisfactory means of access.

09 The gradient of the drive shall not exceed 8% within 6 metres of the edge of the adjoining carriageway.

09 Reason: In the interests of highway safety

10 Before the development hereby approved is first brought into use, the access shall be constructed with a non-migratory surfacing material for a minimum distance of 10 metres from the highway boundary.

10 Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

11 Prior to the completion of development a cut off drain shall be provided to prevent the egress of surface water onto the public highway.

11 Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

12 Nothing over 0.6 metres in height above the level of the carriageway shall be erected or permitted to remain on the land hatched green on the approved plans.

12 Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

13 Before the development hereby approved is first brought into use, a turning space shall be provided within the site to enable vehicles using the site to enter and leave in a forward gear. The turning space shall be retained and kept available for such purposes at all times.

13 Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

14 The garage/parking spaces hereby approved shall not be used for any other purpose than the parking of cars.

14 Reason: To ensure the provision and retention of the parking spaces in the interests of local amenity and highway safety.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

Informatives

01. This permission is granted for the following reasons:

The development is in accordance with the policies and proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), planning permission should therefore be granted.

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: H1, H5, H7, UB3, T2, T6, R3

Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: H1, H7, EN5, EN13, T9, RT3

Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: H2, H7, DP3, DP10, DP11, T2, T4, RT3

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

Item 05 **Parish** Southwick And Widley
Conservation Area:
Case No: 03/01437/FUL
Ref No: W18418
Date Valid: 10 June 2003
Grid Ref: 462708 108757
Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Mr Neil Mackintosh
Applicant: J And S Estates
Proposal: (AMENDED DESCRIPTION AND PLANS) Two storey extension to existing block of flats to provide 4 No. two bedroom flats
Location: 1 - 6 Norton Close Southwick Fareham Hampshire
(As amended by plans received on 11 December 2003)

Officer Report

History

None

Policy

Development plan

HCSPR – H1, H5, UB3, T5

WDLP – H1, EN5, T9

Emerging development plan

WDLPR – H2, DP3, T4

Other material considerations

PPG1, 3, 13

Consultations

Original application for 5 units

Highways – refuse, insufficient off-street parking provided. The additional demand for parking on street is likely to exacerbate the dangers that currently exist and be detrimental to highway safety.

Housing – 35% rounded up means two flats should be made available as subsidised affordable units.

Policy – proposal acceptable, subject to affordable housing and POS provision

Landscape – refuse, landscape proposals are very superficial and minimal and are limited to a relatively small area. The new block will also have a visual impact on neighbours.

Amended application for 4 units

Highways – provided that the car parking is surfaced and marked out, no objection

Housing – original view no longer relevant, as threshold not reached

Policy – subject to POS

Landscape – as before but understand that a landscaping scheme may be forthcoming.

Representations

Original application for 5 units

Ward Member – objects, overbearing in relation to adjoining properties, loss of privacy, factual inaccuracies, inadequate car parking, affect on vehicular access to and from Norton Close

Southwick & Widley PC - object, lack of infrastructure serving Southwick, no urgent need for extra housing, not in sympathy with surroundings, would exacerbate parking problems, would set a precedent, drainage problems, access for emergency vehicles.

6 residents Norton Close – object, lack of parking, access for emergency vehicles, affect on outlook, lack of infrastructure eg. buses, doctors surgery, no work - HMS Dryad is closing.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

12 residents Castle Road – object, overlooks bedrooms in Castle road, overbearing, existing flats out of place in area, inaccuracies in design statement, lack of local facilities, little work in the area, would exacerbate parking problems, access for emergency vehicles, increased traffic.

Naval Cottages (1) – would make access to garages even more difficult

Naval Cottages (1) – no objection, disturbance to the peace of inhabitants should be avoided during works

West Street (1) – as Norton Close above,

Current application for 4 units

Ward Member – objects, represents very significant increase in footprint, still overbearing in relation to Castle Road and will result in overlooking due to levels differences, although addition of parking within the curtilage is welcomed increase in noise nuisance should be assessed.

Southwick & Widley PC – object, still overlooking/loss of outlook problems, original objections still relevant

3 residents Norton Close – object, as before.

6 residents Castle Road – object, still overlooks, car park will lead to increased disturbance and drainage problems, would dominate the view from houses, lack of local facilities, loss of trees

West Street(1) – increased traffic, would infringe privacy of Castle Road, emergency access, cycle storage likely to be unnecessary

Assessment

Numbers 1-12 Norton Close are two-bedroom flats contained within two, three-storey blocks. They were erected by the MoD approximately 40 years ago, in connection with the requirements of the adjacent Naval Base, HMS Dryad. They are now in private ownership. The two blocks of flats look out of place as they are surrounded by conventional housing, mainly two-storey but only single storey to the South West. They are described by the current owner as 'utilitarian'. The twelve dwellings occupy a 0.3ha site, resulting in a density of 40 per ha.

The proposal is to extend one of the blocks to add further two-bedroom flats. Originally five were proposed but this has now been reduced to four, in a two-storey extension. This results in a density of 53 per ha. The reason for the reduction, however, was not to do with site density but because the applicant does not wish to breach the affordable housing threshold. The reduction has the advantage of reducing the height of the block and, as a result, overlooking problems. A car park is proposed between the two existing blocks.

The amended plans have been re-advertised and the neighbours re-notified. This has resulted in reiteration of most of the reasons for objection. However, as a result of the new proposal to provide additional car parking spaces, the Highway Engineer is no longer raising any objection to the scheme. A landscaping scheme has been promised, although not received at the time of writing. It is possible that a good scheme could alleviate some of the problems perceived within the existing site as well as improving the appearance of the new development from Castle Road.

In your officers opinion the original scheme was seriously flawed. The Applicant maintained that he owned and had control over Norton Close. This has proved not to be the case and he now accepts that this is public highway. In order to provide for sufficient parking off the highway the submitted plans have been amended to incorporate 24 spaces on his land. This amounts to 1.5 spaces per unit. It is envisaged that this will alleviate the on-street parking problems that exist at present. It is considered that this amount of parking is necessary, bearing in mind the lack of public transport and other facilities in Southwick, as well as jobs.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

The other main problems here are the concept of adding to buildings that are already considered to be out of keeping with their surroundings and the affect that building here will have upon the neighbours. Now that the proposal has been reduced to two storeys in height it would be more difficult to refuse in principle. Much of the surrounding development is also two-storey. This reduction also removes an element of the overlooking feared by adjacent residents of Castle. However this problem is not entirely overcome. There is a difference in levels between the site and the houses in Castle Road, the site being approximately two metres higher. This could result in windows at ground floor and first floor being visible from the rear windows of 5-9 Castle Road. Having said this the minimum distance between buildings is 35m. This is far greater than accepted standards for 'back-to-back' relationships in new development.

On balance, your officers now consider that a refusal would be difficult to sustain and permission is recommended, subject to the payment of POS and the imposition of conditions.

Recommendation

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

Conditions/Reasons

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 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.

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

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

04 Details of measures to be taken to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site during construction works being deposited on the public highway 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 duration of the construction period. No lorry shall leave the site unless its wheels have been cleaned sufficiently to prevent mud being carried onto the highway.

04 Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

05 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.

05 Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

06 The car park shall be constructed, surfaced and marked out in accordance with the approved plan before the development hereby permitted is brought into operation. That area shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking, loading, unloading and turning of vehicles.

06 Reason: To ensure that adequate on-site parking and turning facilities are made available.

07 Before the development hereby approved is first brought into use, a turning space shall be provided within the site to enable vehicles using the site to enter and leave in a forward gear. The turning space shall be retained and kept available for such purposes at all times.

07 Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

Informatives

01. This permission is granted for the following reasons:
The development is in accordance with the policies and proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), planning permission should therefore be granted.

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: H1, H5, UB3, T5

Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: H1, EN5, T9

Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: H2, DP3, T4

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

Item 06 **Parish** Compton And Shawford
Conservation Area:
Case No: 03/02852/FUL
Ref No: W18676
Date Valid: 3 December 2003
Grid Ref: 446535 124737
Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Mr Neil Mackintosh
Applicant: Bayview Developments Ltd
Proposal: Erection of 1 no. four bedroom dwelling with integral single garage and associated parking
Location: Land Adjacent To Ashcroft 3 Shepherds Lane Compton Hampshire

Officer Report

History

None

Policy

Development plan

HCSPR – H1, H5, UB3, T2, R3

WDLP – H1, EN5, EN13, T9, RT3

Emerging development plan

WDLPR – H2, DP3, DP10, T4, RT3

Other material considerations

PPG3, 13

Consultations

Highways – no objection, existing access to be used, sufficient parking and turning facilities

Landscape – would be very close to adjacent Thuja trees and would have an adverse impact on them, refer to Arboriculturalist

Arboriculture – the trees were once a hedge and were regularly topped. The recently built garage at Fermain is only 2m from them and the construction of a house on the other side can do no more damage. The trees, although of some small amenity value are not worthy of TPO status.

Representations

Compton and Shawford PC – object, subdivision will create two very small plots, out of character with neighbouring properties. New development would be overbearing on 3 Shepherds Lane and would present Fermain with a two storey brick wall on their boundary.

Fermain – object, too large and intrusive, previous application on Fermain land refused, not in keeping, parking on road during construction, would object to removal of any trees, adverse effect on neighbouring properties.

Valdon - object, out of keeping in design/general appearance of area, insufficient off-street parking, obstruction during construction, detrimental to enjoyment of neighbouring properties.

Woodpeckers – object, out of keeping with rest of area, would create parking difficulties, would affect the enjoyment of the neighbouring properties.

Assessment

This proposal is for the erection of a four-bedroom house, with integral garage, on the side garden of 3, Shepherds Lane. This would require the demolition of a double garage currently serving No.3. This building is of no particular significance.

The character of the area is mixed. The plot is between two pairs of semi-detached houses. However, there are bungalows and detached houses in the immediate vicinity. There are public

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

views of the site from Shepherds Lane and from the Recreation Ground to the rear. This part of Shepherds Lane is more densely built on than the area to the West, which consists of large houses on large plots. No.3 currently enjoys a plot size of approximately 0.12ha. and this proposal would halve the plot. Two dwellings on the site would still only result in development at 16 per ha.

As the plot lies within an area designated H1 in WDLP (H2 in WDLPR) residential development will normally be permitted, subject to Policies EN5, EN13 and T9 of that Plan.

T9 – refers to adequate provision for highway safety, access, internal layout and parking. The Highways Engineer raises no objection on these grounds.

EN13 – refers to flooding and protection of groundwaters. This site is not within a floodplain and the house would be connected to mains drains.

EN5 – this policy gives criteria for all new development, four of which are particularly germane in this case;

'in sympathy with the appearance and character of the local environment' – although this is a proposal for a detached house between two pairs of semi's, your officers do not consider that this would look out of place. The character of the area is mixed and views of the front of the site are broken by trees. From the rear the house will not look awkward, in view of the position and orientation of the adjoining houses.

The scale, mass, design, materials, layout and siting of the proposal are considered appropriate. *'have a satisfactory means of access etc.'* – this has been dealt with above.

'retain beneficial landscape features' – the applicant does not propose to fell any trees, but there is an issue as to whether Thuja trees on the adjacent plot, at Fermain, might be adversely affected. These trees are of no great value in themselves but they would serve to ameliorate side views of the proposed building. Arboricultural advice is that 'there can be no more damage to the thujas' so it assumed that, provided their owner wishes to retain them, their future will not be affected by the proposal. *'not be detrimental to the amenities or the operation of adjoining uses'* – the use of the land to the rear is as recreation ground and to the front highway. Neither of these uses will be affected. To the sides are residential uses. Fermain is 18m from the side wall of the proposed house. Although this wall contains three small windows they serve bathrooms and there will be no problem from overlooking. The scale and mass of the proposal will have a small affect upon secondary windows at No.3 but this is not considered to be significant enough to warrant refusal of the scheme.

Your officers conclude that, provided that the applicant is willing to contribute towards the Council's Public Open Space Funding System, the proposal would do no material harm to interests of acknowledged importance and should be permitted.

Recommendation

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

Conditions/Reasons

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.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

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

03 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.

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

04 Details of all works to trees (on or adjacent to the site), must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of those works. All tree surgery/works shall be carried out in accordance with the relevant recommendations of BS 3998 Tree Work.

04 Reason: To ensure the continuity of amenity afforded by the tree(s) in question.

05 The first floor window(s) in the side elevations of the dwelling hereby permitted shall be glazed in obscure glass and thereafter retained.

05 Reason: To protect the amenity and privacy of the adjoining residential properties.

06 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Classes A,B,C,D and E of Part One of Schedule 2 of the Order, shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

06 Reason: To protect the amenities of the locality and to maintain a good quality environment.

07 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.

07 Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

08 Before the development hereby approved is first brought into use, a turning space shall be provided within the site to enable vehicles using the site to enter and leave in a forward gear. The turning space shall be retained and kept available for such purposes at all times.

08 Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

09 The garage and parking area hereby approved shall not be used for any other purpose than the parking of cars.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

09 Reason: To ensure the provision and retention of the n the interests of local amenity and highway safety.

Informatives

01. This permission is granted for the following reasons:

The development is in accordance with the policies and proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), planning permission should therefore be granted.

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: H1, H5,UB3, T2, R3

Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: H1, EN5, EN13, T9, RT3

Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: H2, DP3, DP10, T4, RT3

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

Item 07 **Parish:** Winchester Town
Conservation Area: Winchester Conservation Area
Case No: 03/02763/FUL
Ref No: W02572/07
Date Valid: 17 November 2003
Grid Ref: 447943 129433
Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Emma Norgate
Applicant: Miss M Hooker
Proposal: Single storey rear extension
Location: Flat 3 17 Southgate Street Winchester Hampshire SO23 9AA

Officer Report

History

W2572/1 – change of use of offices to 7 flats – grant – 12/4/00
W2572/3 – conservatory to rear of ground floor flat – refused 9/1/01
W2572/4 – conservatory to rear of ground floor flat – refused – 10/8/01
W2572/5 – conservatory to rear – refused – 15/10/01 – dismissed at appeal – 6/12/02
W2572/6 – single storey rear extension – refused – 16/7/03 – subject of a current appeal.

Policy

Development plan

HCSP(R) UB3, E16

WDLP EN5, HG7

Emerging Development Plan: WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: DP3, HE5, HE6

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Winchester Conservation Area document

Consultations

None

Representations

City of Winchester Trust – no comment

4 neighbour objections on the following grounds: will create a precedent in green Conservation Area, footprint of existing building should be retained, infill should not be considered, it is a brick extension not a conservatory, will enlarge living space and not provide additional affordable housing, height is greater than that refused in a previous Inspector's decision, would not retain the character of the building, flat is not freehold, would result in loss of light and heat to flat.

Assessment

This is a full planning application for a single storey extension to the rear of the ground floor flat at 17 Southgate Street in Winchester. The site falls within the Winchester Conservation Area, but is not a listed building. Members may recall that there have been a number of applications which have been referred to Planning Development Control Committee at the above site, one of which was the subject of both a planning appeal and enforcement appeal in 2002. Since that time, the applicants have complied with the requirements of the Enforcement notice.

The main building is 4 storeys in height with a two storey extension which has a complex roof structure. The proposed single storey brick extension is at ground floor level for part of the two storey extension with a mono-pitch slate roof, and is therefore not for the full width of the building.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

The height of the roof, which does not include the lead flashing, is 3.2m from the submitted drawing, this is 0.2m below the underside of the cill of the flat above. At the time of the site visit, the Inspector found that the conservatory had been built larger than on either of the submitted plans. As this is a mono-pitch roof, the roof slopes down and away from the flat above. The depth of the extension is 2.5m compared to the conservatory, which was constructed on site and measured by the Inspector on the site, to be 3.97m. The width of the proposal is 3.7m which is over only part of the two-storey element, rather than almost the full width of the building. Given the change in the size of the proposal, your Officers now consider that the proposal is in scale with the existing building on the site.

In his decision, the Inspector considered that whilst he was "not against modest extension to Flat 3 it seems to me that a more simple solution should be found, possibly echoing the lean-to projections on the original house." He also highlighted any extension should take account of the flat above, whilst remembering that they have no rights to a view.

A number of issues have been raised in the representations, one of which is the setting of a precedent. There have been a number of alterations over time to buildings within the Conservation Area, including extensions and your Officers consider that it would be unreasonable to refuse the application for this reason. Policy within the Local Plan does allow for extensions in the Conservation Area and does not differentiate between flats and houses. As a flat, the site does not benefit from Permitted Development rights and therefore the Local Planning Authority has control over development.

Another issue raised is that the proposal is an extension not a conservatory. The proposal is a brick extension with full height windows to the rear and side elevations. In the Inspectors decision letter, the difference between a conservatory and an extension is not differentiated and the Inspector indicates that he was not against a modest extension to Flat 3. Policy within the Local Plan does not differentiate between conservatories and extensions and allows for extensions under policy EN5 and HG7. Your Officers consider that the proposal would not result in an adverse impact on the other flats within 17 Southgate Street.

Proposed materials are brick and slate and your Officers consider that these are appropriate in the Conservation Area. It is suggested that samples be submitted in order to ensure the quality of the development.

The height of the proposed extension is 3.2m and not including the lead flashing is 0.2m below the cill of the window of the flat above. Given the design of the roof, which being a mono-pitch, slopes down and away from the flat above, and is slate, your Officers consider that this would not have an adverse impact on the flat above. In his previous decision the Inspector noted that the previous proposal would dominate the outlook of the occupiers, albeit in a more sympathetic manner, but highlighted that there was no right to a view. However, that had a pitched roof and this proposal is a mono-pitch roof.

Your Officers have carefully considered the proposal with regard to development plan policy including the Inspector's previous decision and the representations received and do not consider that there is sufficient justification to refuse this application and are therefore recommending approval of the application subject to conditions.

Recommendation

O - THAT PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:-

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

Conditions/Reasons

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 extension 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.

Informatives

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB3, E16

Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: EN5, HG7

Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit:DP3, HE5, HE6

02. This permission is granted for the following reasons:

The development is in accordance with the policies and proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), planning permission should therefore be granted.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

Item **Parish** Boarhunt
08 **Conservation Area:**
Case No: 03/02830/FUL
Ref No: W11132/16
Date Valid: 25 November 2003
Grid Ref: 459432 110657
Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Emma Norgate
Applicant: M Willers Esq And Ms F Eastop
Proposal: Erection of 1 No. four bedroom dwelling to replace existing temporary mobile home, to be used in conjunction with adjoining nursery business only
Location: Mud Island Nurseries Southwick Road North Boarhunt Fareham Hampshire PO17 6JF

Officer Report

History

W11132/6 – retention for a temporary period in connection with adjoining nursery – grant – 1/2/01

Policy

Development plan

HCSP(R) C1, UB3, R2

WDLP C1, C2, C14, C15, H3, EN5, RT3

Emerging Development Plan: WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: C1, C17, C18, C19, H4, DP3, RT3

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Boarhunt Village Design Statement

PPG7

Consultations

County Land Agent – since last visit enterprises have expanded, evidenced with financial information and net profit for at least the past three years, existing functional need for a full time worker to be readily available at most times. Agricultural activity established for at least three years, are profitable with the prospect of remaining so. Permanent dwelling of the size proposed is of an appropriate size and appropriately sited.

Landscape – area of garden needs to be carefully defined, landscape details should be submitted and PD rights removed. Should be strong framework of planting to ensure it does not have a detrimental impact on the character of the area. Local traditional materials and detailing should be used.

City Engineers – no highway objections – unlikely the proposal would result in increased traffic or cause demonstrable harm.

Representations

Parish Council – object – on the size of the proposed development, the height of the dwelling should be limited to make use of the roof space.

Assessment

This is a full planning application for the erection of a four bedroom dwelling to replace the existing mobile home, to be used in conjunction with the adjoining nursery business.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

The site is located at Mud Island Nursery in North Boarhunt, which is accessed from the Southwick Road. The Nursery buildings are set back within the site behind large trees which form a screen to the main road. The existing mobile home is set within the existing Nursery buildings and is well screened. This was granted temporary consent, to be used in conjunction with the Nursery Business in 2001.

The applicants have now submitted an application for a permanent four bedroom dwelling on the site. Horticultural workers fall within the definition of agriculture in PPG7 and can therefore be considered as agricultural workers. Annex I of PPG7 clearly defines the circumstances in which agricultural workers dwellings can be considered and sets out the criteria and notes that such dwellings should only be allowed to support existing agricultural activities on well established units providing: there is a clearly established functional need, the need relates to a full time worker (or one primarily employed), the unit and activity have been established for at least three years, profitable for at least one of those, are currently financially sound and have a clear prospect of remaining so, functional need could not be fulfilled by another dwelling in the area or on the unit which is suitable and available, and other normal planning requirements e.g. siting are satisfied. This is reflected in Policy C15 of the current WDLP and rolled forward as Policy C19 in the revised WDLP.

Therefore the County Land Agent has been consulted and has assessed the application based on the criteria set out in Annex I, as identified above. He is of the opinion that there is an existing functional need for a full time worker to be readily available at most times in order to ensure that essential husbandry and care are provided. The unit and agricultural activity have been established for at least three years and are profitable with the prospect of remaining so for the foreseeable future, especially having regard to the ongoing investment and expansion. It is also considered that the size of the proposed dwelling is appropriate with regard to the size of the holding. Your Officers consider that there are no other dwellings within the vicinity that would provide appropriate accommodation.

The proposed dwelling is two storey brick and tile dwelling with part tile hanging. The roof of the dwelling has been hipped to reduce the bulk of the dwelling with lower gables on the front and rear elevations. The dwelling at its highest point is 7.8m in height. Concern was raised by the Parish Council with regard to the proposed height of the building. The proposed building is set within the existing complex of buildings on the site and your Officers consider that the height of the proposal is acceptable in this location. The overall size of the dwelling is approximately 146 sq.m. which your Officers consider acceptable and complies with Policy C15. The proposal also includes a detached garage, which should be assessed under C19 of the WDLP. The materials are proposed to match the dwelling and the roof is partially hipped to either end with a catslide roof to the rear to reduce the bulk of the building. This is set slightly further back into the site and your Officers consider the garage acceptable. Given that the nearest dwelling is over 100m away, your Officers consider there are no issues of overlooking to be considered.

The Landscape Architect has highlighted that there should be a strong framework of planting to ensure that the dwelling does not impact on the character of the area. Although a landscape plan has been submitted, your Officers consider that additional planting, especially to reinforce the western boundary would be beneficial and also to provide a setting for the house and therefore it is suggested that further landscape details need to be submitted.

Your Officers have carefully considered the application, the relevant policy and other material considerations including the Village Design Statement and representations and are recommending approval of the application subject to conditions.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

Recommendation

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

Conditions/Reasons

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 The occupation of the dwelling shall be limited to a person solely or mainly working, or last working in the locality in horticulture, agriculture or forestry or a widow or widower of such a person and to any resident dependants.

03 Reason: The site is in an area where new dwellings are not normally permitted except where there is an overriding need in the interests of horticulture, agriculture or forestry.

04 The existing mobile home on site shall be removed from the site within 3 months of the first occupation of the building hereby permitted.

04 Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality.

05 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Classes A,B,C,E of Parts 1 of Schedule 2 of the Order, shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

05 Reason: To protect the amenities of the locality and to maintain a good quality environment.

06 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.

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

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

Informatives

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: C1, UB3, R2

Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: C1, C2, C14, C15, H3, EN5, RT3

Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: C1, C17, C18, C19, H4, DP3, RT3

02. This permission is granted for the following reasons:

The development is in accordance with the policies and proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), planning permission should therefore be granted.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

To the north is a property known as 'Dryads Spinney' and to the west open countryside.

The property has already had a number of extensions as the planning history demonstrates. This application seeks planning permission for a conservatory on the garage which would extend the full height of the garage to enable access from the games room above. This would create a large glazed area to the rear of the garage. This would be partly screened from public view points by the existing kitchen conservatory and balcony above and a mature conifer tree in the front garden.

Development plan policy seeks to ensure that residential development does not impact on the character and amenities of an area, nor the amenities of adjoining occupiers. Given that the proposed extension will only be partly visible in the public realm, it is not considered to be harmful to the character and amenities of the area. The proposed conservatory has been designed to a high standard and will add an unusual and interesting addition to the property. The extension will be at least 18 metres to the closest property to the south and 24 metres from Yew Tree Cottages to the rear. Given the distance of the extension from the closest neighbours, it is not considered to have a detrimental impact on their amenity.

In response to the comments of the Parish Council, this property has indeed had a number of extensions. However, the property sits in substantial grounds and there are other large properties in Durley Street. The resultant property is not considered to be out of character with the area, and it will not impact on the amenities of the wider countryside to the west and south east.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to satisfy the provisions of the development plan and is recommended for approval.

Recommendation

O - THAT PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:-

Conditions/Reasons

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 extension 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.

Informatives

01. This permission is granted for the following reasons:
The development is in accordance with the policies and proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), planning permission should therefore be granted.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB3 and C2
Winchester District Local Plan: EN5 and H2
Emerging development plan WDLPR DP3 and H3

| | | |
|-----------|---------------------------|--|
| Item | Parish | Upham |
| 10 | Conservation Area: | Upham Conservation Area |
| | Case No: | 03/02511/FUL |
| | Ref No: | W16314/02 |
| | Date Valid: | 15 October 2003 |
| | Grid Ref: | 453910 120719 |
| | Team: | WEST |
| | Applicant: | Mr And Mrs Southcott |
| | Proposal: | Conversions of loft over garage to studio and loft over swimming pool to gym with 4 no. dormer windows and 2 no. rooflights (THIS APPLICATION MAY AFFECT THE SETTING OF A PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY) |
| | Location: | Church Height Shoe Lane Upham Southampton Hampshire SO32 1JJ |
| | Case Officer: | Andrea L Swain |

Officer Report

History

W16314 - Replacement dwelling with triple garage, swimming pool enclosure and associated works - Church Height Shoe Lane Upham Southampton Hants SO32 1JJ - PER - 30/03/2000
W16314/01LBCA - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement dwelling associated works - Church Height Shoe Lane Upham Southampton Hants SO32 1JJ - PER - 30/03/2000

Policy

Development plan

WDLP – HG7, H2 and EN5
HCSPR – E16, E17 and UB3

Emerging development plan

WDLPR – HE5, H3 and DP3

Other material considerations

Upham Village Design Statement

Consultations

Conservation Team – Drawings inaccurate.

Representations

Upham Parish Council – Objection. Intensification of development on this site will adversely affect the privacy of neighbour and is not appropriate in a Conservation Area. The addition of the windows will add to the bulk of this substantial dwelling and this is not in accordance with the Village Design Statement. The sanctity and character of the nearby church yard and footpath should also be preserved.

Assessment

This application was deferred from Committee on 8 January, 2004 pending the receipt of accurate drawings.

'Church Height' in Shoe Lane, Upham is a large, detached house of traditional design that had been recently constructed following the grant of planning permission in March 2000. The house is an 'L' shaped design with the main two storey part of the house forming one wing of the 'L' and a single storey garage and pool building forming the second wing. This wing is at right angles to Shoe Lane and is 2.6 metres from the boundary of 'Glebe Cottage' to the north west. There is an existing high level roof light on the rear of the garage building looking towards 'Glebe Cottage'. On the eastern boundary is a public footpath which links Shoe Lane with Church Street and passes through the cemetery of the Church of Blessed Mary of Upham.

The application seeks planning permission for the conversion of the existing loft over the garage to a studio and the conversion of the loft over the swimming pool to a gym. This will involve the addition of four dormers to the front elevation and a second roof light to the rear.

The Conservation Team have raised concerns with regard to the accuracy of the drawings. Correct plans are, therefore, presently awaited. An oral report will be made on this aspect.

Development Plan policy seeks to ensure that development within designated conservation areas preserves or enhances the character of the area. In particular the massing and materials should be in scale and harmony with adjoining buildings and the area as a whole. The proportion of features should relate well to each other and to adjoining buildings. Development Plan policy also seeks to ensure that the character and amenities of an area and the amenities of adjacent occupiers are protected. Upham Village Design Statement makes specific reference to dormer windows and states that dormers should be small (with typically 900mm max wide windows) and spaced ideally at least 1.5 times the window width apart. The main issues for consideration are, therefore, the impact of the proposal on the conservation area and whether the development satisfies the Upham Village Design Statement criteria for dormer windows and the impact of the proposal on adjoining occupiers at Glebe Cottage and the users of the footpath.

Impact on the Conservation Area

The single storey garage and swimming pool building is 23 metres in length and has a red tile roof to match the main house. This is a large expanse of roof and it is considered that the addition of four dormer windows will break up the roof line, creating a more interesting development when viewed from Shoe Lane. The dormers are small, measuring 1.2 metres in width (the windows themselves measuring 0.9m). The dormers to the swimming pool loft are spaced 5.5 metres apart and the dormers to the garage loft are spaced 1.6 metres apart. The proposed rear velux windows are not visible in the public realm.

It is considered that the proportions of the dormers relate well to the existing building and will enhance the character of the Conservation Area by breaking up the existing massing of the roof.

The size and spacing of the windows is in accordance with the Upham Village Design Statement.

Impact on Adjoining Uses

As stated above, there is an existing high level roof light on the rear of the garage loft. The second roof light will serve a toilet and it is not considered that this will cause loss of privacy to the occupants of Glebe Cottage. The public footpath is over 20 metres away from the garage and swimming pool building. There is a mature hedgerow along the boundary of the footpath which provides additional screening from the development.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

The additional dormers are not considered to be harmful to the character of the area, nor the enjoyment of the users of the footpath.

Conclusion

Your officers accept the Parish Council's concerns relating to the size of the property. However the addition of the dormers and velux window is not considered to have a harmful impact on the character and amenities of the Conservation Area, nor the amenities of the occupants of Glebe Cottage or the users of the footpath.

Subject to no adverse comments from the Conservation Team on the receipt of correct plans, the application is recommended for conditional planning permission.

Recommendation

O - THAT PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:-

Conditions/Reasons

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 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dormer windows hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

02 Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual relationship between the new development and the existing.

Informatives

01. This permission is granted for the following reasons:
The development is in accordance with the policies and proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), planning permission should therefore be granted.

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB3, E16 and E17
Winchester District Local Plan: EN5, HG7 and H2.
Emerging development plan WDLPR DP3, HE5 and H3.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 5 February 2004

Item 11 **Parish:** Sparsholt
Conservation Area: Sparsholt Conservation Area
Case No: 03/02453/FUL
Ref No: W18600
Date Valid: 8 October 2003
Grid Ref: 443450 131325
Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Ann Wilkinson
Applicant: Mr And Mrs M Conroy
Proposal: Demolition of existing industrial building and replacement with 1
No. detached two bedroom dwelling with alterations to existing
access
Location: Industrial Building Lambourne Close Sparsholt Hampshire

Recommendation

O – SEE REPORT OF VIEWING SUB COMMITTEE.
