

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

3 March 2004

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

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

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

Deputy Members

Councillor Wagner (Standing Deputy for Councillor Hatch)

Others in attendance

Councillor Cook

1181. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meetings of the Committee held on the 8 January 2004, 4 February 2004 and 5 February 2004 be approved and adopted.

1182. **2 STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, 50 WAVELL WAY, WINCHESTER**

(Report PDC392 refers)

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in the respect of this item, as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on the application, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on this application and he spoke and voted thereon.

The Director of Development Services reported that the applicant had appealed against non determination on this application but it had not as yet been validated by the Planning Inspector, therefore the Committee could determine the application as set out.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused for the following reasons:

The proposal by virtue of its size and design detracts from the distinctive character and form of the area. It disrupts the rhythm of the street and introduces a discordant element to the simple, uniform design. It has an over dominant impact on Montgomery Close and reduces the open aspect between the houses to the vegetated hillside beyond. If approved it could lead to a similar application for an extension to 48 Wavell Way, further detracting from the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is contrary to policy UB3 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan, proposal EN.5 of the Winchester District Local Plan and proposal DP.3 of the Local Plan Review Revised Deposit 2003.

1183. **REQUEST FOR AUTHORITY TO TAKE ENFORCEMENT ACTION IN RESPECT OF UNAUTHORISED USE OF LAND FOR THE SITING OF A RESIDENTIAL CARAVAN, LAND ADJACENT TO THE MAPLES, SUTTON WOOD LANE, BIGHTON.**

(Report PDC391 refers)

The Director of Development Services requested the Committee to consider an additional recommendation that the use of the site as a builder's yard should cease and that building materials should be removed from the site. The Committee agreed to this request.

RESOLVED:

That enforcement action be authorised, including the service of an Enforcement Notice, to secure the cessation of residential use and associated storage and removal of the caravan from the land, and that the use of the site as a builders yard should cease and that building materials should be removed from the site.

1184. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC396 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 16 February 2004 – minute referring to St John the Baptist Church, St John Street, Winchester (attached as appendix A to the minutes).

In respect of St John the Baptist Church, St John Street, Winchester, the Director of Development Services reported that written comments from English Heritage were still to be received. The Committee considered that a number of matters raised at the Viewing Sub-Committee, including the possible provision of a new path along the North Wall, the treatment of railings and the provision of a lay-by, needed to be clarified and investigated. Therefore, it was the Officers' recommendation that the application be deferred to the Committee's next meeting where these issues could be addressed by means of a new report to contain the results of further negotiation with the applicant and also again attaching the minutes of the Planning Viewing Sub-Committee. The Committee agreed to this course of action.

Arising out of consideration of the minutes, Councillor de Peyer, who was present at the Sub-Committee meeting, stated that the minutes were inaccurate and incomplete in a number of respects. He clarified that in the reference to the Conservation Officer's comments (made by Mr Keeley), that it was the intention to render the existing south facing Victorian porch obsolete; this was not in fact the intention by the applicant, Canon Teare. Councillor de Peyer additionally stated that he had been misrepresented in his comments for the need for the new porch. He stated that he had not conveyed that he was against the porch but had highlighted the fact that it was a contentious matter. He had also enquired about the treatment of the whole churchyard and the applicant had responded that it would not be kept in a rough condition nor would it be manicured, but this had not been minuted. The points made by Councillor de Peyer were supported by others Members of the Committee who had served on the Viewing Sub-Committee.

RESOLVED:

1. That the application in respect of St John the Baptist Church, St John Street, Winchester be deferred for a further report to be brought to the Committee's next meeting and;
2. That the points of clarification and addition made by Councillor de Peyer on the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee in respect of the St John the Baptist Church, St John Street, Winchester application be noted.

1185. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS

(Report PDC394 refers)

The schedule of development control decisions arising from the consideration of the above report is circulated separately and forms an appendix to the minutes.

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 1 as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust which had commented on this application and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in the respect of item 1, as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on this application and he spoke and voted thereon.

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

In respect of item 1 – Westacre Nursing Home, Sleepers Hill, Winchester, Mr P Scammell spoke in support of the application and against the Officers' recommendation for refusal. In assessing the application, the Committee took into account the recommended highway reasons for refusal, but on balance it was agreed that application should be granted. The Committee reached its decision to grant permission as it was thought that the need for nursing care facilities in the District and the precedence for development already in the Sleepers Hill area (where the detrimental impact of incremental development would in the Committee's view be difficult to defend at planning appeal) outweighed the recommended reasons for refusal. Authority was therefore delegated to the Director of Development Services in consultation with the Chairman to approve conditions.

In respect of item 5 – 5 Hawthorne Close, Colden Common, Winchester Mr Davison spoke against the application and Mr Johns spoke in support. After consideration, the Committee agreed to support the application as set out.

In respect of items not subject to public participation, it was agreed that in respect of item 3 – Lowlands Farm, Polly Glovers Lane, West Meon, the Director of Development Services be requested to give consideration to an additional condition to cease other unauthorised use of the land, and to include a landscape condition to approve the appearance of the site.

Arising out of consideration of item 7 – Swifts Farm, Hensting Lane, Fishers Pond, Eastleigh, the Director of Development Services reported that the applicant had given a verbal agreement to the proposed conditions. Following consideration of the item, the Director of Development Services was requested to enter into dialogue with Hampshire County Council to consider the issues arising from the policy of diversification in the Countryside which was increasingly resulting in large lorries having to visit isolated rural industrial sites that were only accessible via narrow country roads. He was also asked to monitor the future uses of the site to ensure that personal restrictions contained in the permission were complied with.

In respect of item 8 – land adjacent to 1 Sun Hill Crescent, Sun Lane, Alresford, at the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Cook spoke on this item as a Ward Member. In summary he stated that there were a number of local objectors to the proposals. The objections focused on the smallness of the site, as it was 0.025 of a hectare and the resultant tight development, which would fill the site leaving no space for boundary treatment. The proposals were also visually intrusive on number 2 Sunhill Crescent, leading to overlooking and there was inadequate space on the site for the parking of two cars. He also had personal concerns at the highway implications of the proposals as peak time traffic was very heavy and the application site was near to a school. He requested that a Viewing Sub-Committee visit the site to observe highway problems, particularly at peak times. The Committee agreed to the request that its Viewing Sub-Committee should visit the application site on Friday 19 March at 8.30am in order that issues relating to heavy traffic on Sun Hill Road could be observed and that on-site issues including possible over development, impact on light to neighbouring properties and access could be considered.

RESOLVED:

1. That the decisions taken on the development control application, as set out in the schedule which forms an appendix to the minutes, be agreed.
2. That the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee visit item 8, 1 Sun Hill Crescent, Alresford, at 8.30am on Friday 19 March 2004 and that Councillors Busher, Johnston, Pearce, Read and Sutton be appointed to serve thereon.
3. That in respect of item 1 – Westacre Nursing Home, Sleepers Hill, Winchester, authority be delegated to the Director of Development Services in consultation with the Chairman to approve conditions.
4. That in respect of item 3 – Lowlands Farm, Polly Glovers Lane, West Meon, the Director of Development Service be authorised to consider the inclusion of additional conditions to cease other unauthorised uses of the land, and a landscape condition to approve the appearance of the site.

5. That in respect of item 7 - Swifts Farm, Hensting Lane, Fishers Pond, Eastleigh, the Director of Development Services contact Hampshire County Council to consider the issues arising from the policy of diversification in the Countryside resulting in large lorries having to visit isolated rural industrial sites that were only accessible via narrow country roads, and that consideration be given to the possible inclusion of a personal permission and monitoring of the use of the site.

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 5.00pm

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**16 February 2004****Attendance:**

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Evans (P)

Hammerton (P)

Pearson (P)

Sutton (P)

Others in Attendance:

Councillor Mitchell

Councillors Craig and de Peyer (for minute item 1 only)

Councillor Carter (for minute item 2 only)

Councillor Coates (for minute item 3 only)

Officers in Attendance:

Mrs S Proudlock (Team Leader, Planning)

Ms S Leonard (Planner)

Mr D Keeley (Conservation Officer)

Mr N Culhane (Highways Engineer)

Mrs Brushett (Conservation Officer)

1186. EXTENSION TO VESTRY, NEW NORTH ENTRANCE PORCH, PATH AND GATE WITH ALTERATION TO BOUNDARY WALL AND GRAVEYARD TO CREATE PARKING SPACE – ST JOHN THE BAPTIST CHURCH, ST JOHNS STREET, WINCHESTER

The Sub-Committee met at St John The Baptist Church, St Johns Street, Winchester, where the Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately ten local residents, Mr Forshaw (the applicant's architect) and Councillors Craig and de Peyer as Ward Members.

The Sub-Committee had been formed to view the site in further detail following its consideration at the Planning Development Control Committee on 4 February 2004.

Mr Forshaw explained that the church was part Norman and was in the process of undergoing extensive renovations. The application sought to make the church more useable for its congregation and to meet the Disability Discrimination Act 1995. It proposed that a sealed medieval entrance on the north side of the church be re-opened with a new porch to allow for disabled access and to afford greater protection from the weather. The porch would have a pitched roof with plain tiles and with lead flashing between it and the nearest buttress. A new path with a limited gradient of one-in-twelve would be dug from the far northern end of the graveyard and lead to the new entrance. It was noted that the north wall suffered from damp and the excavation of earth from this area would also help to cure this problem.

In response to Members' questions, Ms Leonard reported that the archaeological section had recommended conditions should the application be granted. Mr Forshaw explained that no archaeological items had been discovered from an initial excavation for a drain near the proposed porch area, but he anticipated that the remains of several bodies would be found at a depth of four feet along the route of the new path.

In response to Members' questions, Mr Keeley explained that the owners of listed buildings could be discharged from the responsibilities of the Disability Discrimination Act if their application to improve access had been refused Listed Building Consent by the local planning authority.

It is also proposed that a new parking space and pedestrian access be created from part of the graveyard and this would therefore require the alteration of the line of boundary wall and iron railings and excavation of the graveyard. The space would provide parking for one vehicle only and it was proposed that this would be used by a hearse, the principal wedding car or for disabled parking. It was noted that because of the narrowness of St Johns Street, events at the church had caused significant traffic problems.

Mr Culhane explained that subject to amendments, the County Council would not object to the proposals for the new parking space. Members also noted that the County was unlikely to endorse the use of curved kerbstones (that would reflect the line of the amended ironing railings) because of maintenance problems.

Mr Keeley explained that the case to alter this listed building by the addition of the new porch, excavation for a path and parking space had not been sufficiently justified. He was concerned to hear that the intention was to render the existing south facing Victorian porch obsolete. Reopening a doorway in the north elevation was acceptable but as an occasionally used disabled access it would not need a new porch. A simpler solution to access this door would be to run a path along the north wall. This would be cheaper, require minimal excavation and less intrusive and help cure the damp problem in this wall.

The views of English Heritage had not however been obtained and it would be necessary for them to be consulted before a decision on the application was made.

The application also sought to increase the size of the vestry to the rear of the church to accommodate disabled toilets. The extension would have a flat roof and officers raised no objection.

Councillor de Peyer questioned the need for the new porch and Councillor Craig spoke in support of the application.

A number of the public present spoke in support of the application and of the need for ancient churches to evolve and keep pace with the needs of its modern congregation.

In conclusion, although certain Members spoke of their concerns at the need for the new porch and the need for the new parking space, the majority of Members agreed to recommend that the application be approved.

RECOMMENDED:

That subject to the receipt of the views of English Heritage and to the applicant entering into a section 278 agreement with Hampshire County Council in respect of the footpath and lay-by construction then approval be granted, subject to the following conditions.

- 1 1LIST
1LSTR
- 2 A010
A010R
- 3 Details of a specification, sections and materials, including samples, for the construction of the new entrance path shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to work commencing.
Reason. To ensure that such details are appropriate to the setting of the listed building and the character of the conservation area.
- 4 Details including samples of all facing and roofing materials for the construction of the porch shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to work commencing.
Reason. To ensure that such details are appropriate to the listed building and the character of the conservation area.

1187. **TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO EXISTING BLOCK OF FLATS TO PROVIDE 4 NO. TWO BEDROOM FLATS – 1 - 6 NORTON CLOSE, SOUTHWICK, FAREHAM**

The Sub-Committee met at Norton Close, Southwick where the Chairman welcomed to the meeting Councillor Carter as Ward Member, Mr Randle (the applicant's agent), Mrs Bazalgette (Southwick and Widley Parish Council), and approximately 15 members of the public.

The application had also been amended to incorporate 24 on-site car parking spaces. In light of the poor access to public transport in Southwick and the lack of amenities in the village, Mrs Proudlock recommended this additional car parking to Members which would alleviate parking on the road. It was noted that with one space per dwelling, the new car park would provide a further eight spaces that could be used by surrounding residents.

Mrs Proudlock reported that although the Highways Authority had raised no objection, objections had been received from 12 residents from Norton and Castle Closes concerning car parking, overlooking and massing.

Members noted that the scheme had been amended from that considered at Planning Development Control on 5 February 2004. The application now sought permission to build a two (and not a three storey) extension in matching materials to the north facing side elevation of the existing 1960s three storey block. The extension would cover the existing windows of the block's stairwell. The additional four two bedroom flats would bring the density of the area to 53 dwellings per hectare.

With regard to concerns of overlooking, it was noted that the amended plans also sought to minimise this by placing the bedroom and not the living room windows at the rear onto Castle Close.

In light of the amendments outlined, Mrs Proudlock recommended the scheme be approved.

Members noted that the application would result in the loss of nine small trees, although Mr Randle confirmed that in terms of landscaping, the applicant was willing to abide by officers' advice.

The Committee discussed the need for the units and it was agreed that information from the affordable housing register would be presented to the next Planning Development Control Committee.

Councillor Carter spoke in opposition to the application because of the mass of the extension.

At the invitation of the Chairman, several members of the public and Mrs Bazalgette spoke against the style of architecture and of their concerns relating to the potential loss of light, overlooking, drainage, and that the lawn area was currently used as an informal playground for children. With regard to concerns over the loss of light, it was noted that, although the application was on higher ground it would be a minimum of 35 metres from the nearest properties in Castle Close.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Members agreed to recommend that the application be refused because of the likely effects of overlooking, the loss of trees and because the density of the development was too great.

RECOMMENDED:

That the application be refused.

Conditions/Reasons

01 The proposal is contrary to Policy UB3 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review), Policies H1 and EN5 of the Winchester District Local Plan and Proposals H2 and DP3 of the emerging draft Winchester Local Plan in that: -

(i) the proposed development would result in unsatisfactory building relationships with adjoining properties to the detriment of the amenities and privacy, which the occupants thereof might reasonably expect to enjoy;

(ii) the proposed development would create an unacceptable density of development, which would detract from the open character of the area and would be out of keeping with Southwick;

(iii) the proposed development would result in the loss of open space and trees around the existing buildings and would amount to over-development, which would have a detrimental effect on the character of the area.

02 The proposed development is contrary to Policy R2 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996-2011 (Review) and proposal RT3 of the Winchester District Local Plan in that it fails to make adequate provision for public recreational open space to the required standard, and would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the area. The proposal would also be likely to prejudice the emerging Winchester District Local Plan Review Deposit and Revised Deposit in that it would undermine those plan policies for recreational open space provision within the District.

1188. **SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO SIDE TO PROVIDE MEETING ROOM, PARISH OFFICE AND FACILITIES WITH EXTERNAL STAIRS TO ROOF STORAGE – ST PETERS PARISH CHURCH, SCHOOL HILL, SOBERTON**

The Sub-Committee met at St Peters Parish Church, School Hill, Soberton and the Chairman welcomed to the meeting Councillor Coates (as the Ward Member), Mr Hunt (the applicant's architect), Mr Betts (Soberton Parish Council) and approximately twelve local residents.

Mrs Brushett explained that the application sought to erect a single storey extension onto the north elevation of the part Norman, Grade 1 listed church. The extension would accommodate toilets, an office and a meeting room for 35 people and would have disabled access. An external staircase would lead to a roof storage space and it was noted that the extension would be constructed within the external buttresses.

The applicant's architect stated that there was no archaeological impediment to the scheme and that the application had taken into account the views of the public and English Heritage. It was noted that, if granted, an archaeological watching brief would be placed as a condition.

Mrs Brushett recommended that the application be refused as the domestic looking design of the extension, and in particular the external stairs, had no relevance to the church and that the need for the extra space was unjustified. Mrs Brushett suggested that the additional space could be found at Soberton Parish Hall that was a three-minute walk away. Members visited the Hall to assess its merits as an alternative.

In response to Members' questions, Mrs Brushett confirmed that English Heritage had not objected to the application, as it would in their view balance the Victorian extension to the south elevation of the church.

Councillor Coates, as a Ward Member, and Mr Betts of Soberton Parish Council spoke in support of the application and commented that similar extensions had been approved at East Meon and Swanmore.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a number of local residents spoke in opposition to the application and the detrimental visual effect it would have from long distance views from neighbouring properties. The owner of one neighbouring property reported that she was willing to continue storing church property in her own house and, following a discussion, the applicant agreed that this agreement would negate the need for the roof storage and external staircase. However, it was noted that the pitch of the roof would remain at the same angle to allow for the hang of the natural slate tiles.

The Sub Committee discussed the traffic implications of the application and it was noted that the parking for the church was on the Church green, although this would be inaccessible in poor weather conditions.

Members commented on the style of the proposed extension and Mr Hunt agreed to reconsider the plans to ensure that the building looked more ecclesiastical through, for example, rounding the tops of the windows.

In conclusion, the majority of Members agreed that the application should be recommended for approval and suggested that the removal of the staircase and dormer would be an improvement. Members agreed that the application would be part of the evolution of the church. They considered the need for the extension to be justified and that it was unreasonable to expect the church office to be part of the new vicarage, as this was used as a private dwelling. Although alternative accommodation could be provided at the nearby Village Hall, Members considered this to be dangerous as the road had no pavement or lighting.

RECOMMENDED:

That the application be approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. Details of the proposed windows at scale 1:5 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development hereby approved commences.
Reason: To ensure the details are satisfactory and respect the character of the listed building.
3. No development shall take place until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the 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.
Reason: To ensure that the development presents a satisfactory appearance in the interests of the amenities of the area.
4. Details of the proposed levels and materials on the path shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before the development hereby approved commences.
Reason: To ensure the details are satisfactory and respect the character of the listed building.
5. Details of the proposed service trenches across the graveyard shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before the development hereby approved commences.
Reason: To ensure the details are satisfactory and respect the character of the listed building.

6. A method statement relating to the protection of the church wall and any underpinning proposed shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the development hereby approved commences.
Reason: To ensure the details are satisfactory and respect the character of the listed building.
7. A method statement relating to the delivery of plant and equipment to the site and the protection of the graveyard during the period of construction shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before the development hereby approved commences.
Reason: In order to ensure that disturbance to the graveyard is minimised.
8. Large scale plans at scale 1:20 of the stairs and dormer window shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before the development hereby approved commences.
Reason: To ensure the details are satisfactory and respect the character of the listed building.
9. 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 08:00 to 1800 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 Saturdays and at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining properties during the construction period.
10. Details of the layout and proposed surfacing of the parking area shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before the development commences. The approved details shall be fully implemented before the extension is brought into use.
Reason: In order to ensure the provision of satisfactory off street parking in the interests of highway safety.
11. Details of the method of removal of spoil from the site shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before the development hereby approved commences.
Reason: In order to protect the amenities of the locality.
12. No development or site preparation prior to operations which has any effect on disturbing or altering the level of composition of the land, shall take place within the site until the applicant or their agents or successors in title has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation to be submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure that the archaeological interest of the site is properly safeguarded and recorded.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 1.30pm.

Chairman