

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 (for all minute items)
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)

1. **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.

2. **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.

3. **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 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