

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**4 March 2004**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Sutton (Vice-Chairman in the Chair) (P)  
Busher (Chairman)

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

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

Others in attendance:

Councillors Campbell and Hiscock

---

1189. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Baxter, Busher and Chamberlain.

1190. **VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR THE MEETING**

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Evans be appointed Vice-Chairman for the meeting.

1191. **MEMBERSHIP OF SUB-COMMITTEES ETC.**

RESOLVED:

That a meeting of the Knowle Hospital Sub-Committee be held on Monday 22 March 2004 to commence at 7pm at Knowle.

1192. **PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISION**

(Report PDC 393 refers)

The Committee requested the Director of Development Services to circulate to all Committee members the full planning appeal decision in respect of the Shearers Arms, Owslebury Bottom, Owslebury.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

1193. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**  
(Report PDC396 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 16 February 2004 relating to items 1 - 6 Norton Close, Fareham and St Peter's Parish Church, School Hill, Soberton. (Attached as appendix A to the minutes of the meeting held on the 3 March 2004).

The Committee supported the Viewing Sub-Committee's recommendation for refusal in respect of 1 - 6 Norton Close, Southwick, Fareham.

In respect of St Peter's Parish Church, School Hill, Soberton, the Director of Development Services reported that further to issues raised at the Sub-Committee meeting, the applicant had indicated that there would be improvements to the vehicular access and an improved scheme design. The amended design would include the deletion of external stairs and roof storage as the owner of a neighbouring property would be willing to continue storing church property in her own house. However, the applicant had not substantiated this by the submission of amended plans and therefore the Committee decided after debate to refuse the application for the reasons stated in report PDC384 as considered at the previous meeting of the Committee held on 5 February 2004.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee meeting held on the 16 February 2004 be approved and adopted in relation to 1-6 Norton Close, Southwick, Fareham and that in respect of St Peter's Parish Church, School Hill, Soberton the application be refused for the reasons set out in the schedule of development control decisions which is attached as an appendix to the minutes.

1194. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**  
(Report PDC395 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 items 5, 11, 18 and 19 as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on those applications, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 5, 11, 18, 19 and 20 as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on those applications, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Pearson declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 12 as he was a member of Swanmore Parish Council which had supported the application but he had not personally taken any part in the Parish Council discussion on that application, and he spoke and voted thereon. He additionally expressed a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 13 as both the applicant and the two principal objectors had been in contact with him about the application but he had not expressed an opinion on the application and he spoke and voted thereon.

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

In respect of items 1 and 2 – The Coach House, Fir Hill, High Street, Droxford, Mr J O'Donovan spoke in support of the application and against the Officers' recommendation for refusal. Following consideration, the Committee supported the reasons for refusal as set out.

In respect of items 3 and 4 – Yew Tree Cottage, West Street, Soberton, Mr Rowntree spoke against the application and Mr Cole spoke in support. Following debate, the Committee approved the applications as set out.

In respect of item 5 – 10 Cripstead Lane, Winchester, Mrs Donger spoke against the application and Mr Morton spoke in support. After taking into consideration the amount of work that the applicant could carry out without consent and the high standard of the proposed dormer, the Committee agreed to support the application as set out.

In respect of item 6 and 7 – Pitter Cottage, Peach Hill Lane, Crawley, Winchester, Mr D Trussler spoke in support of the application and against the Officers' recommendation for refusal. Following consideration, the Committee supported the reasons for refusal as set out.

In respect of item 8 – Land opposite Moor Hill Coach House, St Anne's Lane, Shedfield, Mr Wharf spoke against the application and Mrs Thompson spoke in support. At the request of a Ward Member, Councillor Goodall, the Vice-Chairman explained that Councillor Goodall could not be present at the meeting, and in his absence she summarised for the Committee a letter, which he had written to all members of the Committee. In summary Councillor Goodall objected to the present application to locate stables at the bottom of the application site as it would be near to residential houses, and to place it at the top of the site across open fields, would lead to a scar on the landscape due to the need to facilitate an access track. The best solution was to have no stables at all, and the division of the countryside into smaller parcels for equestrian use was damaging to the appearance of the countryside. He also stated that the site was not near bridle ways, which was a planning consideration. Following debate, the Committee supported the Officers' recommendation to refuse the application as set out.

In respect of item 10 – 23 Old Kennels Lane, Oliver's Battery, Winchester, Mr Stainforth spoke against the application and Mr Harrison spoke in support. In introducing the item, the Director of Development Services explained that there was an error within the Officers' report in that the gap between the properties was 4 metres and not 6 metres as stated. The Director of Development Services also circulated at the meeting additional conditions for the Committee to take into consideration should it be minded to approve the application. The Committee agreed that its Viewing Sub-Committee should visit the application site on the 19 March 2004 to observe the proximity between the two properties, the change in levels between the two sites and to assess issues relating to the access.

In respect of item 12 – Brooke Garage, New Road, Swanmore, Mr Taylor spoke against the application. The Director of Development Services stated that since preparing the report additional representations had been received and these were summarised for the Committee. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Campbell, a Ward Member, stated in summary that she supported the retention of the offices within the scheme but had concerns about the tight arrangements for car parking on the site and the problems for traffic that could be generated within New

Road, which was already a busy thoroughfare. Following debate, the Committee supported the issues raised regarding the inadequate provision and arrangements for car parking upon the site, and the lack of alternative public car parking nearby. Therefore, on balance, the Committee agreed to refuse the application and delegated authority to the Director of Development Services in consultation with the Chairman to agree reasons for refusal.

In respect of item 13 – Russett, Heath Road, Soberton, Southampton, Mrs Morse and a representative of Soberton Parish Council spoke against the application and Dr Robinson spoke in support. The Director of Development Services, stated that additional representation had been received on the application and he summarised this for the Committee. He also informed the Committee that amendment had been made to the application in that the height of the proposed dwelling had been amended to be in scale between Russett and the neighbouring property May Cottage. He also added that representation had been received from Soberton Parish Council, which reiterated concerns on scale and mass and that the proposals were out of character. They also requested that if the Committee were minded to approve the application then a Grampian type condition should be included that alterations take place to Russett to provide an integral garage before works commenced on the new dwelling.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Campbell, a Ward Member, spoke on this item (item13). In summary she spoke of her concerns at the traffic implications of the proposal and the width of the proposed garage which would be too narrow to be operationally practical. She asked that if the existing boundary hedge was cut back to achieve improved visibility splays then a condition be included that its maintenance be preserved and therefore the conclusions of the Village Design Statement would be adhered to. In response, the Director of Development Services, stated that a condition could be included relating to the relationship of levels between developments and the ridge height of the proposed dwelling. He additionally explained that although the width of the garage was narrow no objections had been received from Highways, and in response to points raised by the objector regarding traffic accidents, the police had no record of recorded accidents within the last 13 years. He also added that the proposals accorded with the basic principles of the Village Design Statement. Following debate, and in approving the application, the Committee agreed to additional conditions to reinforce and maintain the hedgerows; to control the levels of development in order to keep the ridge height to its lowest possible point and that a Grampian type condition be included in order that the garage to Russet was constructed prior to the new build development taking place.

In respect of item 18 – Winchester Delivery Office, Middle Brook Street, Winchester, Dr Khoo and Mr Bedford spoke against the application and Mr Hecks and Mr Symmonds spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Hiscock, a Ward Member, spoke on this item. In summary he stated that his comments had the support of the other Ward Councillors. The application site was adjacent to a heavily populated area and there was local anxiety that disturbance would result from the proposals. There was concern that the measures proposed by the applicant to control the behaviour of patrons leaving the premises would not be effective and the proposals would be disruptive and detrimental to the local area. In agreeing to refuse the application, the Committee delegated authority to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to agree additional reasons for refusal based on traffic considerations and impact on the amenity of nearby residents.

The following items were not subject to public participation.

In respect of item 11 – Land to the rear of 67-73 Bar End Road, Winchester, the Director of Development Services reported that Hampshire County Council had objected to the application due to the loss of highway land if the disposal of land owned by the City Council adjacent to the site to allow development to take place. Should the City Council dispose of the land to the applicant, it was for the applicant to negotiate with Hampshire County Council to extinguish highway rights to the land. In considering this item, Members raised concerns at the safety to the highway roundabout adjacent to the application site and that the potential to improve this roundabout could be compromised if highway land was disposed of to the applicant. In addition, Members questioned the overbearing nature and potential for overlooking from the development to existing properties in Bar End Road and also asked that the assumption relating to car parking spaces in the St Catherines Park and Ride car park also required clarification. In order to allow these issues to be clarified, the Committee agreed to defer consideration of this item to its next meeting.

In respect of item 14 – Land adjacent to Cherrydene, High Street, Shirrell Heath, this application was deferred as the date for receipt of public representation would not expire until the 14 March 2004.

In respect of items 16 and 17 – Lainston House Hotel, Stockbridge Road, Sparsholt, the Director of Development Services reported that the Council's Conservation Officer had discussed the application with English Heritage's Case Officer and no adverse comment had been made, however no written representation had been received. The Committee noted the comments of the Director of Development Services and approved the applications as set out, subject to the inclusion of an additional condition that extra large scale drawings be submitted.

In respect of item 21 – Rural buildings – Land at Calcot Lane, Curdridge, the Committee agreed to approve the application subject to the Director of Development Services in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman for the meeting agreeing to the wording of an additional condition, if appropriate, that the use be personal to the applicant only.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the decisions taken on the development control applications, as set out in the schedule which forms as appendix to the minutes, be agreed.
2. That the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee visit application site number 10 at 9.45am 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 12 – Brooke Garage, New Road, Swanmore, the Director of Development Services in consultation with the Chairman be delegated authority to agree reasons for refusal.
4. That in respect of item 11 – Land to the rear of 67-73 Bar End Road, Winchester, and item 14 – Land adjacent to Cherrydene, High Street, Shirrell Heath, the Committee agreed to defer consideration of these items to its next meeting.

5. That in respect of item 18 – Winchester Delivery Office, Middle Brook Street, Winchester, authority be delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to agree additional reasons for refusal based on traffic considerations and impact on the amenity of nearby residents.

6. That in respect of item 21 – Rural buildings – Land at Calcot Lane, Curdridge, the application be approved subject to the Director of Development Services in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman for the meeting agreeing to the wording of an additional condition, if appropriate, that the use be personal to the applicant only.

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 8.35pm

Chairman