

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

1 April 2004

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

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

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

Others in attendance and Speaking:

Councillors Bailey and Hiscock

1352. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Baxter, Jeffs (Standing Deputy for Councillor Baxter), Hammerton and Chamberlain (Standing Deputy for Councillor Hammerton).

1353. **MEMBERSHIP OF SUB-COMMITTEES ETC**

The Committee agreed to appoint a Sub-Committee to consider the application at the Royal Observer Corp, Worthy Road, Winchester as it was a large, high density scheme on a site that contained listed buildings.

RESOLVED:

1. That a Planning Development Control (Royal Observer Corp) Sub-Committee be established and that Councillors Busher, Sutton, Davies, Bennetts, Beveridge, Evans, Johnston, Pearson, and Tait (Deputy Members: Councillors de Peyer, Hammerton, Mitchell and Read) be appointed to serve thereon.

2. That the first meeting of the Sub-Committee be held on Monday 26 April 2004, with an informal site visit for Members only at 9.30am and to reconvene at 10.30am in the Wintonian Room, Guildhall, Winchester for a public meeting.

1354. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**
(Report PDC404 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 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 16 and 17 as he was a Member of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on these applications, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 2, 7, 8, 16 and 17 as he was a Member of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on these applications, and he spoke and voted thereon.

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

In respect of item 1 – Hockley Golf Club, Twyford – Mrs Dyer spoke in support of the application and, following debate, the Committee supported the application as set out.

In respect of item 8 – Workhouse Ltd, Granville House, St Peters Street, Winchester – Mr McMaster spoke against the application and Mr Paget, the applicant's agent, spoke in support. Following debate, the Committee supported the application as set out and resolved that an informative be included concerning the installation of fire sprinklers.

In respect of item 9 – Longacre, Hurdle Way, Compton – Mr Airey (who represented the Compton Down Society) and Mrs Millar (a representative of Compton and Shawford Parish Council) spoke against the application and Mrs Hauser (the applicant) spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, a Ward Member, Councillor Bailey spoke against the application. She highlighted that the appeal against a previous refusal on the site for 17 dwellings (rather than the proposed 5 dwellings in the current application) had been upheld by the Planning Inspector only because of its effect on the sub-standard Hurdle Way/Otterbourne Road Junction. Councillor Bailey added that if the application were granted, it was likely to encourage incremental development in Hurdle Way.

The Committee noted that the Director of Development Services had recommended that the application be approved and had stated that, although visibility at the junction was approximately 50 metres short of the required standard, it had been calculated that the 5 proposed developments within the current application would only generate an additional 38 vehicle movements a day onto the junction.

Members were concerned about the vehicular movement capacity for the junction and noted that whilst the developer had offered an off-site contribution to improve the junction, their programme of works meant that the County Council were unable to accept this offer. Following debate, it was agreed that the application be refused because of the inadequacies of the Hurdle Way/Otterbourne Road junction and it was agreed that this issue be pursued with the County Council.

In respect to item 10 – The Vine School, Church Lane, Curdridge – Mr Medway, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. The Director explained that following the publication of the report, further letters (and poetry) in support of the application had been received from both parents and pupils of the school. Members also noted that a Ward Member, Councillor Knasel, had contacted the Committee to express the concerns of some local residents regarding the expanding number of pupils at the

school and its effect on traffic. However, the Director of Development Services recommended a condition so that the proposed building could not be used as an additional classroom and therefore increase the school's pupil capacity. Following debate, the application was approved as set out, and delegated authority was granted to the Director of Development Services in consultation with the Chairman to clarify the above condition.

In respect to items 16 and 17 – Hyde Post Office and Stores, 16 Egbert Road, Winchester – Ms Hodges spoke against the application and Mr Haddow in support.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a Ward Member, Councillor Hiscock spoke against the application. He noted that as the shop had not been successfully re-let and a suitable community use had not been found, he approved of the conversion of the shop into flats. However, he objected to the proposal to convert the single storey detached garage in the rear garden into a one bedroom dwelling, because of its effect on neighbouring properties. With regard to concerns over a loss of privacy from the former garage, the Director explained that this would not be affected by the proposed skylights which were above head height within the garage.

Whilst no concerns were raised regarding the conversion of the shop, the conversion of the garage and its increased height, loss of light, impact on the Conservation Area and the loss of a healthy magnolia tree adjacent to the garage led Members to defer the application and to request amended plans in the light of these concerns.

In respect of item 2 – The Grange, St Cross Road, Winchester – the Committee approved the application as set out and agreed to the inclusion of two further conditions. These would ensure that the footpath from Painters Field to St Cross Road would remain open and that the only vehicular access to The Grange would be limited to the proposed new access from St Cross Road.

In respect of item 6 – 23 Old Kennels Lane, Olivers Battery – the Committee noted the recommendation of the Viewing Sub Committee to approve the application (Report PDC405 refers) and the Director of Development Services reported that a number of the trees on the site had been killed by poor works. He recommended the addition of a condition that the surviving trees be protected during the construction process. Subject to this additional condition, the application was approved as set out.

In respect of item 7 – Dolphin House, St Peters Street, Winchester – and at the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Hiscock, a Ward Member, spoke against the application. He stated that the proposal would result in a loss of privacy from the garden of Richard Moss House, the loss of valuable and occupied office space and that no affordable housing was proposed. The Director of Development Services explained that the privacy of the Richard Moss garden could be protected by conditions on fencing. Members noted that concerns over the loss of office space had also been raised by the Chamber of Commerce.

The Committee agreed that the appearance of the existing three storey 1960s office block detracted from the Conservation Area and questioned the advice of the Sites and Monuments Officer who was unable to attend the meeting. However, in the report, she had advised that this building should not be demolished and redeveloped because of the likely damage this would have on archaeology beneath the site. Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application because of the loss of employment space, that the application proposed no affordable housing, and to seek further clarification on the archaeological issues on the site.

In respect of item 12 – Barley Mow, Pricketts Hill, Shedfield – the Committee agreed to the application as set out with an additional condition to limit its use to agricultural purposes only.

In respect of items 14 and 15 – Ballakitch, Highways Road, Compton - the Chairman read a request from a Ward Member, Councillor Bailey, to visit the application site. She stated that its location adjacent to the M3 motorway would result in a level of noise in the gardens beyond that recommended by the World Health Organisation and that a number of residents had opposed the proposed urbanisation of Highways Road. Councillor Bailey had also written that a number of neighbouring properties had not been aware of the latest amended plans.

During the discussion, the Director of Development Services corrected an error in the report that the number of affordable houses at the development was 5 and not 15 as set out in the report. The Director also explained that with the proposed insulation, the noise levels within the development would comply with the necessary standards, but that these requirements did not apply to gardens.

Following debate, the Committee agreed that the Viewing Sub-Committee should visit the application site on Monday 19 April 2004 to further consider the above issues.

RESOLVED:

1. That the decisions taken on the development control applications, as set out in the schedule which forms an appendix to the minutes, be agreed.

2. That the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee visit application site numbers 14 and 15 (Ballaktich, Highways Road, Compton, Winchester) on Monday 19 April 2004 and that the membership be as appointed at the meeting of the Committee held on 31 March 2004.

3. That in respect to item 10 – The Vine School, Church Lane, Curdridge, the application be approved and that the Director of Development Services be granted delegated authority in consultation with the Chairman to draft an additional condition so that the new building could not be used to increase the pupil capacity of the school.

1355. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC401 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 16 March 2004 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 16 March 2004 be received.

1356. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**
(Report PDC405 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 19 March 2004 in relation to the application at 23 Old Kennels Lane, Olivers Battery (attached as Appendix B to the minutes of 31 March 2004).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 19 March 2004 in relation to 23 Old Kennels Lane, Olivers Battery be approved and adopted.

1357. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (KNOWLE HOSPITAL) SUB-COMMITTEE**
(Report PDC406 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Knowle Hospital) Sub-Committee held on 22 March 2004 (attached as Appendix B to the minutes).

Members noted with concern that the amended plans for the Community Building, which the applicant Berkeley Homes had said would be submitted within the next few days, had not yet been received.

Members also discussed the Sub-Committee's concern that the remainder of the required affordable housing should not be crammed into one of the four phases yet to be brought forward and agreed that this concern should be highlighted in the recommendations.

In regard to paragraph 6, it was agreed that officers, and not the Chairman, would seek the advice of the City Council's engineers about whether the parking on Mayles Lane could be policed.

It was also agreed that the resolutions at items 1, 4, 6 and 7 be amended to read "recommended," and the Director of Development Services explained that issues relating to the application for the improved access to the sewerage works would be considered at the next meeting of this Committee on 22 April 2004.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Knowle Hospital) Sub-Committee held on 22 March 2004 be approved and adopted, subject to the above amendments.

1358. **PLANNING APPEALS**
(Report PDC402 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 7.00pm.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB COMMITTEE**16 March 2004**Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Baxter
Davies (P)Pearson (P)
Read (P)
Sutton (P)Others in Attendance:

Councillor Nelmes (a Ward Member for St Bartholomews)

Officers in attendance:

Miss E Norgate (Principal Planner)

1359. ROOFTOP TELECOMMUNICATIONS BASE STATION COMPRISING THE REPLACEMENT OF 3 ANTENNAE AND INSTALLATION OF 1. EQUIPMENT CABIN – BT TELEPHONE EXCHANGE, UPPER BROOK STREET, WINCHESTER.

The Sub-Committee met opposite the application site at Middle Brook Street car park. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr James and Ms Gallagher from Waldon Telecommunications Limited on behalf of the applicant, Vodafone.

Miss Norgate explained that a full planning application had been submitted by Vodafone for a rooftop telecommunications base station comprising of the replacement of 3 panel antennae and installation of 1 equipment cabin. The height to the base of the antennae was 16.55 metres (height of the existing building was 14 metres) and the new cabin was to measure 3.7 metres by 2.5 metres by 2.8 metres. It was noted that the applicant had provided a certificate of compliance with the ICNIRP guidelines on the cumulative effect of the proposals.

She continued that since the compilation of the officer report, a letter of representation had been received from a resident of Parchment Street expressing concern of electromagnetic radiation emissions. It was explained that although the development did introduce some potential for intrusion to the surrounding conservation area if viewed from certain angles, officers recommended approval, with a condition that the cabin be painted a suitable grey colour.

Mr James demonstrated the positioning of the proposals, particularly that of the cabin. This was to be located below the pitch line of the roof towards the rear of the building. He clarified that his clients required the proposals to improve existing second-generation coverage and to introduce third-generation coverage in the town area. Mr James also advised that operators were unable to share equipment cabins, however

the existing headframe supported 3 operators in total and that the replacement antennae would add minimal extra bulk.

In their consideration of the application, Members viewed the proposals from the following locations: the corner of St Georges Street and Upper Brook Street, behind 14 Upper Brook Street opposite the Brooks Centre and from Parchment Street (the old Post Office yard and Stonemasons Court). Members noted that the proposals, notably the cabin, would be most visible from the latter locations.

Members were satisfied that the visual impact of the proposals (in addition to that from the equipment already in-situ) was minimal. Therefore, the Sub-Committee agreed to approve the application, on condition that the applicant paint the cabin a suitable grey colour, the exact shade to be agreed in consultation with officers. The colour of the antennae should match that of the existing masts on the headframe.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. 1FUL
1FULR
2. The mast and equipment cabins hereby permitted shall be painted a suitable grey colour details of which must first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.
3. Before any specified plant or machinery is used on the premises it shall be enclosed with sound insulating material and mounted in a way which will minimise transmission of structure and air borne sound in accordance with a scheme to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby properties.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 10.15am.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (KNOWLE HOSPITAL) SUB-COMMITTEE**22 March 2004****Attendance:**

Councillors:

Bennetts (P)	Busher (Chairman) (P)	Hatch (P)
Clohosey		Pearson (P)
Davies		Read (P)
Evans (P)		Sutton (P)

Deputy Members in Attendance:

Councillor Beveridge (Standing Deputy for Councillor Clohosey)
 Councillor de Peyer (Standing Deputy for Councillor Davies)

Officers in Attendance:

Mrs S Proudlock (Team Manager Planning)
 Mr A Amery (Principal Planning Officer)

1360. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Clohosey and Davies.

1361. **MINUTES**
(Report PDC387 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 6 January 2004, be approved and adopted.

1362. **THE COMMUNITY BUILDING**
(Oral Report)

The Sub-Committee met at the portacabin at Knowle Hospital and the Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately ten members of the public together with Mr Shepherd, a representative of Berkeley Homes (the applicant).

Members noted that the flooring of the Community Building had been completed and that a number of events had already been held in the de-consecrated chapel. However, Members were concerned that the installation of screens (that would enable the chapel to be used by different groups) was still outstanding and recommended a swift resolution. Mr Shepherd agreed and confirmed that amended plans regarding the screens would be submitted to the Council within the next few days and it was noted that a decision on this matter would normally be delegated to officers.

With regard to disabled access, Members noted that access to the rear and kitchen area was not possible internally because of the steps associated with the stage. It was explained that use of an existing external door would be difficult to convert to disabled access because of the limitations that arose from the building's listed status. It was therefore agreed that the Conservation Officer be further consulted with a view to remedying this and any other concerns the Portfolio Holder for Community Services had, which prevented the chapel from maximising its potential as a community facility.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted and that the above actions pursued.

1363. **CONSIDERATION OF PHASE 9 OF KNOWLE VILLAGE**
(Oral Report)

Mr Amery explained that Phase 9 of the development of Knowle Village had been originally considered at the previous meeting of this Committee on 6 January 2004. In response to comments made at that meeting, and comments made at the public consultations conducted by the developer, Berkeley Homes had submitted amended plans. Mr Amery recommended that the revised plans represented a significant improvement and reported that the Architects' Panel had approved the designs, in principle.

It was noted that Phase 9 proposed 42 dwellings which comprised a mixture of two bedroom flats and three and four bedroom houses across a 4.9 acres site. The embankment onto Mayles Lane had been deleted in the new plan and it was now proposed that the buildings would be stepped to follow the contours of the land.

With regard to concerns about pedestrians' safety, the amended plans proposed a 1.2 metre hard surfaced footpath alongside one side of all the roads, which Mr Shepherd explained would use conservation kerbs to retain the area's rural character. It was noted that the proposed materials, the narrowness and curving nature of the roads would have a similar effect to a home-zone where traffic was encouraged to drive at low speeds.

However, Members noted that all of the amendments to the roadways were subject to comment from the City Council's Engineers.

The amended plans proposed that an equipped play area for younger children be created within the area of Phase 7 of the development and alongside a previously agreed area designated for unequipped play. Timber fencing would enclose the equipped play area.

In response to concerns about a safe crossing to the play area, Mr Shepherd explained that this would be provided by a raised surface along a straight section of the road. Members were also concerned about the visibility of the play area and noted that the nearest houses were at a distance of 15 metres. Mr Shepherd explained that the trees that surrounded the play area were protected, but that their leaf canopies began at approximately three metres above the ground.

In response to a Member's comment, Mr Shepherd confirmed that the location of play areas was highlighted to prospective customers and that Berkeleys anticipated that they be completed in time with other works on Phase 7.

The Sub-Committee discussed the proposals for the pumping station within Phase 9 and noted that the building was likely to be constructed by the utility company and be two metres in height. Although such buildings usually benefited from permitted development rights, Members agreed that landscaping conditions should be imposed to ensure that the station was enclosed by a 1.8 metres close boarded timber fence. It was also noted that it was not possible to “sink” the level of the station into the ground as it was to be serviced by utility vehicles.

Furthermore, in response to a comment from a member of the public, regarding rights to an existing cesspit within Phase 9, Members recommended that the City Secretary and Solicitor further investigate this issue.

Mr Amery reported that the amended plans proposed a ten metre landscaped strip along Mayles Lane. Some of the dwellings onto Mayles Lane had been re-configured so that their frontages looked out from the village and so that the view from Mayles Lane would not be of a continuous and uniform line of rear garden fences.

In response to questions, Mr Amery explained that there were no affordable housing sites proposed within either Phase 9 or Phase 5 (as set out later in these minutes). It was recommended that officers negotiate with the developer to ensure that the remainder of the required affordable housing was not crammed into one of the four phases yet to be brought forward.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a number of members of the public present commented on the boundary of the development and it was explained that the original masterplan permitted development on the land formerly owned by the hospital, which went beyond the listed boundary wall.

Concerns were also raised regarding the proposed pedestrian linkages to Mayles Lane through the woodland, and whilst it was noted that the walkways would be sensitively landscaped, some members of the public present were concerned that this would encourage car parking on Mayles Lane. In response, the Chairman agreed to seek the advice of the City Council’s Engineers on how potentially dangerous parking on this private road could be policed.

A number of the members of the public present were concerned about the lack of parking and, in particular, the lack of visitor parking spaces available. In reply, Mr Amery stated that whilst Government planning guidance recommended an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling, in recognition of the larger properties within this Phase of development, two spaces per dwellings had been proposed. He confirmed that this calculation included spaces provided in garages, driveways and (if any were to be proposed) visitor parking areas.

There was also a concern that the local shops had not yet been occupied and Mr Shepherd explained that the marketing of these units had been transferred from Berkeleys to a specialist company.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted and that the above actions be pursued.

1364. **CONSIDERATION OF PHASE 5 OF KNOWLE VILLAGE**
(Oral Report)

Mr Amery outlined to the Sub-Committee the preliminary details of Phase 5 of the development. This comprised 33 dwellings in three blocks that enclosed a central courtyard parking area. One block would be three storeys in height and accommodate 13 flats, the second block was two and a half storeys (with dormer windows to the rear) and comprised eight houses and four further flats, and the third block would be two storey and used for housing. All the flats would be two bedrooms and the houses would be three to four bedrooms. The area of land to be developed was 1.4 acres and this would include a play area. With regard to car parking, an average of 1.68 spaces per unit was proposed for this Phase and Mr Shepherd explained that it would be surfaced by a gravel based material.

Mr Amery stated that the blocks were similar in scale to others already developed in the village and that they would frame views through the listed building and central courtyard. Members also noted that the boundary treatment and fences to the rear of the properties would be part hidden by the stepped ends of the blocks.

In response to questions, it was confirmed that this Phase of the development included a cycle storage area.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

1365. **BUS ROUTES AND ACCESS**
(Oral Report)

Mrs Proudlock explained that a bus route through to the village from Mayles Lane had been agreed as a condition to Phase 7 of the development. To restrict the access to buses only, the County Council had recommended the use of rising bollards to be operated by radar from the buses. The County had advised that this was cheapest maintenance option for the management company to take on, and that the system could also be operated from emergency vehicles. Members also noted that the system would prevent "tail-gating" vehicles.

However, some members of the public present were concerned that the bollards would not stop motorbikes, and it was noted that the County had been reluctant to adopt this access road, which meant that it was not possible to impose traffic orders. No action could therefore be taken against unauthorised use by motorbikes. Following discussion, it was agreed that the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Access should discuss the matter of adoption further with the County Council.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted and the above actions be pursued. The details of the rising bollard system has been accepted in accordance with the requirements of the condition.

1366. **UPDATE ON CONSTRUCTION WORKS TO UPGRADE THE ACCESS ROAD TO THE SEWERAGE TREATMENT WORKS AT LAND NORTH OF NORTH PARK FARM, MAYLES LANE, KNOWLE**
(Oral Report)

Mrs Proudlock explained that the developer had negotiated access rights from Mayles Lane to the sewerage plant alongside the cemetery. She reported that the City Council's Engineers had not commented on the access point because it was onto a private road, but that the Arboriculturist Officer had concluded that the scheme would not result in the loss of good quality trees. Members noted that the scheme proposed the felling of trees at the entrance and of five trees along the route of the access road.

In response to comments, Mrs Proudlock agreed to investigate the possibility of restricting access along the road to utility vehicles only and noted Members' concerns about the urbanisation of the entrance point onto Mayles Lane. Members also recommended that a landscaping condition be agreed to replace some of the lost trees.

At the conclusion of the meeting, it was suggested that prior to the next meeting, officers give the Sub-Committee a guided tour of the site to update them on latest issues and developments.

RESOLVED:

That the application for the access road be approved subject to appropriate conditions relating to the matters identified.

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

Chairman