

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

25 May 2006

Attendance:

Councillors:

Jeffs (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
Bennetts (P)
Beveridge (P)
Busher (P)
de Peyer (P)
Evans (P)
Huxstep (P)

Johnston (P)
Read (P)
Ruffell
Saunders (P)
Sutton (P)
Wood (P)

Deputy Members:

Councillor Pearson (Standing Deputy for Councillor Ruffell)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Cook, Godfrey and Lipscomb.

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Jackson

1. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT**

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Councillors Huxstep and Wood, who were new to the Council as well as the Committee, and also Councillor de Peyer as a new member to the Committee.

2. **APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN**

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Read be appointed Vice Chairman of the Committee for the 2006/2007 Municipal year.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meetings of the Committee held on 16 February 2006 and 8 March 2006 be approved and adopted.

4. **MORN HILL, HOTEL DEVELOPMENT**

(Report PDC626 refers)

The Committee agreed to the request of the City Secretary and Solicitor that this item be deferred in order that further legal advice on the application could be sought.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of report PDC626 – Morn Hill, Hotel Development, be deferred to a future meeting of the Committee.

5. **MONITORING OF COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS BY INDEPENDENT MEMBERS AND PARISH REPRESENTATIVES**

(Report PDC623 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

6. **APPOINTMENT OF SUB - COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES 2006/2007**

(Report PDC624 refers)

Following further advice from the Director of Development, the Committee agreed not to reappoint the Chesil Street, Chilbolton Avenue and Police Headquarters Sub - Committees. It was noted that any matters relating to these applications could be brought directly to Committee for consideration, or alternatively a Sub - Committee could be appointed at the appropriate time if required.

In respect of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub – Committee, the Committee agreed to defer making appointments until representatives of each political group had met informally to discuss working arrangements.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub - Committee be reappointed with terms of reference as set out in report PDC624 and that Councillor Read be appointed Chairman and Councillor Bennetts Vice Chairman of the Sub - Committee for the ensuing Municipal Year.

2. That Councillor Johnston (with Councillor Baxter as deputy) be reappointed to the Stockbridge Oil Field Liaison Panel.

3. That the following Sub - Committees be not reappointed:
 Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester Sub - Committee
 Chesil Street, Winchester Sub - Committee
 Police Headquarters, Winchester, Sub - Committee
 Knowle Village Sub - Committee
 Learning Resources Centre, Peter Symonds College,
 Winchester, Sub - Committee
 Bugle Inn, Twyford, Sub - Committee.

4. That appointments to the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub - Committee be deferred to a future meeting of the Committee.

7. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**

(Report PDC625 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 Jeffs declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of Item 7 (Land at Goscombe Lane, Gundleton) as he had been in discussions with residents and the Parish Council regarding the application and also lived in close proximity to the application site and he withdrew from the meeting.

Councillor Huxstep declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Item 4 and 5 (Shedfield House, Sandy Lane, Shedfield, Southampton) as he lived in close proximity to the application site, and he remained in the meeting but did not speak or vote on the application.

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

Item 1; Elim Lodge, Winchester Road, Bishops Waltham – Case number: 06/00660/FUL

Mr Hockin spoke in objection to the application and Mr Hawthorn (agent) spoke in support.

In agreeing to grant planning permission, the Committee agreed to approve an addition to the Section 106 Agreement that there be retention on site of a Local Area for Play with public access in perpetuity.

Item 2: Field House, 1 Field Way, Compton Down, Winchester – Case number: 06/00642/FUL

Mr Geoffrey (on behalf of the Compton Down Society) spoke in objection to the application and Mr Marker (agent) spoke in support.

The Director of Development reported that the applicant had agreed to enter into a Section 106 Agreement (or to the payment of the contribution) to secure a contribution of £2,000 towards offsite highway works to facilitate the relocation of the crash barrier at the junction of Shepherds Lane and Otterbourne Road,. It was explained that the works to the crash barrier would alter the alignment of the road to improve sight lines.

The Director of Development reported that the applicant had agreed to enter into a Section 106 Agreement (or to the payment of the contribution) to secure a contribution of £2,000 towards offsite highway works to facilitate the relocation of the crash barrier at the junction of Shepherds Lane and Otterbourne Road. It was explained that the works to the crash barrier would improve the existing visibility splays, to the benefit of all users of the Shepherds Lane junction. However, the vertical alignment of Otterbourne Road prevented the full recommended visibility splay from being obtained.

In approving the application to grant planning permission the Committee additionally agreed to the inclusion of the Section 106 Agreement or payment of a contribution for off site highway works as set out above.

Item 3: Land at rear of 63-67 Church Street, Micheldever – Case number: 06/00861/FUL

Mr Critchley spoke as an individual in objection to the application and Mr Wallis (representing Micheldever Parish Council) also spoke in objection to the application.

A Ward Councillor, Councillor Godfrey spoke in objection to the application. In summary, he stated that he objected to the application in view of its impact on the conservation area; that part of the proposed development was outside the policy boundary (and therefore in the countryside); that the proposed development was of too high a density; that the junction between Rook Lane and Church Street was not safe and that the garages were too large for the countryside location.

Councillor Lipscomb, a Ward Member, added that the £10,000 contribution for highway improvements would not affect the safety of the Rook Lane and Church Street junction; that the vehicle movements proposed of 6 to 7 movements per day were not reflected in the size of the garage block proposed and the number of cars associated with the development and that highway works might lag behind the building of the scheme due to the prioritisation of works within Hampshire County Council Highways Section. He asked whether the Committee would consider a Grampian condition that properties on site would not be occupied until after highway works had been completed.

Mr Holmes (agent) spoke in support of the application.

The City Secretary and Solicitor advised the Committee against the imposition of a Grampian condition, as the applicant had already agreed to pay £10,000 as recommended by the Highways Officer for offsite highway improvements. To seek that the properties constructed could not be occupied until off site highway works had been completed by a third party, that is Hampshire County Council, which was outside of control of the applicant, might be interpreted as being unreasonable. The Committee supported this advice.

The Director of Development reported at the meeting on a number of additions to the conditions including a plan to show the south fence line and the change in Condition 16 regarding visibility splays to the west and east of Rook Lane.

The Committee agreed to include within the recommendation a proposal that the £10,000 offsite highway works be used by Hampshire County Council to improve sight lines between Rook Lane and Church Street.

Following debate, the Committee voted not to approve the application including this amendment. Following further debate, the Committee voted to refuse the application on the grounds of intrusion into the countryside as part of the development was outside the policy boundary; the inadequacy of the Rook Lane and Church Street junctions and on grounds of overdevelopment in the Conservation Area. The Committee additionally agreed to delegate authority to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to agree detailed reasons for refusal based on the guiding principles as set out above.

Item 6: Ivy Cottage, Avington Park Lane, Easton, Winchester – Case number 06/00689/FUL

Mrs Collis spoke as an individual in objection to the application and Mrs A Matthews (representing Itchen Valley Parish Council) also spoke in objection.

Mrs Collis requested that consideration of the application be deferred until English Heritage had made a decision on the possible listing of the property.

The Director of Development explained that the cottage had been altered too much from its original state to be listed. He added that even if English Heritage agreed to list the property, the Council could still allow appropriate extensions. Although the property was not listed, the impact of the proposals on the Conservation Area had been taken into consideration. The Director of Development also confirmed that the length of the extension to the washroom was 5.8 metres and not 3.4 metres as set out in the report.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission as set out.

Item 7: Land at Goscombe Lane, Gundleton, Hampshire – Case number 06/00626/FUL

Mr Davis (representing Bighton Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Miss Wallis, applicant, spoke in support.

Councillor Cook, a Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. In summary, he stated that access to the site was inadequate and refusal was supported by the Council's Highway Engineer. There had also been a number of Enforcement cases against the applicant for breach of conditions on previous permissions.

The Director of Development stated that past enforcement should not be taken into consideration by the Committee in its deliberations of the application before it. The Director added that Highways' objection had been taken into consideration in the recommendation by the inclusion of a condition to prevent extensive use of the site by restricting the use to the applicant only and by restricting the use to no more than six horses, in total, being kept on land or within the stables for the purpose of training and breeding at any one time (Condition 4).

Following debate, the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the application to a future meeting in order that issues relating to the detail of the proposed commercial operation could be clarified.

Item 8: 13 Follyfield, Bishops Waltham, Southampton – Case number 06/00745/FUL

Mr Stevens (agent) spoke in support of the application. Mr Stevens stated that a contribution would be made for public open space.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission as set out.

Item 9: Knowle Farm, Mayles Lane, Knowle, Fareham – Case number 06/00635/FUL

Mr George spoke in support of the application.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission as set out.

Item 10: 14 St Clement Street, Winchester – Case reference 06/00875/FUL

The Committee took into consideration written representation submitted by the Crime Reduction Initiative (CRI) in support of the application.

Following debate, the Committee approved the application to grant change of use from B1 (Offices) to D1 (Non residential institution) advice and information service.

In respect of Items that were not subject to public participation, the following were discussed:

Item 4 and 5: Shedfield House, Sandy Lane, Shedfield, Southampton – Case Numbers 06/00430/FUL and 06/00702/LIS. Following debate, the Committee resolved to grant planning permission and listed building consent as set out.

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 in respect of Item 3 – Land at rear of 63-67 Church Street, Micheldever – authority be delegated to the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman, to set out detailed reasons for refusal based on the following guiding principles: Intrusion into the countryside as part of the development was outside the policy boundary; the inadequacy of the Rook Lane and Church Street junctions and on grounds of overdevelopment in the Conservation Area.

3. That in respect of Item 7 – Land at Goscombe Lane, Gundleton, Hampshire the application be deferred for further negotiation and clarification between the Director of Development and the applicant on the detail of the commercial operation proposed.

The meeting commenced at 9.30 am, adjourned for lunch at 1.15pm, recommenced at 2.15pm and concluded at 5.55pm.

Chairman