

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**13 March 2008****Attendance:**

Councillors:

Jefferies (Chairman) (P)

Baxter
 Beveridge (P)
 Busher (P)
 Huxstep (P)
 Johnston (P)

Lipscomb (P)
 Pearce (P)
 Ruffell (P)
 Saunders
 Sutton (P)

Deputy Members

Councillor Tait (Standing Deputy for Councillor Baxter) for the Land Off Hookpit Farm and Minutes of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub Committee items only.

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Barratt, Godfrey, Jackson, Tait and Wright

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Baxter and Saunders.

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 20 February 2008 be approved and adopted.

3. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SCHEDULE**

[\(Report PDC738 Refers\)](#)

The Schedule of Development Control Decisions arising from the consideration of the above Report was 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. However, he had taken no part in the Trust's consideration of this item and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Lipscomb 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. However, he had taken no part in the Trust's consideration of this item and he spoke and voted thereon.

The Chairman (Councillor Jeffs) declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Items 2, 3 and 6 as his wife was the Chair of the New Alresford Town Council Planning Committee, which had commented on these applications, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Item 1: Land adjacent to Milnthorpe, Sleepers Hill, Winchester - Case No 08/00047/FUL

The Head of Planning Control stated that, since the publication of the Report, an internal consultation response had been received from the Environmental Protection Officer recommending Conditions to identify and deal with any contamination that may arise at the site. As the application was recommended for refusal, no action was therefore required.

The Head of Planning Control also updated Members regarding one of the three letters of objection which had been received. The occupiers of "Pentargon" had since written to advise that they no longer objected to the application, as the applicant had addressed their concerns regarding a hedge or fence boundary treatment. They now therefore supported the application, which increased the numbers of letters in support to ten.

The Head of Planning Control continued that further representation had been received from the applicant, stating that the provision of smaller dwellings was contrary to Policy D2 of the Sleepers Hill Local Area Design Statement (LADS) and also cited examples of similar applications in Airlie Road and Romsey Road, which had been granted planning permission and therefore the issue of precedent should be reconsidered. He explained that the LADS dealt only with design issues, not the need for smaller dwellings, as required by the Local Plan which took precedence over LADS. With regard to precedent, the northern side of the Sleepers Hill area provided a special area of tree cover, which was worthy of protection. Although the new scheme proposed the removal of four Category 'A' trees, these would be replaced to the satisfaction of the Arboricultural Officer.

Mr Caiger and Councillor Tait (a Ward Member) spoke in support of the application.

In summary, Councillor Tait stated that there were further letters of support for the scheme, but that these were received at pre-application stage and were therefore not included on the application file. With regard to precedent, development in Sleepers Hill was incremental in comparison with the sub-division of plots in Dean Lane and Chilbolton Avenue (which in his view had not been beneficial to the character of that area) and would therefore respect the character of this area. The proposal's form and scale conformed to the relevant criteria and would enhance the area. The proposals also benefited from the support of neighbours. The Council's Arboricultural Officer had no objections and other consultees had not raised any issues. He suggested that, although policy relating to density was important, so was the character of the area, which this proposal protected and enhanced.

In answer to Members' questions, the Head of Planning Control explained that at eight dwellings per hectare, the application was significantly lower than what was expected, but it was possible, within the footprint available, to increase the density of development without affecting the character of the area. This could be achieved by, for example, the sub-division of one of the main dwellings creating a pair of semi-detached dwellings. In this way Policy H7 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review regarding housing mix could also be applied.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the report.

Item 4: Holleydene, 86 Downs Road, South Wonston - Case No 07/02820/OUT

Councillor Wright (a Ward Member) spoke against the application. In summary, he stated that he also spoke on behalf of South Wonston Parish Council who had not been informed that the item was to be considered at the meeting. He stated that the Parish Council objected for the reasons set out in the Report, including the detrimental effect on neighbours and that the proposed access may not be viable. He continued that manoeuvring for two vehicles on the site and the access road would not be possible. The proposals were not in character with the future development proposed for Stables Yard to the south of the site in terms of its size, layout and design. He also enquired whether the road through the Stables Yard development had been deliberately terminated, to provide future development access to the application site and whether the development would now prevent development on adjacent land to the rear of 84 and 88 Downs Road. If future development was prevented to the rear of 84 and 88 Downs Road, this should be a reason for refusal, as a comprehensive development could not be achieved

The Head of Planning Control responded by explaining that access for future development to the rear of 84 Downs Road would be possible, but may be restricted for 88 Downs Road. However, this had not been included as a reason for refusal, as such reasons had not stood up to appeal in the past. Although it was noted that there was no highway objection to the application, a Condition could be included to request additional information on car parking and manoeuvring, to be supplied by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission for the reasons, and subject to the Conditions, set out in the Report. The Committee also agreed to include additional Conditions requiring information on car parking and manoeuvring to be submitted and to retain the hedge within the site to the western boundary of the plot, to protect the amenities of adjoining occupants.

Item 5: The Hollies, 31 Main Road, Littleton, Winchester Case No 07/03178/FUL

Mr B Middleton and Mrs G Pidsley and Mr D Elsmore (Littleton and Harestock Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Councillor Jackson (a Ward Member) also spoke against the application. Mr M Kilcommons, applicant, spoke in support.

The Head of Planning Control stated that, since publication of the Report, two further representations had been received, one referring to highways (stating that sightlines and manoeuvring were inadequate) and the second, that a number of representations in support of the application were from people not living in close proximity to the site.

In summary, Councillor Jackson stated that she supported neighbours' objections to the scheme. She commented on the supporting letters, which were in the majority, from Harestock, which was some distance away from the application site. She also had concerns on the traffic access and the possibility of head-to-head traffic situations on the potentially dangerous bends on the highway and also manoeuvring of traffic on site, which she considered was not practicable. The site was tight and she supported the recommendation to refuse the granting of planning permission.

In response to Members' questions, the Head of Planning Control confirmed that there were no highway objections to the application, including those concerning manoeuvrability on site. The issue of the amount of weight given to letters of support coming from outside the immediate application site area would be given further consideration by officers.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the Report.

Item 7: Upton Cottage, Wonston Road, Wonston, Winchester - Case No 07/02924/FUL

Mr S Mullins spoke in objection to the application and Councillor Godfrey (a Ward Member) also spoke against the application. Mr and Mrs Carey (applicants) spoke in support.

In summary, Councillor Godfrey stated that South Wonston Parish Council opposed the proposed garage on grounds of its height and adverse effect on the amenities of the neighbouring property at Acorns (occupied by Mr Mullins) and that revised plans would not overcome their concerns. No objection had been raised to the alterations to the house, but the garage was a cause of concern. Although the new application was more sympathetic than that previously refused, it was still substantial and would cause an adverse impact on the views of the public from the adjacent bridleway, be in a conservation area and that it was out of character with the surrounding area.

At the conclusion of debate, after taking into consideration the points raised by Councillor Godfrey and Mr Mullins, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission for the reasons and subject to the Conditions, as set out in the Report.

Item 8: Telecom Mast Site, Andover Road, Winchester – Case Reference Number 08/00313/TCP

Councillor Barratt (a Ward Member) spoke against the application.

The Head of Planning Control stated that, since publication of the Report, an internal consultation response had been received from the Environmental Protection Officer who raised no objection. However, an additional letter of objection had been received from a local resident questioning the need for a taller mast and raising concerns about the visual impact of the mast, the impact on the natural environment and upon highway safety.

The City of Winchester Trust had also commented that, if granted, the Conditions should stipulate that the mast and cabinet be painted a dark colour. The applicant had confirmed in writing that O2 intended to finish the mast in a dark colour. Although Members noted that it was not possible to attach Conditions to Prior Notification Applications, under the applicant's Permitted Development rights it would have to ensure the mast accorded with the colour as submitted by them

In summary, Councillor Barratt stated that the applicant had not consulted Ward Councillors at the pre-application stage due to a misunderstanding over the location of the mast. The applicant had previously indicated that they would mast share at the Hunts Frozen Food site on Andover Road, but the latest data submitted now stated that this site would not provide sufficient coverage. She stated that this brought into question the reliability of the information submitted by the applicant and whether enough evidence had been provided to verify that alternative sites had been

considered. She continued that trees would only provide partial screening for the mast and that the telecom companies should work harder to justify their chosen sites.

At the conclusion of debate the Committee agreed to raise no objection to the Prior Notification and requested the applicant amend their application to include details of the paint scheme for the mast and cabinet acceptable to the local planning authority.

The following items were not subject to public participation:

Item 2: Public House and Premises, The Running Horse Inn, 22 Pound Hill, Alresford - Case No 08/00047/FUL

The Head of Planning Control stated that, since publication of the Report, a further representation had been received from New Alresford Town Council. The Town Council stated that it was unable to send a representative to attend the meeting and the Head of Planning Control drew their representation to the Committee's attention. A copy of the letter is kept on the application case file.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission for the reasons given and subject to the Conditions, as set out in the Report, together with additional Conditions that the lights should be turned off each day when trading ceases and that the light should not exceed the level of luminosity as submitted in the application.

Item 3: Public House and Premises, The Running Horse Inn, 22 Pound Hill, Alresford, Case No 08/00018/LIS

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant listed building consent for the reasons given and subject to the Conditions, as set out in the report.

Item 6: 4 Carisbrooke Close, Alresford, Winchester Case No 08/00280/FUL

The Head of Planning Control stated that this was an officer application, which had been processed normally in accordance with Section 3 of the Council's Protocol on Planning Matters.

The Head of Planning Control explained that, subsequent to the publication of the Report, New Alresford Town Council had objected to the proposal on the grounds that the proposed extension would look like a 'hotchpotch', and that it could cause harm to neighbours and could look overbearing.

In addition, the New Alresford Society stated that it supported the conclusions of New Alresford Town Council and that it considered that the appearance that proposal was unsuitable and that it would be overbearing.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission for the reasons given and subject to the Conditions, as set out in the Report.

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 (The Running Horse Inn, 22 Pound Hill, Alresford), planning permission be granted for the reasons given and subject to the Conditions, as set out in the Report, together with additional Conditions that the lights should be turned off each day when trading ceases and that the light should not exceed the level of luminosity as submitted in the application.

3. That in respect of Item 4 (Hollydene, 86 Downs Road, South Wonston), planning permission be granted for the reasons given and subject to the Conditions, as set out in the report, subject to additional Conditions to request information on car parking and manoeuvring on the site and to retain the hedge to the western boundary of the plot to protect the amenities of adjoining occupants.

4. That in respect of Item 8 (Telecom Mast Site, Andover Road, Winchester) that no objection be raised to the Prior Notification and that the applicant be requested to amend their application to include details of a dark colour acceptable to the local planning authority.

4. **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB COMMITTEE – 22 FEBRUARY 2008**
[\(Report PDC739 refers\)](#)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub Committee held on 22 February 2008 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the deletion of the words: “and subject to the following Conditions” from the resolution relating to Lawsonia, Bull Lane, Waltham Chase, the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub Committee held on 22 February 2008 be received.

5. **APPLICATION W19673 05/01662/OUT AT LAND OFF HOOKPIT LANE, KINGS WORTHY**
[\(Report PDC740 refers\)](#)

By way of personal explanation, Councillor Johnston drew attention to this item where, due to his involvement as a Ward Member and as Chairman of Kings Worthy Parish Council, he risked the perception of predetermination. He therefore sat apart from Committee on this item, spoke as the Chairman of Kings Worthy Parish Council only and did not vote thereon.

The Head of Planning Control stated that, since publication of the Report, a further seven letters of objection had been received from separate households. An outline of the issues raised in the letters of objection was provided to the Committee and copies of the letters were kept on the application case file.

The Head of Planning Control additionally reported that the applicant was offering public open space to the fringes of the site, which met the provision of public open space for this type of development but, due to its positioning being narrow and at the edges of the development, it did not lend itself to adult sports pitches. Therefore, the Local Planning Authority would be seeking an additional contribution from the applicant for this type of provision in Kings Worthy and Headbourne Worthy.

The Head of Planning Control also requested the Committee to give consideration to an additional Condition and Informative. The Condition was to require an ecological survey and mitigation strategy to be put in place for anything found on the site. The Informative would explain that land indicated by the applicant for an additional 15 affordable dwellings adjacent to the application site did not commit the local planning authority to development of this land and any subsequent application for affordable housing would be by a separate application, to be judged against the Winchester District Local Plan on its own merits. It was also confirmed by the Head of Strategic Housing that there were 79 individual applications on the Housing Waiting List with local needs who required rented housing.

In the public participation part of the meeting, Councillor Johnston spoke as the Chairman of Kings Worthy Parish Council in support of the application.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to support the application as set out together with an additional Condition regarding the ecological survey and mitigation strategy and the Informative relating to the adjacent piece of land indicated by the applicant for affordable housing.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement (in a form to be agreed by the Head of Legal Services) containing the terms set out in Appendix 5 of the Report, the Application be granted subject to the Conditions and for the reasons set out in the Appendix 1 to the Report, including an additional Condition relating to an ecological survey and associated mitigation strategy and an Informative relating to the adjacent piece of land indicated by the applicant for affordable housing, as outlined above.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned for lunch between 1.15pm and 2.00pm, and concluded at 3.15pm.

Chairman

CASE SUMMARY RESULTS FROM COMMITTEE :- 13 March 2008

Item 1

Case No:	08/00047/FUL	
W No:	W02143/08	
Case Officer	Mrs Julie Pinnock	Team: EAST
Applicant:	Mr And Mrs Dudgeon	
Proposal:	1 no. detached five bedroom dwelling with detached double garage and 1 no. detached six bedroom dwelling with double garage	
Location:	Land Adjacent To Milnthorpe, Sleepers Hill, Winchester, Hampshire	

Recommendation

Refused subject to the following refusal reason(s):-

Conditions/Reasons

- 1 The development as proposed would not accord with Proposal DP.3 and H.7 of the Winchester District Local Plan or Development Guideline D1 of the Sleepers Hill Local Area Design Statement in that the proposal at a density of 8 dwellings per hectare is below the minimum guideline of 30 dwellings per hectare and therefore the proposal fails to make the most efficient and effective use of land.
- 2 The proposal is contrary to Policy H.7 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review and supplementary planning guidance Achieving a Better Mix in new Housing Developments in that it fails to provide 50% mix of smaller 1 or 2 bedroom dwellings with a floor area of no more than 75 sq.m. within the district.
- 3 The proposal would create an undesirable precedent which would make it difficult to refuse further similar applications.
(Precedent)
- 4 The proposal is contrary to policy RT.4 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 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 and would not provide a satisfactory level of amenity for the occupiers of the units.

Informatives

1. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: H1, H2, T5;

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP.1, DP.3, DP.4, DP.5, DP.6, H.3, H.7, RT.4, T.1, T.2, T.3, T.4, and W.1.

Achieving a Better Mix in New Housing Developments: August 2002

Sleepers Hill Local Area Design Statement: July 2007

CASE SUMMARY RESULTS FROM COMMITTEE :- 13 March 2008

Item 2

Case No:	08/00014/AVC	
W No:	W11209/12A	
Case Officer	Mrs Julie Pinnock	Team: EAST
Applicant:	Greene King Pub Partners	
Proposal:	2 no. replacement stratford style lanterns; 4 no. floodlights; 1 no. double sided post mounted pictorial sign with trough light illumination; black foamex letters externally illuminated by trough light; 2 no. timber amenity boards to replace existing menu board	
Location:	Public House And Premises, The Running Horse Inn, 22 Pound Hill, Alresford, Hampshire	

Recommendation

APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

1 Any advertisements displayed and any site used for the display of advertisements shall be maintained in a clean and tidy condition to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As required by the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992.

2 Any structure or hoarding erected or used principally for the purpose of display of advertisements shall be maintained in a safe condition.

Reason: As required by the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992.

3 Where an advertisement is required under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992 to be removed, the removal shall be carried out to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the preservation and character of the listed building/conservation area and the safety of the public and personnel on site.

4 No advertisement is to be displayed without the permission of the owner of the site or any other person with an interest in the site entitled to grant permission.

Reason: As required by the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992.

5 No advertisement shall be sited or displayed so as to obscure, or hinder the ready interpretation of any road traffic sign, railway signal or aid to navigation by water or air, or so otherwise to render hazardous the use of any highway, railway, waterway or aerodrome (civil or military).

Reason: As required by the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992.

6 The lighting to the signs and building hereby permitted shall be switched off outside the trading hours of the public house.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to prevent unnecessary light spillage when the premises is not trading as a public house.

CASE SUMMARY RESULTS FROM COMMITTEE :- 13 March 2008

The levels of luminance shall not exceed 0.0176567 candelas per square metre.

Reason: To accord with the terms of the application and in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

Informatives

1. This permission is granted for the following reasons:
The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

2. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: E16
Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: HE.4, HE.5, HE.11

Item 3

Case No:	08/00018/LIS	
W No:	W11209/13LB	
Case Officer	Mrs Julie Pinnock	Team: EAST
Applicant:	Greene King Pub Partners	
Proposal:	2 no. replacement stratford style lanterns; 4 no. floodlights; 1 no. double sided post mounted pictorial sign with trough light illumination; black foamex letters externally illuminated by trough light; 2 no. timber amenity boards to replace existing menu board	
Location:	Public House And Premises, The Running Horse Inn, 22 Pound Hill, Alresford, Hampshire	

Recommendation

APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

1 The works hereby consented to shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.

Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 18(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

Informatives

1. This permission is granted for the following reasons:
The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

2. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: E16
Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: HE.4, HE.5, HE.11

CASE SUMMARY RESULTS FROM COMMITTEE :- 13 March 2008

Item 4

Case No:	07/02820/OUT	
W No:	W20867/01	
Case Officer	Mr Tom Patchell	Team: EAST
Applicant:	Mr E Gardiner	
Proposal:	Two storey detached dwelling (OUTLINE APPLICATION)(RESUBMISSION)	
Location:	Hollydene, 86 Downs Road, South Wonston, Winchester, Hampshire, SO21 3EW	

Recommendation

APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

1 Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2 Plans and particulars showing the detailed proposals for all the following aspects of the development (hereinafter called "the reserved and other matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development is commenced. The approved details shall be carried out as approved and fully implemented before the building(s) is/are occupied.

Reserved and other Matters:

Landscape considerations including:

- (i) an accurate plan showing the position, type and spread of all the trees on the site and a schedule detailing the size and physical condition of each tree and, where appropriate, the steps to be taken to bring each tree to a satisfactory condition; also details of any proposals for the felling, pruning, trimming or uprooting of any trees and the measures to be taken for the protection of the boundary hedges during construction;
- (ii) a landscape scheme showing the planting proposed to be undertaken, the means of forming enclosures, the materials to be used for paved and hard surfaces and the finished levels in relation to existing levels;
- (iii) the arrangements to be made for the future maintenance of landscaped and other open areas;
- (iv) an arboricultural impact assessment and method statement.

The design of all buildings, plant and tanks, including the colour and texture of external materials to be used together with samples of all external facing and roofing materials.

The details of materials/treatment to be used for hard surfacing.

The layout of foul sewers and surface water drains.

The alignment, height and materials of all walls and fences and other means of enclosure.

The finished levels, above ordnance datum, of the ground floor of the proposed building(s), and their relationship to the levels of any existing adjoining buildings.

CASE SUMMARY RESULTS FROM COMMITTEE :- 13 March 2008

The provision to be made for the parking, turning, loading and unloading of vehicles.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order).

3 The beech hedge along the Western boundary shall be retained at its current height (ie 2.5 metres) in perpetuity. In the event that part or all of the hedge becomes diseased or dies then it shall be replaced with similar plant species or alternative species agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the neighbour and in the interests of visual amenity

Informatives

1. This permission is granted for the following reasons:
The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

2. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: T5

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP.3, DP.4, H.1, H.3, RT.4, T.2 and T.4

Item 5

Case No:	07/03178/FUL		
W No:	W11578/05		
Case Officer	Mr Robert Ainslie	Team:	EAST
Applicant:	Mr R Kilcommons		
Proposal:	1 no. two bed dwelling in rear garden of existing property (RESUBMISSION)		
Location:	The Hollies 31 Main Road Littleton Winchester Hampshire SO22 6QQ		

Recommendation

REFUSED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING REFUSAL REASON(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

1 The proposed development would be contrary to policy UB3 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review 1996 - 2011, and policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that it would result in the overdevelopment of the site by virtue of the design, height, mass and bulk of the dwelling within a cramped layout in a limited sized plot.

2 The proposal is contrary to the policies of the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review (R2) and the Winchester District Local Plan Review (RT4) 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.

CASE SUMMARY RESULTS FROM COMMITTEE :- 13 March 2008

Informatives

1. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: No relevant policies
Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP1, DP3, DP4, DP5, DP6, DP8, DP10, H3, H7, RT4, T1, T2, T3, T4

Item 6

Case No:	08/00280/FUL	Team:	EAST
W No:	W04015/02		
Case Officer	Mr Andrew Rushmer		
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Steve Tilbury		
Proposal:	Single storey front extension		
Location:	4 Carisbrooke Close, Alresford, Hampshire, SO24 9PQ		

Recommendation

APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three 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 (as amended).

2 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual relationship between the new development and the existing.

Informatives

1. This permission is granted for the following reasons:
The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

2. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP3

CASE SUMMARY RESULTS FROM COMMITTEE :- 13 March 2008

Item 7

Case No:	07/02924/FUL	
W No:	W16040/05	
Case Officer	Mr Simon Avery	Team: EAST
Applicant:	Mr M Carey	
Proposal:	Single storey front extension; detached three bay garage (RESUBMISSION)	
Location:	Upton Cottage, Wonston Road, Wonston, Winchester, Hampshire, SO21 3LR	

Recommendation

APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three 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 (as amended).

2 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order, with or without modification), no openings other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall, at any time, be constructed in the garage hereby permitted.

Reason: To protect the amenity and privacy of the adjoining residential properties.

3 Prior to the commencement of development on site details of any

Informatives

1. This permission is granted for the following reasons:
The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

2. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: E16
Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP3, DP4, CE5, HE4, HE5

3. All building works including demolition, construction and machinery or plant operation should only be carried out between the hours of 0800 and 1800 hrs Monday to Friday and 0800 and 1300 hrs Saturday and at no time on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Where allegations of noise from such works are substantiated by the Environmental Health and Housing Department, a Notice limiting the hours of operation under The Control of Pollution Act 1974 may be served.

4. No materials should be burnt on site. Where allegations of statutory nuisance are substantiated by the Environmental Health and Housing Department, an Abatement Notice may be served under The Environmental Protection Act 1990. The applicant is reminded that the emission of dark smoke through the burning of materials is a direct offence under The Clean Air Act 1993.

CASE SUMMARY RESULTS FROM COMMITTEE :- 13 March 2008

Item 8

Case No:	08/00313/TCP	
W No:	WTC/165/02	
Case Officer	Mr Simon Avery	Team: EAST
Applicant:	O2 UK Ltd	
Proposal:	Installation of 12.5 metre tall replacement slim-line pole telecommunications column with additional associated ground based equipment cabinet	
Location:	Telecom Mast Site, Andover Road, Winchester, Hampshire	

Recommendation

NO OBJECTION SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):-

Conditions/Reasons

1 In the event that the development hereby approved becomes redundant or otherwise not required for the purpose permitted, the mast and all associated equipment and enclosures shall be dismantled and permanently removed from the site, which shall be restored to its former condition.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

2 The mast and cabinet hereby approved shall be painted matt black and retained in this colour hereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area.

Informatives

1. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Winchester District Local Plan Review Proposals: DP.3 and DP.14

CASE SUMMARY RESULTS FROM COMMITTEE :- 13 March 2008

PDC740

Case No:	05/01662/OUT	
W No:	W19673	
Case Officer	Mr Robert Ainslie	Team: EAST
Applicant:	Milford Group Ltd	
Proposal:	Residential development for 25 no. affordable dwellings (THIS APPLICATION MAY AFFECT THE SETTING OF A PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY) (OUTLINE)	
Location:	Land Off Hookpit Farm Lane, Hookpit Farm Lane, Kings Worthy, Hampshire	

Recommendation

APPROVED - subject to a Section 106/Section 278 Agreement for:

- 1. The provision of 25 units of affordable housing in perpetuity**
- 2. The provision of public open space**
- 3. Dedication of a public footpath through the application site.**

(Note: If the Legal Agreement is not completed within 6 months then the application may be refused without further reference to Committee)

Conditions/Reasons

1 Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2 Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

3 The provision to be made for the storage and disposal of refuse.

The finished levels, above ordnance datum, of the ground floor of the proposed building(s), and their relationship to the levels of any existing adjoining buildings.

Details of the siting, external appearance and materials to be used for any statutory undertakers or service providers equipment such as electricity sub-stations, gas governors, telecommunication cabinets.

The provision to be made for contractors vehicles parking and plant, storage of building materials and any excavated materials, huts and all working areas.

The layout including the positions and widths of roads and footpaths.

The provision to be made for the parking, turning, loading and unloading of vehicles.

The layout of foul sewers and surface water drains.

The design of all buildings, plant and tanks, including the colour and texture of external materials to be used together with samples of all external facing and roofing materials.

CASE SUMMARY RESULTS FROM COMMITTEE :- 13 March 2008

The siting of all buildings and the means of access thereto from an existing or proposed highway, including the layout, construction and sightlines.

Plans and particulars showing the detailed proposals for all the following aspects of the development (hereinafter called "the reserved and other matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development is commenced. The approved details shall be carried out as approved and fully implemented before the building(s) is/are occupied.

Reserved and other Matters:

The provision to be made for street lighting (details to include lux levels and luminere design).

Reason: To comply with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order).

4 No development or site preparation prior to development 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.

5 Development shall not begin until a scheme to mitigate the effect of any contamination of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The above scheme shall include an investigation and assessment to identify the extent of contamination and the measures to be taken to avoid risk to the public and the environment when the site is developed. Development shall not commence until the measures approved in the scheme have been fully implemented

Reason: In order to secure satisfactory development and in the interests of the safety and amenity of future occupants.

6 An Acoustic report shall be submitted by a competent Acoustic Consultant. The report shall details the noise impact on the proposed development from traffic noise and railway noise with reference to PPG24. The report shall propose methods of mitigation of noise from these sources if found to be required, again with reference to PPG24. The report shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of any works. Any recommendations in the report shall be implemented by the applicant.

Reason: To ensure that acceptable noise levels within the dwellings and the curtilages of the dwellings are not exceeded.

7 No development shall take place until details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include the following, as relevant:

- existing and proposed finished levels or contours:
- means of enclosure, including any retaining structures:

CASE SUMMARY RESULTS FROM COMMITTEE :- 13 March 2008

- car parking layout:
- other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas:
- hard surfacing materials:
- minor artefacts and structures (eg. street furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc):
- proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc, including lines, manholes, supports etc.):
- retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration.

Soft landscape details shall include the following as relevant:

- planting plans:
- written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment:
- schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate:
- retained areas of grassland cover, scrub, hedgerow, trees and woodland;
- manner and treatment of watercourses, ditches and banks:
- implementation programme:

Reason: To improve the appearance of the site in the interests of visual amenity.

8 All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out before the use hereby permitted is commenced and prior to the completion of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed with the Local Planning Authority. If within a period of five years after planting any tree or plant is removed, dies or becomes, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged, defective or diseased another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally approved shall be planted at the same place, within the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscape in accordance with the approved designs.

9 A landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, specifically the woodland area to the front of the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the development or any phase of the development, whichever is the sooner, for its permitted use. The landscape management plan shall be carried out in accordance with the details hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure that due regard is paid to the continuing enhancement and maintenance of amenity afforded by landscape features of communal, public, nature conservation and historic significance.

CASE SUMMARY RESULTS FROM COMMITTEE :- 13 March 2008

10 No development shall take place until a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of years has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation. Landscape maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.

Reason: To ensure that due regard is paid to the continuing enhancement and maintenance of amenity afforded by landscape features of communal, public, nature conservation and historic significance.

11 The plans and particulars submitted in accordance with condition(s) above shall include:

a) a plan showing the location of, and allocating a reference number to each existing tree on the site which has a stem with a diameter measured over the bark at a point 1.5 metres above ground level, exceeding 75mm, showing which trees are to be retained and the crown spread of each retained tree;

b) details of the species, diameter (measured in accordance with paragraph (a) above) and the approximate height, and an assessment of the general state of health and stability, of each retained tree and of each tree which is on land adjacent to the site and to which paragraphs (c) and (d) below apply;

c) details of any proposed surgery or other works to any retained tree, or of any tree on land adjacent to the site;

d) details of any proposed alterations in existing ground levels, and of the position of any proposed excavation

e) details of the specification and position of fencing (and of any other measures to be taken) for the protection of any retained tree from damage before or during the course of development. The fencing shall conform to the recommendations of BS 5837 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the plan referred to in paragraph (a) above.

Reason: To enable proper consideration to be given to the impact of the proposed development on existing trees.

12 Details of all works to trees (on or adjacent to the site), must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of those works. All tree surgery/works shall be carried out in accordance with the relevant recommendations of BS 3998 Tree Work.

Reason: To ensure the continuity of amenity afforded by the tree(s) in question.

13 No development pursuant to the permission hereby granted shall commence until the applicant or their agents or successors in title has undertaken a detailed ecological investigation and survey of the site and submitted the findings to the Local Planning Authority for consideration together with a scheme of mitigation and programme for implementation of such measures. The approval in writing of the LPA shall be obtained before any work is commenced and the approved details shall be fully implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that any ecological interest on the site is properly dealt with.

CASE SUMMARY RESULTS FROM COMMITTEE :- 13 March 2008

Informatives

1. This permission is granted for the following reasons:
The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.
2. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB3, T4, T5, T6, H7, H8, H9, R2, C1, E6, E8, E14,
Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: C1, C2, C14, HG1, HG2, HG3, EN5, EN7, EN8, EN9, EN13, H3, H6, H7, RT3, T8, T9, T11,
Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: DP1, DP3, DP5, DP6, DP14, C1, C17, HE1, HE2, H6, H7, RT3, RT5, T1, T2, T4
3. If dewatering of the site and discharge of associated water is necessary during construction operations, the Environment Agency should be notified regarding the dewatering and consulted regarding the need for a discharge consent.
4. The applicant/developer should enter into a formal agreement with Southern Water to provide the necessary sewage infrastructure required to service this development. Please contact Southern Water's Network Development Team (Wastewater) based in Otterbourne, Hampshire or www.southernwater.co.uk.
5. A formal application for connection to the water supply is required in order to service this development. Please contact Southern Water's Network Development Team (Water) based in Chatham, Kent or www.southernwater.co.uk.
6. The note on the land transfer plan which refers to additional land for 15 affordable houses does not commit the local planning authority to additional development on the land. Any proposal for additional affordable housing would require a separate planning application which would be assessed on its merits against H6 of the Winchester District Local Plan (Review).