

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

22 May 2008

Attendance:

Councillors:

Jeffer (Chairman) (P)

Barratt (P)
Baxter (P)
Busher (P)
Fall (P)
Huxstep (P)

Johnston (P)
Lipscomb
Pearce (P)
Ruffell (P)
Tait (P)

Deputy Members

Councillor Berry (Standing Deputy for Councillor Lipscomb)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors: Biggs, Hiscock and Verney

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Lipscomb.

2. **APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Huxstep be appointed Vice Chairman of the Committee for the 2008/09 Municipal Year.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 24 April 2008 be approved and adopted.

4. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SCHEDULE**

[\(Report PDC743 refers\)](#)

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 Johnston declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Item 4 as he was acquainted with the applicant and he spoke and voted thereon.

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

Item 1: Old Park Wood Industrial Estate, Old Park Road, Bishops Sutton - Case Number: 07/03197/FUL

Mrs Miller representing Bishop Sutton Parish Council and Mr Docherty, applicant, spoke in support of the application. Councillor Verney spoke on this item as the Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Verney stated that he believed that the applicant had been encouraged to develop a scheme that included live/work units following discussions with a previous Director of Development of the City Council. The applicant had presented a scheme that would accommodate approximately 36 people to live and work on the site, with additional workers being transported to the site by a minibus. Draft Government guidance in PPS4 would encourage eco-friendly developments, such as this. The Council was not compelled to insist on affordable housing as part of this development and the present full-time industrial use resulted in traffic access problems on narrow local roads. The proposed traffic generation would envisage approximately 80 journeys per day, which would be lower than the present industrial use. Members could use their discretion to make an exception to policy to approve a potentially award winning scheme.

The Head of Planning Control stated that further representations had been received since preparation of the report. A petition had been received from Bishops Sutton Parish Council in support of the application containing 62 signatories. A letter of support from Councillor Cook had also been received. Representation had also been received from the tenant of the industrial units who was concerned at the potential loss of employment. An update sheet was circulated at the meeting, which contained legal clarification of the policy position concerning the provision of affordable housing, copies of which are held on the application file.

In answer to Members' questions, the Head of Planning Control illustrated to the Committee the proximity of neighbouring housing to the application site, the nearest of which was approximately 300 metres to the south. In addition, the Head of Planning Control stated that the work element of the live/work units would be protected by condition, but the units could be easily converted to residential and the monitoring of the condition could prove difficult. The applicant had not included the wind turbines for power-generation within the application in case this proved contentious, but was willing to include this element if encouraged by the Committee. The Head of Legal Services stated that PPS4 was in draft and had less weight than existing adopted policies.

The Head of Planning Control suggested a number of amendments to the recommendation within the report and these were agreed by the Committee. The amendments referred to the deletion of the reference to policy E4 in Reasons 1. and in the Informatives; the deletion of the wording in Reason 1. (b) stating: "and would introduce a predominantly B1(a) office use contrary to Policy E4 of the Local Plan", and in recommendation 2. the deletion of the reference to: "the Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review) particularly Policies T1 to T5" and its replacement with: "the Winchester District Local Plan Policy T1", and the addition of a reason for refusal relating to affordable housing.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to the reasons for refusal as set out in the Report as amended above, to include an additional reason for refusal relating to affordable housing.

Item 2: Shipyard Motor Co, Hambledon Road, Denmead, – Case Number: 08/00208/FUL

Mr Lander Brinkley representing Denmead Parish Council spoke against the application.

In answer to Members' questions, the Head of Planning Control confirmed that although it had been indicated by the applicant that a dentistry practice would occupy the building, any other facility or service would satisfy the Council's policy on protecting these types of uses.

Following debate, the Committee rejected the officer recommendation to approve the application and agreed to refuse planning permission for the reasons that the three-storey building represented over-development of the site; with excessive density, which was detrimental to the character of the area. The units were too small resulting in an insufficient living environment for the amenity of residents, with some rooms only being served by roof lights.

Authority was delegated to the Head of Planning Control in consultation with the Chairman to agree detailed wording for the reasons for refusal based on the above, including an additional reason relating to public open space payments.

Item 3: Bolt House, Love Lane, West Meon – Case Number: 08/00404/FUL

Mr J Daniel and Mrs E Nicholl spoke against the application.

Councillor Biggs addressed the Committee as the Ward Member. In summary, she stated that the applicants had tried to reduce the bulk of the development but it still had an adverse impact, particularly on Love Lane Cottage, which was contrary to Winchester District Local Plan Review appendix 2 paragraph 16. Also, the public right of way was affected in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The development would have a prominent position within the Conservation Area and was against the Village Design Statement and was also contrary to policies CE23, CE 5 and 6 and HE4 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review.

The Head of Planning Control reported that since the report was prepared, further representation had been received from West Meon Parish Council, who had raised no objection to the application. The Parish Council explained that it noted that the height of the proposal would have an impact upon the properties to the north and that the previous dormer windows had been replaced by roof light windows and it was considered that the planned extension no longer overlooked the footpath or the adjoining properties to the north.

The Head of Planning Control continued that representation had also been received from the South Downs Joint AONB Committee. This second detailed response raised objections to the scheme. The South Downs Joint AONB Committee considered that the existing building had little to contribute to the setting of the AONB or the Conservation Area to the north. It was felt that there was some benefits to the scheme such as the loss of the flat roof section of the building and replacement of concrete roof tiles with slate roof tiles, however this should be weighed against the increased bulk (particularly when viewed from the west) of the roof area. Overall the Committee considered that the merits of the proposal were finely balanced were it not for the fact that the dwelling was extended in the 1980s.

In response to Members' questions, the Head of Planning Control stated that the proposed development was a distance ranging between 9 and 15 metres from Love Lane Cottage and would involve a rising in height from 4.1 metres to 6.2 metres. It was also confirmed that the development would be built on ground higher than the adjacent public right of way. However, on balance, it was not thought that the development would be visually intrusive

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed that the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub Committee should determine the application. The factors for the Viewing Sub Committee to take into consideration were the topography of the site and the bulk and scale of development in order to assess the impact upon the public right of way, neighbouring properties and the AONB. The site visit would take place on Tuesday 3rd June at 9:30am on site followed by a public meeting at 11am at a local venue.

Item 4: Carle End, School Lane, Headbourne Worthy – Case Number: 08/00771/FUL

Mr P Bulkeley (Agent) spoke in support of the application.

The Head of Planning Control informed the Committee that the report had been written prior to the end of the consultation period and there were now 13 letters of support and five letters of objection to the application and that Headbourne Worthy Parish Council had also objected. Details of the letters of support and objection, including those of the Parish Council, were contained on the application file. The Head of Planning Control also clarified that the application site was within the Local Gap and not the Strategic Gap as stated in the Report. As this was an application in which a Member had an interest, the Head of Planning Control also confirmed that the application had been processed normally.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application for the reasons set out in the Report.

Item 5: Hill Farm Orchards, Droxford Road, Swanmore – Case Number: 07/00138/FUL

Mr Hildrew representing Swanmore Parish Council spoke in objection to the application and Mr Dobson, applicant, spoke in support. Councillor Pearson, a Ward Member, also spoke on this item.

The Head of Planning Control reported that since preparing the report additional representations had been received referring to the increase in lorries on Swanmore/Droxford Road since the application was previously reported to Committee, and that traffic was entering and leaving the site 24 hours a day.

In addition, Swanmore Parish Council supported the application subject to the inclusion of various matters in the Section 106 Agreement, some of which were included in the draft Agreement.

In summary, Councillor Pearson stated that there were a number of issues to be taken into consideration in considering this application. If the Council was too restrictive then this could affect the commercial viability of the farm and prejudice its future, but too much development would penalise the local population.

He stated that the commercial practice was very weather dependent, which at certain times of year may involve it supplementing its output of apples and pears with top fruit

from other markets in the area. As it supplied a major supermarket chain there were rules on delivery, which it needed to comply with. However, the lorries accessing the facility had damaged local roads and caused a disturbance. He clarified that the use of the term "imported fruit" related to fruit from outside the local growing area and not the country. Reference was made to condition 13 (which would be deleted and replaced by a Section 106 Agreement) in that not more than 300 tonnes total annually of top fruit from other sources ancillary to the operations of Hill Farm Orchards could be stored. He stated that this equated to approximately 40 lorry movements at the times indicated within Condition 6. However, only large lorries could access the site due to the warehouse and distribution requirements of the supermarket chain.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission subject to a Section 106 Agreement that would ensure that no more than 300 tonnes of imported fruit were stored in, and distributed from, the existing buildings in any calendar year, that the proposed building would only be used to store and distribute fruit grown at Hill Farm Orchards and associated land and that procedures are in place to allow officers to monitor the above and to the deletion of condition 13.

Item 6: 20 King Alfred Place, Winchester – Case Number: 08/00626/FUL

Mrs Duxbury spoke in support of the application and Councillor Hiscock spoke as a Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Hiscock stated that there was considerable interest in the application. The only objection was from the City of Winchester Trust. The applicant wished to modernise the end-of-terrace property by creating an additional room at the rear, which would set a precedent for the terrace. The property was last updated approximately 100 years ago and was now in need of further updating.

The Head of Planning Control stated that further comments had been received from the Council's Conservation Officer on 9th May 2008. The comments were that, whilst the revised drawing did show the extension projecting a little beyond the existing rear wall of the kitchen (to address the point made by the City of Winchester Trust about bonding in of the brickwork), this did not alter the principle of the proposal, which would - for the reasons explained in the consultation response - be damaging to the integrity of the terrace, and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Following debate, the Committee rejected the officers' recommendation for refusal, but agreed to grant planning permission. Planning Permission was granted for the reasons that policies HE4 and HE5 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review were not contravened in that in its character, scale and plan form the proposal did not breach these policies as it was sympathetic to the existing property and would not dominate the existing terrace and would be subordinate thereto. In addition, authority was delegated to the Head of Planning Control in consultation with the Chairman to agree appropriate conditions relating to, for example, materials and roof details.

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

Item 7: Street Record, Trussell Crescent, Winchester – Case Number: 08/00478/FUL

In answer to a Member's question, the Head of Planning Control stated that the application did not include proposals for the lighting of the bin store during the winter period.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to the inclusion of an additional condition that the wood board fascia to the bin store be stained a dark colour.

Item 8: The Lodge, 1 Gordon Road, Winchester – Case Number: 08/00626/FUL

The Committee agreed to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions 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. (a) That in respect of Item 2, Shipyard Motor Co, Hambledon Road, Denmead, planning permission be refused for the reasons that the three-storey building represents over-development of the site; with excessive density, which is detrimental to the character of the area. The units are too small resulting in an insufficient living environment for the amenity of residents, with some rooms only being served by roof lights.

(b) That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Control in consultation with the Chairman to agree detailed wording for the reasons for refusal based on (a) above, including an additional reason relating to public open space payments.

3. That in respect of Item 3: Bolt House, Love Lane, West Meon, the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub Committee determine the application at its meeting to be held on Tuesday 3rd June at 9:30am on site followed by a public meeting at 11am at a local venue.

4. (a) That in respect of item 6: 20 King Alfred Place, Winchester, planning permission be granted for the reasons that policies HE4 and HE5 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review have not been contravened in that in its character, scale and plan form the proposals do not breach these policies as the extension will not dominate the existing terrace property and will be subordinate thereto.

(b) That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Control in consultation with the Chairman to agree appropriate conditions relating to, for example, materials and roof details.

5. **PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS DECEMBER 2007 – MAY 2008**

[\(Report PDC747 refers\)](#)

The Head of Planning Control was requested to include within the next Planning Appeals Report decisions relating to May 2008, as the last appeal in this report was dated 28th April 2008.

RESOLVED:

That the Report be noted.

6. **APPOINTMENT OF SUB-COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES 2008/09**
[\(Report PDC 744 refers\)](#)

RESOLVED:

1 That the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee continue to be appointed from the whole Committee, with terms of reference as set out in the Report.

2 That the Chairman (Councillor Jeffs) and Vice Chairman (Councillor Huxstep) of the Planning Development Control Committee be appointed as the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Viewing Sub-Committee for the 2008/09 Municipal Year.

3 That the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee continue to be appointed from the whole Committee, with terms of reference as set out in the Report.

4 That Councillor Huxstep be appointed Chairman and Councillor Ruffell Vice Chairman of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee for the 2008/09 Municipal Year.

5 That Councillors Jeffs (Chairman), Busher, Johnston, Lipscomb, Ruffell and Tait be appointed to the Planning Development Control (Brambridge House Informal Group) for the 2008/09 Municipal Year, with terms of reference as set out in the report.

6 That no Member be appointed to the Stockbridge Oilfield Liaison Panel and that Hampshire County Council Secretariat be contacted to ascertain if there are other County committees with responsibility for mineral extraction that the City Council can be represented upon in view of the District's continued involvement with oil extraction, such as that at the Matteredly Estate, Itchen Valley.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned for lunch at 12.50pm, recommenced at 1.30pm and concluded at 3.40pm.

Chairman

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE: DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MEETING

RESOLUTIONS

22.05.2008

PART II DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS
AND RESOLUTIONS THEREON

2 In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal involves development that cannot be reconciled with national planning policy guidance in PPG13, in that it would result in development that would be inappropriately located away from existing urban areas and would thus over-rely on the private car for access and transport purposes. This would result in an unacceptable increase in the number and length of car journeys to the detriment of the environment and the locality. The proposal therefore conflicts with the strategy of the Winchester District Local Plan Review, particularly Policy T1.

Informatives

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: T5,

Winchester District Local Plan Review: DP.1, DP.3, DP.5, DP.6, DP.9, DP.13, DP.15, CE.18, E.2, H.5, H.6, H.7, T.1, T.4, RT.4,

Item **Denmead** **Ward** **Denmead**

2 **Conservation Area:**

Case No: 08/00208/FUL

Ref No: W17114/04

Date Valid: 30 January 2008

Grid Ref: 465694 112016

Team: EAST **Case Officer:** Mrs Jill Lee

Applicant: Shipyard Motor Co.

Proposal: Redevelopment of existing site to include; dental surgery and 6 no. one bedroom flats with associated landscaping and parking (THIS APPLICATION MAY AFFECT THE SETTING OF A PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY) (RESUBMISSION)

Location: Shipyard Motor Co Hambledon Road Denmead
Waterlooville Hampshire PO7 6NU

Officer PER

Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

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

Conditions/Reasons

1 The proposed development would be contrary to policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan in that it would result in the overdevelopment of the site detrimental to the character of the area.

2 The excessive density of the proposed development would be out of character with the surrounding development and detrimental to the character of the area contrary to the provisions of policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan.

3 The proposed units are too small resulting in insufficient living environment for residents with some rooms being served by roof lights only.

4 The proposal is contrary to Policy RT4 of the Winchester District Local Plan Revised 2006 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 for the area.

Informatives

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

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP3, H3, H7, SF6, RT4, T4

2 It is considered that the proposal fails to accord with policy H4 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006. More specifically, the proposal fails to comply with all of the criteria outlined in the supplementary planning guidance which outlines the implementation of policy H4 - Supplementary Planning Document Implementation of Local Plan Infilling Policy.

3 The proposal is considered to be contrary to policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006, as the scale of the proposal is not considered to be appropriate to the context of the site.

4 The proposal would create an undesirable precedent which would make it difficult to refuse further similar applications.
(Precedent)

5 The available length of frontage to Road is insufficient to enable a satisfactory road junction, with adequate visibility splays to be provided.
(Insufficient Frontage - Visibility)

6 The roads leading to and from the site are of inadequate width to accommodate safely the additional traffic which the proposed development would generate.

7 The road leading to and from the site has substandard junctions with Worthy Road, which are inadequate to accommodate safely the additional traffic that the proposed development would generate.

8 The proposal is contrary to Policy RT4 of the Winchester District Local Plan Revised 2006 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.

Informatives

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

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: CE2, CE3, CE5, H4, DP3, DP9, RT4
Supplementary Planning Guidance - Implementation of Local Plan Infilling Policy (H.4)
Planning Policy Statement 7

Item **Swanmore** **Ward** **Swanmore And Newtown**

5 **Conservation**

Area:

Case No: 07/00138/FUL

Ref No: W04046/15

Date Valid: 22 January 2007

Grid Ref: 458818 116500

Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Mr James Jenkison

Applicant: Hill Farm Orchards Ltd

Proposal: (AMENDED DESCRIPTION) Erection of refrigerated apple storage unit and use of existing and proposed buildings for the storage and distribution of produce grown by Hill Farm Orchards and other English grown produce

Location: Hill Farm Orchards Droxford Road Swanmore Hampshire

Officer PER

Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

APPROVE SUBJECT TO:

A Section 106 Agreement for the restriction of the use of the proposed and existing farm buildings for the storage and distribution of apples/produce from the holding of Hill Farm Orchards and its associated land only and for an additional 300 tonnes per calendar year of imported fruit, and the following conditions:

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 Prior to work commencing on the site a scheme of details of the colour and finishes of all external surfaces of the building hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved within one month of the external surfaces being constructed and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development presents a satisfactory appearance in the interests of the amenities of the area.

3 No development shall take place until details of both hard and soft landscape works and existing tree and hedgerow protection have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved within the first planting season of the substantial completion of the development or as otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include the following, as relevant:

- means of enclosure, including hedgerow planting:
- other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas:
- hard surfacing areas and hard surfacing materials:
- Landscape areas.

Soft landscape details shall include the following as relevant:

- retention of existing trees and hedgerows
- 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:
- schedule of plants for the re-inforcement of the existing hedgerow and new hedgerow planting:
- manner and treatment of watercourses, ditches and banks:
- implementation programme.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the countryside here and the rural character of the AONB.

4 No floodlighting, either affixed to the building or freestanding, shall be erected on the site at any time without the written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The site is located along a rural lane in the AONB and the use of floodlighting would undermine the rural character of the locality.

5 Detailed proposals for the disposal of foul and surface water from the building and hardstanding shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the commencement of the development hereby permitted. The approved details shall be fully implemented before the development is first brought into use.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory provision of foul and surface water drainage.

6 No machinery shall be operated, no process shall be carried out and no deliveries taken at or dispatched from the site except between the hours of 0730 and 1900 Monday to Saturday and 0800 and 1800 on Sundays and Bank Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties.

7 No outside industrial processes or working or storage of materials, vehicles, machinery or equipment (other than the storage of pallets related to the horticultural activities of the holding) shall be undertaken on the site at any time unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of local amenities.

8 The storage of pallets on the site shall only occur adjacent to the south-west side elevation of the building hereby approved in an area marked out on the approved landscape plan for the site and shall not be stacked to a height greater than the eaves level of the building hereby approved. Should existing farm building become redundant for other purposes then the storage of the pallets shall be transferred to those buildings.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the locality.

9 No additional floorspace (including the installation of mezzanine floors) shall be created within the development hereby approved unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highways safety and local amenity.

10 If the building hereby approved becomes redundant for agricultural or horticultural purposes associated with the holding then the building shall be dismantled or demolished and all resultant material removed from the site.

Reason: In the interests of the rural amenities of the locality.

11 The existing trees and hedgerow along the north-east boundary shall not be lopped, topped, felled or uprooted without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. These trees shall be protected during building operations by the erection of fencing at least 6 metres from the tree trunks in accordance with BS 5837.

Reason: To retain and protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the area.

12 Details of the air conditioning and ventilation of the building (including noise levels) shall be submitted to and approved in writing prior to the commencement of work on the site. No air conditioning or ventilation shall be installed other than in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining residential properties.

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: C1, C2, E6, E7, E8
Adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: CE13

Item	Winchester Town	Ward	St Bartholomew
6	Conservation Area:		
	Case No:	08/00626/FUL	
	Ref No:	W12961/04	
	Date Valid:	11 March 2008	
	Grid Ref:	448204 130128	
	Team:	WEST	Case Officer: Miss Megan Birkett
	Applicant:	Mr Abd Mrs Duxbury	
	Proposal:	First Floor and two storey rear extension (RESUBMISSION)	
	Location:	20 King Alfred Place Winchester Hampshire SO23 7DF	
	Officer	PER	
	Recommendation:		

Committee Decision:
APPROVE.

Conditions to be delegated to the Head of Planning Control in consultation with the Chairman.

Item **Winchester Town** **Ward** **St Barnabas**

7 **Conservation**

Area:

Case No: 08/00478/FUL

Ref No: W21043

Date Valid: 21 February 2008

Grid Ref: 446618 130979

Team: EAST **Case Officer:** Mrs Julie Pinnock

Applicant: Mr Allen Smith

Proposal: Erection of 4 no. bin store compounds on land to the rear of Trussell Crescent

Location: Street Record Trussell Crescent Winchester Hampshire

Officer PER

Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

APPROVE 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 Before the bin stores are brought into use the timber fencing shall be stained using a finish to first be agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenity 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:-

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP.3

Item **Winchester Town** **Ward** **St Bartholomew**

8 **Conservation**

Area:

Case No: 08/00485/FUL

Ref No: W18845/01

Date Valid: 25 February 2008

Grid Ref: 448297 129971

Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Mrs Jane Rarok

Applicant: The Colour Factory

Proposal: 1 no. single storey detached workshop

Location: The Lodge 1 Gordon Road Winchester Hampshire SO23
7DD

Officer PER

Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

APPROVE 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).

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: None

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006:DP3, E1, SF1, SF6, CE4