

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

12 June 2008

Attendance:

Councillors:

Jeffer (Chairman) (P)

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

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

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors: Beckett, Higgins, Howell, Gemmell, Love, Mitchell and Worrell.

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Berry

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 22 May 2008 be approved and adopted.

2. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SCHEDULE**

(Report [PDC749](#) 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 Lipscomb declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Items 5 and 6 as he was acquainted with a neighbour to the application site who lived at "Ashlyn" and he spoke and voted thereon. Councillor Lipscomb also declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Items 2 and 12 as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust, who had commented on these applications, but he had taken no part in that process and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Huxstep declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Item 1 as he was acquainted with a number of those involved in application and he spoke and voted thereon.

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

Item 1: St Aubyns, Bull Lane, Waltham Chase, Case Number 08/00800/FUL

Mr D Findley and Mr A Cox (representing Shedfield Parish Council) spoke against the application and Mr Pearce and Mr Moody (Agent) spoke in support. Councillor Gemmell spoke on this item as a Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Gemmell stated that there had been 72 letters of objections to the scheme and she also commended the Waltham Chase Community Statement, prepared by Lorrie Smith, to the Committee. If the scheme went ahead it would represent an 89 per cent increase in development in Bull Lane within the last 12 months, which included Lawsonia. This site was not well served by buses, which ceased at 7pm, and the site therefore required access by car. On-site parking was an additional concern, with no parking spaces indicated for St Aubyns itself even though the existing garage was proposed to be demolished. The traffic generated would find problems feeding into Bull Lane due to the speed of traffic. The character of the Lane was one of houses spread apart, giving a rural feel, and this development would make it much too tight. The development would affect the light and amenity of the neighbouring property named Samarinda. The bat and ornithological survey was not complete and a newt survey was being undertaken. An environmental survey and contamination survey was also required. Surface water drainage was also an additional concern – it was felt a solution should be submitted before planning permission was granted. The payment of money in lieu of on-site open space was not a satisfactory solution.

In response, the Head of Planning Control reported that the ecological survey was to the satisfaction of Hampshire Ecology and was also covered by condition 20. Affordable housing would be covered in part by a financial contribution with two small units also being provided on site. In respect of drainage, the applicant would be required to submit a plan to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority to deal with on site drainage, which could include a strategy for water retention to slow water flow and to stop flooding within the new development and on neighbouring areas.

The inclusion of a condition regarding contaminated land represented a precautionary approach. The building fronting Bull Lane had been redesigned following comments at the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub Committee held on 22 February 2008 to increase the gap between St Aubyns and the proposed building to 1.8 metres and, furthermore, internal rooms would be redesigned within the existing bungalow so that their orientation was to the front and rear, which reduced the number of habitable rooms facing the new building.

The Head of Planning Control also requested the Committee to accept an additional Informative to control working hours for demolition and construction.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to not support the application and to refuse permission for the reasons as set out in the Schedule which forms Appendix 1 to the Report, as the application was contrary to policy DP 3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that the proposed units (plots 9-11) to the front of the site would represent a cramped form of development detrimental to the character of the street scene of Bull Lane and that, based on the evidence submitted, the Local Planning Authority was not satisfied that the surface water drainage issues arising from the development of the site for 11 dwellings could be satisfactorily addressed.

Item 2: The Chimneys, 1 Burnett Close, Winchester – Case Number: 08/00279/FUL

Mr Wareham spoke against the application and Mr McFarland (agent) spoke in support. Ward Councillors Mitchell and Worrell also spoke on this item.

In summary, Council Mitchell stated that the inclusion of 3 Burnett Close within the application site was the only change between the previous application and the current application. He asked if the additional landscape strip now achieved by the inclusion of a 3 metre strip obtained from land within the previous ownership of 3 Burnett Close within the application site, allowed an acceptable landscape scheme. The inclusion of the additional property and its change from residential to commercial use reduced the attractiveness of Burnett Close.

He continued that the loading arrangements for 55ft delivery lorries were unsatisfactory. There was conflict between customers and delivery vehicles having to reverse within the car park to unload, which required a member of staff to supervise vehicle manoeuvring. In addition, the single point of entry to the site for both customer vehicles and delivery lorries was unsatisfactory (compared to the proposed Waitrose store next door which had separate customer and delivery vehicle points of access) and Hampshire County Council highways should address this. The provision of 53 car-parking spaces was too few and people would not walk to the store but would park on nearby streets. In addition, conditions 5 and 26 detailing delivery times had good intentions but did not acknowledge the heavy traffic flows in the area at the times proposed and this again required reconsideration.

In summary, Council Worrall commented on the planning history of the application and added that the arrangements for delivery vehicles, customers' cars and pedestrians was unsatisfactory and the proposals represented too much development for one site. The additional traffic and possibility of car parking outside the application site was unacceptable. There had been 460 objections to the proposals and only 4 in support. The applicant had undertaken little consultation with neighbours and had exercised poor operational management in a number of its stores.

In answer to Members' questions, the Head of Planning Control stated that the landscape element of the scheme had now been increased from 12 per cent to 29 per cent of the total site area and he highlighted the differences between the previous and current applications in terms of landscaping. The concern over delivery times for vehicles could be reconsidered in consultation with the applicant by imposing a condition restricting deliveries to appropriate times. It was confirmed that the applicant would have an employee available to assist delivery vehicles with their manoeuvring within the car park. The loss of 2 Burnett Close from residential to commercial use was not contrary to any planning policy. Advertising signs would be subject to an additional separate application, with the Local Planning Authority retaining control. A condition could be included that no cabinets and shelves be placed against the glazed areas on the ground and first floors of the building in order to create and maintain an active frontage of the building when viewed from the public footpath.

The Head of Planning Control added that the previous reason for refusal on highway grounds could potentially be removed as the applicant was in the process of agreeing to enter into a Highways Legal Agreement with the County Council and any permission granted would not be issued before the satisfactory completion of such an agreement to the satisfaction of the County Council. This included a contribution of £15,000 to monitor the car-parking situation on surrounding streets, with the possibility that yellow lines or dragon's teeth could be introduced to halt indiscriminate

parking. A condition could also be included for the applicant to provide a strategy on how the store would manage shopping trolleys, which could include a coin-operated system. In addition, a condition could be included so that no additional structure was placed in the hard landscaping area without the written consent of the local planning authority in order to maintain the appearance and cleanliness of the site.

The Head of Planning Control also drew the Committee's attention to the Update sheet, which explained that the number of representations as stated in the Report at 830 was incorrect and should read 460. In addition, additional conditions were recommended to secure the retention and future maintenance of the footpath to the south-west boundary of the site (additional condition number 28) and a further additional condition that the site be used only for retail sale of food and convenience items and that the warehouse area shall be retained as such and not be used for retail sales – full details of which are held on the application file.

Following debate, the Committee agreed not to support the officers' recommendation to grant planning permission and agreed to refuse the application, for reasons 1 and 2 set out on page 25 of the Report in respect of the application ref no W04183/20, refused by the Committee on 13 September 2007. However if the applicants signed a Section 106 Agreement or Undertaking which satisfies the County Council in relation to reason 2, the officers be given delegated power to withdraw this reason in any appeal proceedings. In addition, a further reason for refusal be included based on the Committee's concern over safety issues within the car park due to the potential conflict between customers, their vehicles and delivery vehicles, the detailed wording to be delegated to the Head of Planning Control in consultation with the Chairman.

Item 3: Triangle of land, Junction of Lockhams Road and Chapel Lane, Curdridge – Case Number: 08/00166/FUL

Mr R Kemp and Mrs A West spoke against the application. Mr I Donoghue (Planning Agent) spoke against the application on behalf of Curdridge Parish Council. Mr J Heppell (Planning Agent) spoke in support.

The Head of Planning Control explained that since the Report was prepared, an error had been identified in that it referred to the consultation response from Hampshire County Council ecology, but should have referred to Natural England. Natural England's advice had been received following the bat survey and it concluded that the proposed site was not near any Site of Special Scientific Interest and they had not been made aware of any protected species on the site. There were therefore no objections to this application. In addition, a letter had been received from Mark Oaten MP requesting a site visit by Council officers to be made prior to the Committee meeting. It was confirmed this had been done.

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 comments by the Head of Strategic Planning that the proposals did not comply with Criteria 1, 2 and 6 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance Implementation of Infilling Policy and to observe the size and location of the plot in relation to its surroundings and to assess highways considerations. The site visit would take place on Monday 23 June at 9:30am on site followed by a public meeting at 11am at a local venue.

Item 4: Overway, Fontley Road, Titchfield – Case Number: 08/00130/FUL

Mr Walji (applicant) and Mrs J Hollis, Chair of Wickham Parish Council spoke in support of the application.

Following debate, the Committee agreed not to support the officers' recommendation to refuse permission and agreed to grant planning permission.

The reasons for granting planning permission were that the community centre/place of worship could not be located in a site within the built up area and that it met a wider community need, for which there were no better alternative sites available - it was a modest building in itself and the development would enhance the appearance of the site and would represent an improvement in landscaping terms compared to its existing condition and the possible implementation of a recent planning permission for an industrial building of a similar size and in the same location as that proposed. The Committee also acknowledged the Highway Engineer's comments that the proposed development could result in reduced traffic generation compared to the current permitted use for business purposes. Authority was also delegated to the Head of Planning Control in consultation with the Chairman to impose appropriate conditions, including those to restrict use as a community centre/place of worship and to produce a travel plan.

Item 5: Old Orchard, Compton Street, Compton – Case Number: 07/01591/LBC

Following consideration of item 6, which considered the planning application in relation to the site (Case Number: 08/00029/FUL refers), the Committee agreed to refer determination of this item to the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub Committee at its meeting to take place on Monday 23 June 2008 at 3:30pm at the Guildhall, Winchester.

Item 6: Old Orchard, Compton Street, Compton – Case Number: 08/00029/FUL

Dr Ashcroft and Mr A Walmsley (Compton and Shawford Parish Council) spoke against the application. Mr S Masker and Mr C Bradshaw spoke in support. Councillor Beckett spoke as a Ward Member.

Councillor Beckett stated in summary that Councillor Bell, who was also a Ward Member, had submitted written representation in respect of this application, a copy of which was held on the application file. Councillor Beckett continued that the neighbouring property to Old Orchard (named Martin's Close) was also in the same ownership as the applicant. Within the application for Old Orchard and in the previously approved application for Martin's Close was a triangular piece of land, which had been included within both applications. Clarification was required as to which application this triangular piece of land was included within. Reference was also made to comments by the Council's Arboricultural Officer on 4 December 2007 regarding policy CE 12 and loss of fruit trees and their related habitat, which had now been withdrawn. The application did not enhance or preserve the Conservation Area, as it was not linear, being set back from existing development. It did not preserve hedges and overshadowed neighbouring properties. There were objections from the Parish Council and the Hampshire Garden Trust and others to the application, including 53 neighbours.

The Head of Environment explained that the original comment by the Arboricultural Officer related to impending European legislation regarding the protection of orchards and their habitat, but this legislation had not yet been implemented and could not

therefore be sustained at appeal, leading to its withdrawal. In addition, the Head of Planning Control explained that the triangle of land referred to in Councillor Beckett's presentation was indeed shown in both application sites and could legitimately be included within this application, but its inclusion in Old Orchard would more affect the development at Martin's Close. The Head of Cultural Services continued that the guidance on Conservation Areas was that development should preserve or enhance, and this application would preserve the Conservation Area.

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 relationship with the listed buildings at Yew Tree Cottage and Compton End and also with surrounding trees and the Conservation Area; clarification of the status of the triangular piece of land included within the application for Old Orchard and also within the approved planning permission at Martin's Close and to have the plots marked out on site (including height) to assess the relationship with surrounding properties and how visible they would be in the Conservation Area. The Head of Planning Control would also confirm if a contribution towards the Open Space Fund had been paid. The site visit would take place on Monday 23 June at 2.00pm on site followed by a public meeting at 3.30pm at the Guildhall, Winchester.

Item 7: Clelands, Churchill Close, Kings Worthy – Case Number: 08/00439/FUL

Mrs Perkins and Hampshire County Councillor Porter spoke against the application. Councillor Howell spoke on this item as a Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Howell stated that Churchill Close and the roads leading to it were narrow with sharp bends, which led to access problems. There were issues of car parking on Churchill Close and also on nearby Edinburgh Road, with cars parked across dropped kerbs adjoining disabled parking bays blocking access for wheelchair users near to the proposed site entrance. He suggested that a condition be included to limit the number of vehicles that could access Churchill Close at any one time. There were also potential access issues with contractor vehicles. He also made additional points relating to the historic landfill of the site and that there may be contamination on site.

In response, the Head of Planning Control stated that the environmental health condition (Condition 2) would deal with the finding of any contamination on site and that access to Churchill Close could not be limited by condition.

The Head of Planning Control drew the attention of the Committee to the update sheet, which listed the outcome of consultation with the Council's Landscape Section, as detailed on the application file.

An amendment to Condition 9, which related to hard and soft landscape works, was proposed as detailed on the application file. An additional condition 17 was also proposed that no development, or works of site preparation or clearance, shall take place until details, including plans and cross-sections of the existing and proposed ground levels of the development and the boundaries of the site and the height of the ground floor slab and damp-proof course in relation thereto, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority - Reason: To ensure a satisfactory relationship between the new development and adjacent buildings, amenity areas and trees.

An additional condition was also suggested to require a contractors' compound on site for the parking of contractors' vehicles and materials during the construction period.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse planning permission for the reasons relating to DP3(ii) of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that in terms of its form and layout the proposals did not respond positively to the character, appearance and variety with the surrounding area, with detailed wording to be delegated to the Head of Planning Control in consultation with the Chairman.

Item 8: Barnaby, Northbrook Avenue, Winchester – Case Number: 08/00766/LBC

Mrs Jones spoke against the application and Mr J Gardiner (Planning Agent) spoke in support. Councillor Higgins spoke as a Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Higgins stated that the application to demolish the existing dwelling should be considered against policy HE7 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review and the St Giles Hill Neighbourhood Design Statement. There were a number of other 1950s houses within Northbrook Avenue and it was typical of the style from that era. Northbrook Avenue also included infill properties of various ages commencing from the 1930s. This would be the first property to be demolished in the Conservation Area, which could set a precedent.

The Head of Planning Control reported that since the report was prepared an additional letter of objection had been received from Ward Councillor Hicks who objected to the scheme on the grounds that the proposal was contrary to policy HE7 and that demolition would lead to a precedent within the Conservation Area. In addition, 6 additional letters of objection had been received which raised additional points that the building was present before the area was designated as a Conservation Area; that there were no exceptional circumstances to allow demolition and redevelopment and that the building made a positive contribution to the area and therefore a marketing exercise in an attempt to sell property for refurbishment and re-use should have taken place prior to the application being submitted.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission, subject to the conditions set out in the Report.

Item 10: Shedding Oaks Farm, Ham Green, Sparsholt, Winchester – Case Number: 08/00759/FUL

Mrs Hambidge spoke against the application.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the Report.

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

Item 9: Shedding Oaks Farm, Ham Green, Sparsholt, Winchester – Case Number: 07/02379/FUL

The Committee agreed to revoke the Section 106 Agreement for the reasons set out in the Report.

Item 11: Pitcot House – Pitcot Lane, Owlesbury, Winchester - Case Number: 08/00839/FUL

The Head of Planning Control confirmed that this was an officer application and had been processed in the normal manner.

The Committee agreed to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the Report.

Item 12: 86 Hyde Street, Winchester – Case Number: 08/00780/LIS

The Head of Planning Control confirmed that this was a Member application and had been processed in the normal manner.

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. That in respect of item 1. planning permission be refused as the application was contrary to policy DP 3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that the proposed units (plots 9-11) to the front of the site would represent a cramped form of development detrimental to the character of the street scene of Bull Lane and that, based on the evidence submitted, the Local Planning Authority was not satisfied that the drainage issues arising from the development of the site for 11 dwellings could be satisfactorily addressed.

3. That in respect of item 2, planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

(a) Reasons 1 and 2 set out on page 25 of the Report in respect of the application ref no W04183/20, refused by the Committee on 13 September 2007 (however if the applicants signed a Section 106 Agreement or Undertaking which satisfies the County Council in relation to reason 2, the officers be given delegated power to withdraw this reason in any appeal proceedings).

(b) A further reason for refusal be included based on the Committee's concern over safety issues within the car park due to the potential conflict between customers, their vehicles and delivery vehicles, the detailed wording to be delegated to the Head of Planning Control in consultation with the Chairman.

4. That items 3, 5 and 6 be determined at a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub Committee to be held on Monday 23 June 2008.

5. That in respect of item 4, planning permission be granted for the reasons that:

(a) The community centre/place of worship could not be located in a site within the built up area and that it met a wider community need, for which there were no better alternative sites available - it was a modest building in

itself and the development would enhance the appearance of the site and would represent an improvement in landscaping terms compared to its existing condition and the possible implementation of a recent planning permission for an industrial building of a similar size and in the same location as that proposed.

(b) That the Highway Engineer's comments that the proposed development could result in reduced traffic generation compared to the current permitted use for business purposes be acknowledged.

(c) That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Control in consultation with the Chairman to impose appropriate conditions, including those to restrict use as a community centre/place of worship and to produce a travel plan.

6. That in respect of item 7, planning permission be refused for the reasons relating to DP3(ii) of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that in terms of its form and layout the proposals did not respond positively to the character, appearance and variety with the surrounding area, with detailed wording to be delegated to the Head of Planning Control in consultation with the Chairman.

3. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 1910 (AS AMENDED) – LINKS ROAD AND WALNUT GROVE, WINCHESTER**
(Report [PDC751](#) refers)

Councillor Barratt declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item as she was acquainted with the objector, Mrs Moss, and she spoke and voted thereon.

In the public participation part of the meeting, Mrs Moss spoke in objection to the Tree Preservation Order in respect of the maple tree designated as T4 within Order 1910.

Councillor Love spoke on this item as a Ward Member. In summary he stated by that tree T4 should not have been included in the original Tree Preservation Order from the early 1970s as it was only planted in the early 1980s. The tree was not uniquely special and provided a dark and gloomy living amenity for Mr and Mrs Moss at 2 Links Road. It also affected drainage and neighbouring electrical installations.

In answer to Members' questions, the Head of Environment stated that tree T4 provided public benefit and could be managed by means of crown reduction. Technical guidance was also available to reduce the impact on drainage and electrical installations by means of preventative management.

Following debate, the Committee supported the removal of the maple T4 from the Tree Preservation Order 1910 and amended in the Order accordingly.

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 1910 (as amended), land at Links Road and Walnut Grove, Winchester, be confirmed subject to the deletion of the maple (T4).

4. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 1912 (AS AMENDED) – FISH HOUSE, KYTES LANE, DURLEY**
(Report [PDC752](#) refers)

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 1912, land at Fish House, Kytes Lane, Durley, be confirmed, subject to modification (deletion of T1), as set out in the Report.

5. **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB COMMITTEE – 7 MAY 2008**
(Report [PDC748](#) refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub Committee held on 7 May 2008 at Highcroft, Romsey Road, Winchester (attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub Committee held on 7 May 2008 be received.

6. **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB COMMITTEE – 3 JUNE 2008**
(Report [PDC750](#) refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub Committee held on 3 June 2008 at Bolt House, Love Lane, West Meon (attached as Appendix B to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub Committee held on 3 June 2008 be received.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned for lunch at 13.30pm, recommenced at 2.15pm and concluded at 7.45pm.

Chairman

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE : DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MEETING

RESOLUTIONS

12.06.2008

PART II DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS
AND RESOLUTIONS THEREON

Shedfield **Ward** **Shedfield**

01 Conservation Area:

Case No: 08/00800/FUL

Ref No: W07604/03

Date Valid: 28 March 2008

Grid Ref: 456095 114965

Team: WEST

Case Officer: Mr James Jenkison

Applicant: Heritage Property Group

Proposal: Erection of 11 no. dwellings with associated garaging and car parking, landscaping and new access from Bull Lane to include land at Fairlawn and Cherry Trees (RESUBMISSION)

Location: St Aubyns Bull Lane Waltham Chase Southampton Hampshire SO32 2LS

Officer REF

Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

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

Conditions/Reasons

1 The application is contrary to Policy DP.3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that the proposed dwelling on plot 11 at the front of the site would:

i) represent a cramped form of development detrimental to the character of the streetscene of Bull Lane

ii) have a materially harmful impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of the dwellings at St. Aubyns and Samarinda in terms of loss of light to and outlook from these properties.

2 The proposal is contrary to Policy RT.4 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 in that it fails to make adequate provision for public recreational space to the required standard, and would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the area and would undermine the plan's policies for recreational open space provision with the District.

3 The proposal is contrary to Policy H.5 in the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 in that it fails to make adequate provision for affordable housing and would therefore be detrimental to the needs of local people in the Housing Monitoring Report and Housing Needs Survey.

4 The proposal is considered to be contrary to policies DP1 and DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the local planning authority, that the development is capable of being adequately drained of surface water and therefore that it would not increase run-off from the site and add to the risk of flooding in the locality.

Informatives :

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: DP1, DP3, DP4, DP6, H3, H5, H7, RT4, T3, T4, T5

Winchester Town

Ward

St Barnabas

02

Conservation Area:

Case No: 08/00279/FUL

Ref No: W04183/21

Date Valid: 13 February 2008

Grid Ref: 446501 130815

Team: EAST

Case Officer: Mr Dave Dimon

Applicant: Mr Richard Williams

Proposal: Erection of single and part two-storey building to provide food store (Class A1), alterations to access, car park and landscaping (Site also includes No:2 and part of no. 3 Burnetts Close) (RESUBMISSION)

Location: The Chimneys 1 Burnett Close Winchester Hampshire

Officer PER

Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

That planning permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

Conditions/Reasons

1 The Proposal is contrary to policies DP3 and DP5 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that the development would constitute an undesirable over-intensive use of the site. Having regard to the amount of built development and hard surfacing area proposed, which would not achieve an effective setting and spatial arrangement to interface acceptably with the adjacent residential development, the proposal is out of keeping with the suburban area, significantly and unacceptable extending the visual of the commercial/retail activities into the adjacent residential area, to the detriment of its visual amenities and character.

2 The Proposal would have an adverse impact in highways terms in regard to cross town traffic impact, sustainable transport considerations, the need for off site highway improvements, servicing management and traffic management provisions, which would be contrary to the objectives of the Winchester Town Access Plan, and for which no mitigating provisions have been made.

3 It has not been demonstrated that the arrangement for servicing within the site can be considered to be safe or satisfactory in that the space necessary for manoeuvring of large delivery vehicles could conflict directly with the operation and safety of other vehicles using the car park and particularly pedestrians moving between the store and the car park.

(NB above reasons to be verified by Head Of Planning Control and Chair of Planning Development Committee).

	Curdrige	Ward	Owslebury And Curdrige
03	Conservation Area:		
	Case No:	08/00166/FUL	
	Ref No:	W03881/01	
	Date Valid:	28 January 2008	
	Grid Ref:	453405 113598	
	Team:	WEST	Case Officer: Miss Megan Birkett
	Applicant:	Mr C Collins	
	Proposal:	2 no. two bed and 1 no. three bed dwelling with vehicular access from Lockhams Road and Chapel Lane (AMENDED DESCRIPTION)	
	Location:	Triangle Of Land Junction Of Lockhams Road And Chapel Lane Curdrige Hampshire	
	Officer	PER	
	Recommendation:		
	Committee Decision:		
	Deferred for Site Visit		

	Wickham	Ward	Wickham
04	Conservation Area:		
	Case No:	08/00130/FUL	
	Ref No:	W15067/04	
	Date Valid:	25 January 2008	
	Grid Ref:	455119 108773	
	Team:	WEST	Case Officer: Mr Dave Dimon
	Applicant:	Wessex Shia Ithna Asheri Jamaat	
	Proposal:	Community centre/place of worship (use class D1- non-residential institutions)	
	Location:	Overway Fontley Road Titchfield Fareham Hampshire PO15 6QR	
	Officer	REF	
	Recommendation:		

Committee Decision:

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

Compton And Shawford

Ward

Compton And Otterbourne

05 **Conservation Area:** Compton Street Conservation Area
Case No: 07/01591/LBC
Ref No: W14013/04LBCA
Date Valid: 22 June 2007
Grid Ref: 446314 125942
Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Mrs Jane Rarok
Applicant: Mr And Mrs Bradshaw
Proposal: Demolition of dwelling and outbuildings
Location: Old Orchard Compton Street Compton Winchester Hampshire
SO21 2AT
Officer PER
Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

Deferred for Site Visit

Compton And Shawford

Ward

Compton And Otterbourne

06 **Conservation Area:** Compton Street Conservation Area
Case No: 08/00029/FUL
Ref No: W14013/05
Date Valid: 7 January 2008
Grid Ref: 446314 125942
Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Mrs Jane Rarok
Applicant: Mr And Mrs C Bradshaw
Proposal: (AMENDED PLANS) Demolition of existing dwelling and
outbuildings; erection of 1 no. detached six bed dwelling and 1 no.
detached seven bed dwelling; landscaping and associated works
and access
Location: Old Orchard Compton Street Compton Winchester Hampshire
SO21 2AT
Officer PER
Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

Deferred for a Site Visit

Kings Worthy

Ward

Kings Worthy

07

Conservation Area:

Case No: 08/00439/FUL

Ref No: W13975/06

Date Valid: 6 March 2008

Grid Ref: 448915 134177

Team: EAST

Case Officer: Mr Tom Patchell

Applicant: Mrs Vivienne White

Proposal: 6 no. two bed, 4 no. three bed and 2 no. four bed challet bungalows to replace existing dwellings at Clelands and Gambut

Location: Clelands Churchill Close Kings Worthy Winchester Hampshire SO23 7PD

Officer REF

Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

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

Conditions/Reasons

1 The proposed development does not respond positively to the character and appearance of the local environment in terms of building form and layout and is therefore contrary to policy DP3 (ii) of the Winchester District Local Plan (Review).

2 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 there for be detrimental to the amenities of the area.

(NB Above reasons to be verified by Head of Planning Control and Chair of Planning Development Committee)

Winchester Town

Ward

St John And All Saints

08

Conservation Area:

Case No: 08/00766/LBC

Ref No: W05590/10

Date Valid: 28 March 2008

Grid Ref: 449104 129239

Team: EAST

Case Officer: Mr Nick Fisher

Applicant: Millgate(winchester)ltd

Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling

Location: Barnaby Northbrook Avenue Winchester Hampshire SO23 0JW

Officer: PER

Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

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 demolition hereby permitted shall not be undertaken before a contract for the carrying out of the works of redevelopment of the site has been made and planning permission has been granted for the redevelopment for which the contract provides (and the redevelopment shall be commenced within 1 month following the completion of the demolition).

Reason: To prevent the premature demolition of the building and the creation of a "gap site" which will be prejudicial to the amenities of the Conservation Area and to accord with paragraph 4.29 of PPG15.

Informatives

1. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-
Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP1, DP3, HE7.

2. 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.

3. The consent hereby granted does not confer consent to demolish any of the boundary walls to the site.

Sparsholt Ward Sparsholt

09 Conservation Area:
Case No: 07/02379/FUL
Ref No: W01486/05
Date Valid: 5 October 2007
Grid Ref: 443294 130484
Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Mr James Jenkison
Applicant: Mrs Joyce Payne
Proposal: Revocation of a Section 106 Agreement
Location: Shedding Oaks Farm Ham Green Sparsholt Winchester Hampshire
SO21 2PA
Officer TERMIN
Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

The proposal is PERMITTED.

Informatives

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

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: RT16

Sparsholt Ward Sparsholt

10 Conservation Area:
Case No: 08/00759/FUL
Ref No: W06367/06
Date Valid: 28 March 2008
Grid Ref: 443294 130484
Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Mr James Jenkison
Applicant: Mrs Joyce Payne
Proposal: Extensions and alterations to a farm building with tourist
accommodation in the loft and change of use to allow the entire
building as extended for holiday accommodation (AMENDED
DESCRIPTION)
Location: Shedding Oaks Farm Ham Green Sparsholt Winchester Hampshire
SO21 2PA
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 The holiday accommodation unit hereby permitted shall be used for holiday accommodation only which shall be limited to one occupier occupying the unit for a maximum period of 4 weeks and for no more than 3 times per year, with a break between each occupation, by the same occupier, of 4 weeks. A register of the names of the occupiers of the unit and their arrival and departure dates shall be kept by the developer and shall be produced to the Local Planning upon reasonable notice.

NB: The term one occupier refers to a person or group of persons which does not consist of any person occupying the unit previously or subsequently within a period of 4 weeks.

Reason: To accord with the terms of the application since the site lies within an area where residential properties would not normally be permitted.

3 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the alterations and extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

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

4 Prior to the unit of holiday accommodation hereby approved being brought into use, the roof light in the north side elevation shall be replaced with an obscure glaze rooflight and fixed shut. The obscure glazed rooflight shall be retained thereafter in a fixed shut position.

Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining 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:-
Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: RT16, DP3

3. All works including demolition and construction should only be carried out between the hours of 0800 and 1800hrs Monday to Friday and 0800 and 1300hrs Saturday and at no time on Sundays or recognised public holidays. Where allegations of noise from such works are substantiated by the Health and Housing Service, 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 the Health and Housing Service substantiate allegations of statutory nuisance, an Abatement Notice may be served under The Environmental Protection Act 1990. The applicant is reminded that the emission of dark smoke through burning of materials is a direct offence under The Clean Air Act 1993.

Owslebury Ward Owslebury And Curdrige

11

Conservation Area:

Case No: 08/00839/FUL
Ref No: W05585/05
Date Valid: 26 March 2008
Grid Ref: 451559 123415
Team: EAST **Case Officer:** Mr Nick Fisher
Applicant: Mr Jeremy Pride
Proposal: Detached double garage (RESUBMISSION)
Location: Pitcot House Pitcot Lane Owslebury Winchester Hampshire SO21
 1LR
Officer PER
Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

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 garage hereby permitted shall only be used for the purpose of accommodating private motor vehicles or other ancillary domestic storage purposes, and shall not, at any time, be used for living accommodation, business, commercial or industrial purposes.

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

3 The proposed revised landscaping works as shown on plan Revision A dated 21/05/08 shall be carried out in the first planting season following the occupation of the building or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. If within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, any trees, shrubs or plants die, are removed or, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or defective, others of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, in the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

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

Informatives

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

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP1, DP3, DP4, CE5

2. 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.

Winchester Town

Ward

St Bartholomew

12 **Conservation Area:** Winchester Conservation Area
Case No: 08/00780/LIS
Ref No: W09756/15LB
Date Valid: 16 April 2008
Grid Ref: 448064 129888
Team: WEST **Case Officer:** Claire Burriss
Applicant: Mr James Maynard
Proposal: Replacement of 2 no. windows with single glazed units
Location: 86 Hyde Street Winchester Hampshire SO23 7DW
Officer PER
Recommendation:

Committee Decision:

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).

2 The replacement windows hereby approved shall be painted white externally and subsequently maintained in that condition.

Reason: To preserve the special interest of the listed building in accordance with Local Plan Policy HE.14 and PPG15.

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.1, DP.3, HE.14
