

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE****3 June 2008****Attendance:****Councillors:**

Huxstep (Vice Chairman in the Chair) (P)

Barratt (P)  
Baxter (P)  
Busher (P)  
Fall  
JeffsJohnston (P)  
Lipscomb  
Pearce (P)  
Ruffell (P)  
Tait (P)**Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:**

Councillor Biggs

**Officers in Attendance:**Mr J Hearn - Team Manager (DC East)  
Mr N Fisher – Planning Officer  
Mrs P Horsler – Planning Solicitor

---

**1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Jeffs.

**2. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT**

The Sub-Committee met at the Sports Pavilion, West Meon Village Hall where the Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately 18 local residents together with the applicant. Members of the Sub Committee had been given the opportunity to informally view the application site and a neighbouring property most affected immediately prior to the meeting.

**3. BOLT HOUSE, LOVE LANE, WEST MEON, PETERSFIELD – CASE NUMBER: 08/00404/FUL**

Mr R Stone spoke against the application and Mrs Fowler, applicant, spoke in support.

Councillor Biggs addressed the Committee as the Ward Member. In summary, she stated that she had already addressed the Committee at its meeting on 22 May 2008. She added that the application site was situated in an attractive corner of West Meon and the proposed roof light windows and raised roofline would affect the enjoyment of the occupier of the neighbouring property, Love Lane Cottage. Even though the original proposal had been modified, it would still be imposing, affecting the enjoyment of the cottage and its garden. In addition the amenity of those using the two public rights of way would be affected, both that adjacent to the application site

and also right of way to Warnford, where the broad mass of the roof would be a visual impact on long distance views to the detriment of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposals would represent a poor precedent and unique villages such as West Meon should be protected from such development.

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height of the proposal would have an impact upon the properties to the north and that the previous dormer windows had been replaced by roof light windows and it was considered that the planned extension no longer overlooked the footpath or the adjoining properties to the north.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.

The applicants, Dr and Mrs Fowler had submitted additional written representation, which formed the basis of Mrs Fowler's statement to the Sub Committee in the public participation part of the meeting, a copy of which was held on the application case file and was on the update sheet circulated at the meeting.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed that the application be refused for the reasons set out in the resolution below.

**RESOLVED:**

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development is contrary to DP3 (vii) of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that it will appear overbearing and will exacerbate the perception of overlooking of Love Lane Cottage and its private garden area and will adversely affect the residential amenity of its occupants.
2. The proposed development is contrary to DP3 (ii) in that its design and scale does not respond positively to the character, appearance and variety of the local environment when viewed from the public realm.

The meeting commenced at 11.00am and concluded at 11.50am.

Chairman