

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**14 June 2011****Attendance:**

Councillors :

Jeffs (Chairman) (P)

Berry (P)

Clear

Izard (P)

Laming

McLean (P)

Mitchell (P)

Pearce (P)

Read (P)

Ruffell (P)

Rutter (P)

Tait (P)

Officers in Attendance:

Mrs J Pinnock – Planning Management Manager

Mr N Parker – Principal Planning Officer

Ms F Sutherland – Planning and Information Solicitor

1. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT

The Sub-Committee met at Winchester Guildhall, where the Chairman welcomed to the meeting four members of the public along with representatives of the applicants.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS ETC

Councillor Pearce explained that he had been unable to attend the informal site visit for the application held prior to this meeting. However, he explained that he had visited the site earlier both from the road and neighbouring properties and was satisfied that he had sufficient knowledge and understanding of the site to determine the application. Therefore Councillor Pearce spoke and voted thereon with the agreement of the Sub-Committee.

Councillor McLean declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Item 1 as he was a member of Bishops Waltham Parish Council at the time that it had considered the proposal. However, he had not heard the officer's presentation at that time and he therefore spoke and voted thereon.

3. **DEVONIA, RARERIDGE LANE, BISHOPS WALTHAM – CASE NUMBER 11/00057/FUL**
[\(Report PDC898 Item 1 refers\)](#)

The above application had been referred to the Sub-Committee for determination by the Planning Development Control Committee, at its meeting held 26 May 2011. The Committee had agreed that it was unable to determine the application without first visiting the site, to assess whether the proposal would reflect the character of the area and to view the proposed access to, and egress from the site to Rareridge Lane.

Therefore, prior to this meeting, the Sub-Committee informally visited the site in the company of officers and representatives of the applicant (who facilitated access to the site). On site, the Sub-Committee noted:

- The proposed access to, and egress from the site to Rareridge Lane, adjacent to Devonia.
- The view of the site from Rareridge Lane and from neighbouring gardens.
- The Hazeldene development adjacent to the boundary with Jedburgh close to the site.

A full presentation had been given at the Planning Development Control Committee meeting on 26 May 2011, where the Committee had also heard public participation. Therefore, in accordance with procedure, the presentation at the Sub Committee was limited to a summary of the key issues and there was no repeat of the public participation period.

The Head of Planning Management drew attention to the update sheet, which was circulated at the meeting (copy on the application file). Since publication of Report PDC898, a noise assessment report had been submitted. This had concluded that impact of the noise associated with vehicle movements along the proposed access drive to the occupants of Devonia would be negligible. The Head of Environmental Protection had concurred with the methodology used in assessing the noise impact and of its conclusions. Therefore, it was recommended that reason for refusal 2 as set it in the Report be removed. This was noted.

The Head of Planning Management also advised that with regard to the applicant's 3D image of the site (as submitted as part of the application), plots 8 and 9 omitted to show the following items when compared to other plans submitted:

- Three windows omitted from the south east elevation of plot 8 at the ground and first floor levels.
- Dormer windows (serving an ensuite bathroom) omitted from south west elevation facing the adjacent property, Egmont.

Notwithstanding these omissions from these images, it was confirmed that the correct plans had been assessed in relation to neighbouring residential amenity and that the impact on residential amenity was acceptable.

The Head of Planning Management reminded the Sub Committee that the proposal as outlined in the Report proposed the erection of 5 no. two bedroom and 4 no. four bedroom dwellings, with associated parking, garages and bicycle sheds, and would encompass land from four existing back gardens. The existing house, Devonia would be retained as part of the scheme.

Reference was also made to the Planning Inspector's appeal report that upheld the decision to refuse planning permission for a previous development at the site. The Sub-Committee noted the main differences between the two proposals. In summary, the current scheme was for fewer dwellings (nine houses as opposed to twelve) which included the retention of Devonia, which was previously to have been demolished as part of the rejected proposal. The design of the latest scheme also meant that buildings would generally not face existing neighbours and would be a more spacious development overall, with larger gardens.

However, the Sub Committee was reminded that the latest application had not addressed the substantive reasons given by the Inspector to reject the original scheme - i.e. that the development did not integrate or respond positively to the character of the area and so was likely to cause it material harm. Therefore, the application was recommended for refusal.

During questions, the Sub-Committee referred to the existing higher density development at Hazeldene, which was located close to the development site. It was confirmed that the density of that development was approximately 30 dwellings per hectare, compared to 18 for the current application. The Head of Planning Management explained that, whilst both sites were within the development boundary (and so the principle of development was accepted), the scheme to the rear of Devonia was judged to be detrimental to the character of the area. It was explained that Hazeldene was seen to offer better 'synergy' with the higher density of the centre of Bishops Waltham located immediately to the west, by providing a gradual transition towards the east along Rareridge Lane, to more spacious plots and countryside.

The Head of Planning Management also acknowledged that the application would include two and four bedroom homes and that the Parish Council had expressed concern that it did not propose three bedroom dwellings, for which there was a demand within Bishops Waltham. However, whilst the Blueprint exercise may eventually reflect that need, the existing policies of the published Winchester District Local Plan were currently material and therefore the mix of dwellings proposed were acceptable.

It was also clarified that the Hampshire County Council Ecologist had assessed the site and had concluded that the impact of the development on ecology would not be enough to substantiate a reason for refusal. However, a

recommendation should be added to ensure the protection of existing species found at the site.

The Sub-Committee discussed the access and egress to the site. It was noted that, although the County Highways Officer had acknowledged that the driveway was narrow, it was still considered acceptable and that it would not have a negative impact on highway safety. Therefore, an objection to the application on highway grounds could not be sustained. It was explained that this route would be a shared surface and that there was no requirement for a pavement. Members were also reminded that the impact of the noise associated with vehicle movements along the proposed access drive had also been assessed, and was acceptable.

Further to a Member's request, it was explained that landscaping details along the driveway could be required by a condition, to ensure that it was appropriate and did not cause obstruction to the driveway. An arboricultural method statement would also ensure that construction would have regard to root protection zones for trees at the site, although it was likely that some thinning of branches would be required.

Prior to the conclusion of debate, the Sub Committee expressed some reservations about the narrow access and egress driveway to the site, but had regard to the conclusions of the County Highways Officer that this was acceptable.

Members also referred to the Planning Inspector's previous reasons for refusal (as described above) and concluded that the revised application as set out was acceptable, as it would not materially harm the character and appearance of the area.

The Sub Committee was satisfied that, by way of its built form and its spatial characteristics, the proposals would not interrupt the transition from the higher density development in the centre of Bishops Waltham immediately to the west, to the lower density moving eastwards along Rareridge Lane. Members were also satisfied that the application had also addressed previous concerns about the development having a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of existing neighbouring properties.

Therefore, at the conclusion of debate, the Committee did not support the recommendation set out in the Report for the above reasons and instead agreed to grant planning permission, subject to a s106 obligation to secure the financial contributions for open space and transport, with authority being delegated to the Head of Planning Management (in consultation with the Chairman) to set appropriate conditions.

RESOLVED:

That, for the reasons as set out, planning permission be granted subject to a s106 obligation to secure the financial contributions for open space and transport and subject to the conditions to be

determined by the Head of Planning Management (in consultation with the Chairman).

The meeting commenced at 11.00am and concluded at 12.15pm.

Chairman