

Planning Development Control Committee

Update Sheet

8th May 2014

The information set out in this Update Sheet includes details relating to public speaking and any change in circumstances and/or additional information received after the agenda was published.

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
01	14/00227/FUL	Hampshire Fire And Rescue, Fire Station And Premises, North Walls, Winchester	PERMIT

Agenda Page: 3

Officer Presenting: Andrea Swain

Public Speaking

Objector:

Parish Council representative:

Ward Councillor:

Supporter:

This application has been **DEFERRED** until the Planning Committee on 12 June, 2014, pending further negotiation in respect of the Viability Report.

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
02	13/02685/FUL	St Thomas Centre, 20 Southgate Street, Winchester	PERMIT

Agenda Page: 26

Officer Presenting: Simon Avery

Public Speaking

Objector: John Whitworth

Parish Council representative:

Ward Councillor: Cllr Tait

Supporter: Dominic Gaunt

Update

None

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
03	13/02686/LIS	St Thomas Centre, 20 Southgate Street, Winchester	PERMIT
Agenda Page: 41			
<p>Officer Presenting: Simon Avery</p> <p><u>Public Speaking</u> Objector: Parish Council representative: Ward Councillor: Supporter: Dominic Gaunt</p> <p><u>Update</u> None</p>			

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
4	14/00172/FUL	84 Chesil Street, Winchester	REFUSE
Agenda Page: 50			
<p>Officer Presenting: Lisa Booth</p> <p><u>Public Speaking</u> Objector: Parish Council representative: Ward Councillor: Cllr Tait Supporter: Mr Davies (applicant) & Carl Ranger (County Windows)</p> <p><u>Update</u> The applicant Mr Davies has forwarded to officers a copy of a handout that has been circulated to Members of the Planning Committee.</p>			

Afternoon – 2pm start

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
05	14/00321/FUL	Jubilee Hall, Little Shore Lane, Bishops Waltham	PERMIT

Agenda Page: 56

Officer Presenting: Sarah Tose

Public Speaking

Objector: John Watts

Parish Council representative: Bishops Waltham rep

Ward Councillor: Cllr Chamberlain (possibly Cllr Miller)

Supporter: Lee Drennan & Mrs Christian

Update

None

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
06	14/00621/TPO	White Culvers, Bank Street, Bishops Waltham	REFUSE

Agenda Page: 71

Officer Presenting: Thomas Gregory

Public Speaking

Objector:

Parish Council representative:

Ward Councillor:

Supporter: Mr and Mrs Malicki (applicant)

Update

None

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
07	SDNP/13/05935/ FUL	Land Rear of Plough Steep, Main Road, Itchen Abbas	PERMIT

Agenda Page: 75

Officer Presenting: Jane Rarok

Public Speaking

Objector: Joanna O'Connor

Parish Council representative: Penny Flemons

Ward Councillor: Cllr Kim Gottlieb

Supporter: Robin Buchanan (Agent)

Update

Email correspondence from Cllr Gottlieb to members:

"In the report to committee you will see it explained that the current application for three houses is a revision of a previous proposal for four houses, which was withdrawn because it was considered unacceptable for a number of different reasons.

To give you an indication of the difference between the current and the withdrawn applications, I attach a copy of the block plan of each on which I have roughly drawn over the footprint of the individual houses.

You might think, as I certainly do, that the differences are negligible and question why the footprint of house A in the current proposal is virtually identical to the footprint of houses A and B in the withdrawn proposal.

Given that the other two houses in the current proposal are still described as "C" and "D", it is difficult not to suspect that once the principle of development is established by the current application, a further application will be made to revert to the previous four house proposal. Even if it isn't, the current proposal certainly does not involve any reduction in the volume of the buildings.

Another thing you may notice on the attached is the minimal change in relationship between the existing listed property, Vine Cottage, and house D which is positioned on land at least 5 metres higher than the adjoining cottage.

To me, it is this relationship whereby the setting and the amenity of Vine Cottage is significantly harmed, that provides one the chief reasons for objecting to the application – the impacts on Plough Steep are very similar and what I say about Vine Cottage is just as pertinent.

A vague attempt has been made to shield Vine Cottage by building a bund and by some planting, but given the way the site was levelled and cleared of anything of ecological interest before the original proposal was submitted to planning, it is difficult to have much faith that the landscaping will be properly planted or be anything like sufficiently effective, particularly during winter months.

In the current application house D has been moved slightly to the north of the site, but a consequence of this is potential damage to the trees that line the site boundary, and the comments of the Head of Landscape (Trees) are particularly informative.

Also informative are the comments of the Drainage Engineer who notes that he could not see a suitable location for a sewage treatment plant drainage field "except for the barrow". This note needs to be considered in conjunction with the comments of the Head of Historic Environment (Archaeology) who says that "the Anglo-Saxon cemetery and the probable Bronze Age pond barrow are considered to be of National Importance".

I don't know how many spare Bronze Age barrows (burial pits) we have in the locality, but the idea that we might allow one to be dug up to provide a sewage soakaway field seems somehow unfortunate – others might describe it as vandalism. At the very least, this whole issue should have been thoroughly investigated and resolved well before any decision on this planning application was sought.

Lastly, another major reason for my objection to the application is because of where we are in the development of planning policy, which as you all know is undergoing significant changes both at local and at national level.

An important element of this is that we are asking rural communities across the district to share the burden of accommodating new housing, within their much cherished boundaries and traditional village settings.

By and large those rural communities have responded positively and have produced Parish Plans and Design Statements as part of an active process in identifying sites, and in providing criteria for suitable development.

However, in return for that positive response the City has a duty to ensure that any such expansion of the surrounding villages is carried out in a careful and sympathetic way. The schemes for new housing that will be most successful will be those that are hardly noticed, and that the houses when built will appear as though they had always been there, naturally as part of the mature landscape that characterises most of our villages.

This proposal jars, it offends, and will undermine the emerging policy objectives promoted by Parish Plans. I don't know of any other proposals which have quite upset so many people in the Itchen Valley, and for these reasons and others expressed by neighbours, residents and the Parish Council, I would urge you to refuse this application.

Drainage:

Further negotiations between the applicant and the Council's Drainage Engineer have demonstrated that it should be possible to adequately dispose of treated effluent outside the archaeological exclusion zone. The condition remains unchanged and further details will need to be provided prior to development commencing.

Conditions:

Substitute condition 10: Drainage:

Detailed proposals for the disposal of foul water including the location of drainage fields shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the commencement of the development hereby permitted. The agreed works shall be fully implemented before any dwelling is occupied.

Amendment to condition 14 boundary treatments to read:

Notwithstanding the details shown on the Proposed Fencing Plan (drawing no: 3397/L04) no development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected.

Type of boundary treatment will include 'instant hedges' and named supplier to be agreed with Local Planning Authority. Close boarded fencing would not be acceptable in this location.

The boundary treatment shall be completed before the use hereby permitted is commenced. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

Condition 19 and 20 Code for Sustainable Homes

19. The development will need to provide evidence (with design stage SAP data) that the building(s) meet Code 5 standard for energy and (with a design stage BRE water calculator) Code 4 standard for water before commencement on site.

20. The development will need to provide evidence (with as built stage SAP data) that the building(s) meet Code 5 standard for energy and (with a as built stage BRE water calculator) Code 4 standard for water before occupation.

Additional condition site levels 21:

No development, 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, 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.

End of Updates