

PLANNING COMMITTEE

27 July 2017

Attendance:

Councillors:

Ruffell (Chairman) (P)

Clear (P)

Evans

Gottlieb (P)

Izard (P)

Jeffs (P)

Laming (P)

Read (P)

Tait (P)

Deputy Members:

Councillor Rutter (Standing Deputy for Councillor Evans).

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Gemmell, Horrill (Leader and Portfolio Holder for Housing), Hutchison, Scott and Tod.

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 22 June 2017 be approved and adopted.

2. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS SCHEDULE**
(Report PDC1092 and Update Sheet refers)

A copy of each planning application decision is available to view on the Council's website under the respective planning application.

The Committee agreed to receive the Update Sheet as an addendum to Report PDC1092.

At the invitation of the Head of Development Management, the Committee had visited the sites relating to Items 3 and 5 on 25 July 2017, to assist them in assessing the proposed developments in relation to their setting and relationship with neighbouring properties. The site visits were attended by

Members present on the Committee with the exception of Councillor Gottlieb, who had visited the sites on a separate occasion.

Councillor Clear declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 7 (The Willows, Fareham Road, Wickham, Fareham) due to her role as Chairman of Wickham Parish Council. However, as she had not expressed any view on this particular application, she spoke and voted thereon.

Applications inside the area of the South Downs National Park (SDNP)

Item 1: - Proposed two self-build plots – one replacement dwelling and one infill dwelling – Highcroft, Love Lane, Twyford, Winchester .

Case number: SDNP/17/01802/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out: a correction to the policies quoted for refusal 1 to read CP19 and CP20; and a draft unilateral undertaking which had been submitted by the agent and related to marketing the dwellings as 'self-build'.

During public participation, Anthony Fanshawe and Chris Corcoran (Twyford Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Louise Cutts (Wessex Planning) and Nigel Dyer spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Report and as per the Update Sheet.

Item 2: - G1. Raise tree canopy to 5m above ground level over property of Grey Farm House – Grey Farm House, Kilmeston Road, Kilmeston,

Case number: SDNP/17/02689/TPO

During public participation, Graham Tarbuck (on behalf of Philip Housden) spoke in objection to the application and Andrew Gruber spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the tree works for the reasons (and subject to the conditions and informatives) as set out in the Report.

Applications outside the area of the South Downs National Park (WCC):

Item 3: - AMENDED PLANS 05.06.2017 Outline application for the development of approximately 9 family houses beyond St. Luke's Church including the construction of a new access road from Mildmay Street. Full planning application for the development of 5 dwellings North of Battery Hill, including a new access road. 39 dwellings off Wilberforce Close, associated parking spaces and hard and soft landscaping. 23 dwellings off the Valley, associated parking and landscaping. Improvements to footpath network across the Valley and landscaping improvements – Land at The Valley, Stanmore, Winchester .

Case number: 17/00641/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out a correction to condition 22 to remove the word 'Prvecom' from the text.

During public participation, Paul Bulkeley (Architect) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Scott spoke on this item as Ward Member and Councillor Horrill spoke on this item as Portfolio Holder for Housing Services.

In summary, Councillor Scott outlined the background to the development coming forward which had been as a result of a series of public meetings during the consideration of the Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) process, at which potential sites had been identified for development in the future. It was recognised within the Stanmore Planning Framework that there was high demand for the provision of family homes which would enhance the Stanmore area. In conclusion, Councillor Scott urged the Committee to support the recommendation and grant permission to the application.

In summary, Councillor Horrill thanked the Housing Team for the plans that had come forward and stated that she was in support of the development and the new affordable housing that would be delivered in the Valley as a result of this application. She stated that with 2,000 people on the waiting list to be housed in the District, it was critical that new Council homes were provided and this land in Stanmore provided the ideal location for a new scheme. She clarified that the scheme had been supported by the majority of the community, TACT and Ward Members and had been subject to wide consultation. In conclusion, Councillor Horrill stated that access to affordable decent homes in the area was extremely hard for residents to find. However, this development would deliver a choice of affordable housing options to the people who needed it most and she urged the Committee to support the report recommendation.

In response to questions, the Head of New Homes Delivery reported that the scheme proposed to deliver a 100% affordable housing mix (70% rented; 30% shared ownership) and initial costings indicated that this scheme would be viable. However, a review would be carried out upon receipt of the tenders to test that the scheme had met its own viability criteria. Conditions had been set out in the Report to ensure that 70% affordable housing would be achieved on site as a minimum requirement.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons (and subject to the conditions and informatives), set out in the Report and as per the Update Sheet.

Item 4: -.Erection of two storey extension to front north-east corner of building to create additional living space, together with internal alterations.

Change/redesign of roof to existing rear single storey structure – Chapel Cottage, Woodman Lane, Sparsholt .
Case number: 17/00830/HOU

The Head of Development Management drew Members attention to a verbal update that had been received which stated that Sparsholt did have a Village Design Statement that was published in 2014 and that one additional representation in support of the application had been received raising no new issues.

During public participation, Nigel Reid (Sparsholt Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Horrill spoke on this item as Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Horrill stated that she was speaking against the application as she believed the proposal would set a precedent for similar sites where owners may wish to make an application to extend into the 'envelope'. She considered that the main reason the application failed, in her opinion was an issue of boundaries, rather than the application itself. Councillor Horrill stated that Sparsholt had strongly defended the envelope and had resisted previous attempts by owners to develop on these areas and had clearly expressed this view during the LPP2 process as open space contributed significantly to the village. In conclusion, Councillor Horrill urged the Committee to refuse this application.

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services advised the Committee that the precedent did not play a major part in decision making for planning applications as each application was decided on its merits.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons (and subject to the conditions and informatives) as set out in the Report.

Item 5: - Replacement of four semi-detached houses with student accommodation: 2 x studios, 3x3 bed flats, 14 x 4 bed flats, 3 x 5 bed flats, 12 x 6 bed flats, 1 x 7 bed flats and a Wardens flat, together with amenity space, cycle storage, bin store and operational car parking (amended scheme) – 178 – 184 Greenhill Road, Winchester.
Case number: 16/00517/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which detailed the following: Response from the Ecology Officer, Housing Officer and Southern Water; a further letter from University of Winchester; two additional letters of representation from the public; documents and plans submitted by the Applicant and letters dated 17 June and 25 June and a preliminary Ecology report. In addition, the update sheet set out in full the planning officer's response to all these points and also

referred to a number of further conditions to reflect the points raised and the submission of further plans, these are set out as follows:

Change to Recommendation:

That the S106 legal agreement clause (b) as set out in the recommendation be amended to read as follows:

(b) That a clause be inserted into any tenancy agreement between the owner/manager of the development (SuperUni) that any student who intends to occupy any of the accommodation stating that they should not bring a vehicle with them to Winchester, that there is no parking on site and no eligibility for any car parking permit (except in accordance with the Council's Residents Parking Scheme).

New Conditions:

Protection of Nesting Birds

22. No clearance of any vegetation within the site shall take place within the months of March to August inclusive within any calendar year, unless the vegetation has been inspected by a competent person and a written assessment of the inspection and its conclusions is first submitted to and approved in writing with the local planning authority. This would include a timetable for any subsequent clearance work. Any clearance work shall then be undertaken in accordance with the agreed scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the presence of any nesting birds within the site was recognised and that they are protected from harm arising from the development.

Protection of Bats

23. Before any development hereby permitted is first commenced, including the demolition of the properties, the survey work as detailed in the preliminary ecological report to ascertain the potential presence of bats within the buildings, shall be undertaken and a report prepared by a competent person submitted and agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The submitted report shall include any remedial work and a timetable for this work and the demolition. Any remedial work and demolition shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the presence of any bats within the site was recognised and that they are protected from harm arising from the development.

In addition, a verbal update was received outlining a late representation from a local resident. Members agreed that the main points should be summarised by the officers, which were as follows: The unenforceability of the tenancy agreements in relation to the use of vehicles by students residing at the application site; the fact that the applicant is not a member of certain student accommodation bodies; fire safety; traffic levels associated with the arrivals

and departures; and foul drainage concerns. The officer reported that all these issues had been covered in the report or the late update.

During public participation, Helen Dawson spoke in objection to the application and Jeremy Gardiner (Agent) spoke in support of the application and both answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillors Tod and Hutchison spoke on this item as Ward Members.

In summary, Councillor Tod stated that he was speaking in support of local residents and objecting to the application. He considered that the concerns of local residents had not been understood or addressed directly due to the lack of consultation that had occurred. He considered that traffic would be a concern with insufficient car parking in the area and the likelihood that second and third year students would need access to a vehicle whilst carrying out work placements in schools etc as part of their degree with no parking provision available for this purpose. Councillor Tod stated that the concerns of the Council's Urban Design Officer had not been adequately addressed nor did the scheme comply with Policy DM16 or National Planning Policy Framework 7 (NPPF(7)) as, in his opinion, the proposal was unsympathetic due to its large footprint and mass and was out of keeping with the surrounding area. In conclusion, he considered policies 'too neutral' and that building standards needed to be clear with regard to minimum standards when addressing student housing and urged the Committee to refuse this application.

In summary, Councillor Hutchison stated that she fully endorsed the views expressed by Councillor Tod and that whilst the need for student accommodation was recognised, she considered that engagement with local residents could have resolved concerns and moved the proposal forward positively. In general, her view was that the proposal was too dense and capacity too great for the size of the application site and also referred to the comments of the Council's Urban Design Officer. In conclusion, she stated that the proposal would also cause additional stress to access points and that more work was required to remedy the concerns of local residents, therefore she could not support the application in its current form.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application for the following reasons: contrary to Policy DM16 and the Council's High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) by virtue of its character and variety failing to respond positively in terms of design, scale, mass and layout. The exact wording of the reason for refusal were delegated to the Head of Development Management, for finalisation in consultation with the Chairman.

Item 6:- Erection of a single detached 'self-build' dwelling and garage with all matters reserved – Land Adjacent to Seven Oaks, Clewers Hill, Waltham Chase

Case number: 17/00707/OUT

During public participation, Councillor Robbie (Shedfield Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Phil Farminer (Applicant) spoke in support of the application.

During public participation, Councillor Gemmell spoke on this item as Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Gemmell made reference to the hard work carried out by the Parish Council to prepare a blue print for the area and had recognised that there was a need for development within the area, following this a team was formed to prepare the Village Design Statement (VDS). However, Councillor Gemmell stated that sites previously identified as being within the settlement gap in Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1), began to receive planning permission prior to the formal adoption of local plan part 2, as the policy boundary had been changed and those schemes accorded with emerging policy. She expressed concern that the proposal within LPP2 was to deliver 250 homes in this area over a 20 year period. To date 300 houses had been permitted and would be built out within a three year period.

In conclusion, Councillor Gemmell stated that it was crucial that the boundary of the villages be protected and urged the Committee to refuse this application.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Report.

Item 7: - Proposed change of use of existing house into two dwelling units with two storey side extension. Proposed vehicular entrance onto Fareham Road with timber boundary fence to highway – The Willows, Fareham Road, Wickham, Fareham.

Case number: 16/03331/FUL

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons (and subject to the conditions and informatives) as set out in the Report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the decisions taken on the Development Control Applications in relation to those applications outside and inside the area of the South Downs National Park be agreed as set out in the Schedule (appended to the minutes for information), subject to the following:

- (i) That, in respect of item 5, planning permission be refused for the following reason: Contrary to Policy DM16 and the Council's High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) by virtue of its character and variety, failing to respond positively in terms of design, scale, mass and layout.

The exact wording of the reason for refusal delegated to the Head of Development Management, for finalisation in consultation with the Chairman.

3. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2207 – LAND ADJACENT FIELD HOUSE, CHAPEL ROAD, SOBERTON**
(Report PDC1093 refers)

This item was deferred for consideration at the next meeting of the Planning Committee on 24 August 2017.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am adjourned between 1.10pm and 2.00pm and concluded at 4.50pm.

Chairman