

PLANNING COMMITTEE

21 September 2017

Attendance:

Councillors:

Ruffell (Chairman) (P)

Clear
Evans (P)
Gottlieb
Izard (P) (for Items 1-6)

Jeffs (P) (for Items 1-5 & 8 and 9)
Laming (P)
Read (P)
Tait (P)

Deputy Members:

Councillor Bell (for Items 2-9) (Standing Deputy for Councillor Clear) and
Councillor Pearson (Standing Deputy for Councillor Gottlieb)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Cook, Thompson and Tod

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Brook (Portfolio Holder for Built Environment).

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

1. That the minutes of the meeting held on 24 August 2017 be approved and adopted; and
2. That the minutes of the Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee held on 11 September 2017, be received (attached as Appendix A to these minutes).

2. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS SCHEDULE**
(Report PDC1095 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 PDC1095.

In respect of Item 6 (The Watercress Company, The Nythe, Bighton Road, Old Alresford, Alresford) and Item 7 (Cedar Bungalow, Malthouse Lane, Bighton, Alresford), Councillor Jeffs advised that he had predetermined the applications as he had been in discussion with residents and the Parish Council regarding the proposal. Councillor Jeffs spoke as a Ward Member and sat apart from the Committee during the determination of these applications.

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

Item 1: - Demolition of existing dwellings and the development of 91 studio flats as purpose built student accommodation, small-scale retail, communal areas, car and cycle parking, landscaping and associated works – Pine Cottage, 4 Sparkford Road, Winchester.
Case number: 17/01595/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out: an error to Page 3 of the Report to amend the number of studio flats from 91 to 88; an update to three supporting documents, namely: a Transport Statement, Student Travel and Management Plan and the Planting Plan with an amendment to Condition 2 to make reference to these revised documents and that, subsequent to the revision of the planting plan, Condition 5 be amended to require only hard landscaping details to be provided and that, further details of the treatment of the levels at the rear of the site also be required as an additional amendment to Condition 5, as set out in full in the Update Sheet.

In addition, a verbal update was received to amend the site description contained on Page 4 of the Report to read 'King Alfred Campus of Winchester **University**' and not College, as stated.

During public participation, Robert Shaw (Agent) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Thompson stated that she was speaking on behalf of local residents in objection to the application due to the scale and mass of the development which was in close proximity to residential family homes and considered excessive for the area, despite the reduction from 91 to 88 studio flats.

She stated that an Article 4 Direction was in place in two areas of the Town Centre and that Sparkford Close had already been taken over with student accommodation. Any further potential issues with parking, noise and anti-social behaviour would exacerbate the existing situation which local residents

would have to endure. Councillor Thompson made reference to the comments made by the University who suggested that the accommodation was of the wrong type with students requiring good quality accommodation at a reasonable cost. She stated that due to the high specification and cost of the studio flats, they would only attract a limited number of students and reported that the Students Union did not support the application for a large accommodation block opposite the student night club as this would have a detrimental impact on the dispersal of students leaving the club.

Councillor Thompson stated that this is an attractive leafy area and had been, until recently, a quiet residential neighbourhood which she did not believe could cope with this form of development, making roads in this area impassable and tight where there were already existing issues in this regard. In conclusion, Councillor Thompson made reference to the comments of Southern Water and Hampshire County Council as set out in the Report and stated that, with no plan in place as to how future student numbers could be accommodated, a collaborative working approach between the Council and the University to manage this process was suggested.

In summary, Councillor Tod made reference to three areas: Strategy and need, behaviour management and the wider Strategy and stated that there was an incomplete picture of what Policy CP2 said, with reference to '....taking into account local housing needs' and housing mix. He asked the Committee to consider whether the studio flats were the right type of accommodation as they would be suited to mainly international and post graduate students which the University of Winchester had minimal numbers of.

Councillor Tod made reference to the need of the University to increase student numbers from 7,500 to 10,000 by 2025 but also referred to the 4% drop in the number of people applying to universities with a greater number of students choosing to study nearer to home to enable them to live with parents, significantly reducing their ongoing housing costs.

In conclusion, Councillor Tod suggested that Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMO's) appeared to be the preference for many students, largely due to cost and their need to drive to training opportunities linked with teacher training and that focus needed to be placed on affordable housing stock. He stated that there was existing accommodation in the Town Centre where an on-site warden was present day and night. However, this had not resolved issues of anti-social behaviour and where a permanent on-site warden would not be available as part of this particular application he considered that this could result in further problems on site.

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning reported that the Council had two adopted Local Plans which provided planning policy guidance. However, there was no specific policy in relation to the provision of student accommodation so the Council's decision in this respect had been made in accordance with adopted Local Plans Part 1 and 2 (LPP1 and LPP2) which was deemed sufficient for this purpose. It was recognised that changes

had taken place since the adoption of LPP1 in 2012 and, in addition to the Local Plan review, scheduled to take place next year the Committee were informed that the Government had produced draft planning guidance which provided advice to local authorities of how to undertake housing needs assessments, this would include a review of student accommodation housing need, in conjunction with Universities.

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 and verbal update, subject to an addition to Condition 8 to restrict occupation to students enrolled on a full-time course only.

Item 2: - Demolition of existing property and construction of 2 x 4-bedroom and 1 x 5-bedroom terraced dwelling houses with associated car parking and access from Harestock Road – Warren Cottage, 105 Harestock Road, Winchester.

Case number: 17/01149/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out a correction to page 2, under heading entitled 'Proposal' to read 'and one detached **garage** to serve house 2', not dwelling, as stated.

During public participation, Hilary Saunders spoke in objection to the application (on behalf of Cllr Rob Warren, Littleton and Harestock Parish Council) and Robert Carter (Applicant) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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 3: - Stable building with covered area and tack/feed store (RETROSPECTIVE) - Haycorns, Vicarage Lane, Swanmore.

Case number: 17/01146/FUL

The Head of Development Management reminded the Committee that, in respect of Items 3 and 4, the stable building straddled the boundary of the City Council and the South Downs National Park as planning authorities and therefore one application could not proceed without the other.

During public participation, Godfrey Nelson and Liz Nelson (Applicants) spoke in support of the application.

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.

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

Item 4: -.Stable building with covered area and tack/feed store (RETROSPECTIVE) – Haycorns, Vicarage Lane, Swanmore.
Case number: SDNP/17/03292/FUL

During public participation, Godfrey Nelson and Liz Nelson (Applicants) spoke in support of the application.

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: - Redevelopment of part of an existing commercial site, comprising the demolition of existing buildings in employment use and the erection of new replacement buildings in B1 & B8 use (and ancillary food kiosk), parking, circulation, landscaping and associated works.- Humphrey Farms Ltd, Hazeley Road, Twyford.
Case number: SDNP/17/02639/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which detailed the following: an extract taken from the Twyford Neighbourhood Plan (TNP); the Agent's response to the Parish Council's comments; two further neighbour representations objecting to the application; amended wording to Conditions 3 and 9 to allow for a phased implementation of development; amendments to Condition 10 following the submission of a Landscape Management Plan, approved by the Landscape Officer; the removal of Condition 11 and consequently, the re-numbering of Condition 12 to Condition 11.

In addition, a verbal update was provided which outlined that one further letter of objection had been received. However, this did not contain any additional points that had not already been raised by previous objectors.

During the consideration of this application, the Chairman briefly adjourned the meeting to enable the Planning and Information Solicitor to provide appropriate legal advice to Councillor Cook regarding the declaration of interests who had registered to speak on this application.

The meeting was adjourned at 2.40pm and resumed at 2.45pm.

Upon re-commencement of the meeting, the Planning and Information Solicitor outlined the advice that had been provided in respect of the declaration of interests in light of the information that Councillor Cook had provided.

Councillor Cook declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of Item 5, due to the close proximity of her property to the application site. During public participation, she addressed the Committee in objection to the

application, answered questions thereon and subsequently left the meeting taking no further part in any discussion thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Cook and Chris Corcoran (Twyford Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Sarah Andrews (Applicant) and Kirsten Gray spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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, subject to an amendment to the Update Sheet to read '**noise emitted**' and not 'noise omitted'.

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

Item 6:- Five mobile units to be permanently located for agricultural workers as follows: 3 x units to be utilised for 10 month; 2 x units to be utilised for 12 months, one of which is to be allocated as rest room – The Watercress Company, The Nythe, Bighton Road, Old Alresford, Alresford
Case number: 16/02313/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which stated 'Condition 2 to be updated'.

During public participation, Antony Thesiger spoke in objection to the application and Thomas Amery (Applicant) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Jeffs stated that he spoke in support Mr Thesiger who was not opposed to the salad business in The Nythe but objected to the siting of the mobile units on site which would have a detrimental impact on Mr Thesiger's living environment if located adjacent to his property and boundary. Councillor Jeffs suggested that positioning of the mobile units on the boundary with Mr Thesiger's property would result in unacceptable noise levels, cooking odours and vermin infestation as a result of BBQ use and each mobile unit sleeping between four to six people during the seasonal months.

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, subject to the following: Condition 2 being amended to specify location and the number of units to be occupied and those to be used as a rest room and to clarify each element in a measured approach; additional conditions to ensure that no more than five mobile units are permitted on site; that mobile units must be removed if they cease to be used by seasonal workers; and confirmation of waste management disposal measures with the exact wording of conditions to be delegated to the Head of

Development Management and the Planning and Information Solicitor for agreement, in consultation with the Chairman.

Item 7: - Modification of Clause 5 of the Deed of Agreement (dated 31 August 2010) to substitute the requirement for named agricultural workers with a generic requirement for Cedar Bungalow (see full description below) – Cedar Bungalow, Malthouse Lane, Bighton, Alresford.

Case number: 16/01348/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which drew attention that reference to Bighton under Supplementary Planning Guidance should be omitted and also detailed the representation received from Councillor Jeffs which explained the reasons for referring this application to Committee.

During public participation, Nicholas Ashford (Bighton Parish Council) and Henry McCowen (Applicant) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

In response to questions, the Applicant stated that, if the Committee were minded to allow Cedar Bungalow to remain in situ, he would offer to let the property at a rate of 50% of an open market rental cost (of a comparable sized property) to provide the dwelling as an affordable housing option for an agricultural worker/retired agricultural worker, employed by Manor Farms Ltd/McCowen Farms.

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

In summary, Councillor Jeffs stated that Cedar Bungalow was a small dwelling in the countryside which formed part of McCowen Farm and had, up until recently, been the home of a retired couple who were former employees of the farm. In August 2010 a deed of agreement had been approved to allow this couple to reside at the property for their lifetime, the last person of which had recently sadly passed away.

Councillor Jeffs considered this small dwelling in its rural village location to be a useful asset that should be protected and not in danger of demolition.

In conclusion, Councillor Jeffs stated that the retention of this bungalow was fully supported by Bighton Parish Council and McCowen Farms where it could be used to provide an affordable home for an agricultural worker or a retired agricultural worker and he urged the Committee to reject the officer's recommendation in this instance.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee voted against the recommendation to refuse permission to vary the section 106 agreement, and voted instead to allow a variation of the agreement to retain the dwelling known as Cedar Bungalow for occupation by an agricultural workers or a retired agricultural worker and to remove the requirement that the dwelling be

demolished. This was due to the dwelling providing a functional need on the holding for agricultural workers/retired workers. The terms of the section 106 agreement were to be delegated to the Head of Development Management and the Planning and Information Solicitor, in consultation with the Chairman following negotiation with the applicant, with the requirement to demolish the dwelling being removed.

Item 8:- Replace and reposition fence enclosing existing boundary line of the property. 1 m in from footpath with planting – 13 Benenden Green, Alresford.
Case number: 17/01111/HOU

During public participation, Spencer Matthews (Applicant) spoke in support of the application.

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 9:- Replacement of existing detached garden shed with detached oak framed garden room – Baileys End, 42-43 East Stratton, Winchester.
Case number: 17/01656/HOU

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 inside and outside the area of the South Downs National Park be agreed as set out in the Schedule (appended to the minutes for information) and the Update Sheet, subject to:

(i) That, in respect of item 1 (Pine Cottage, 4 Sparkford Road, Winchester) planning permission be granted, subject to an addition to Condition 8 to restrict occupation to students enrolled on a full-time course only;

(ii) That, in respect of item 5 (Humphrey's Farm Ltd, Hazeley Road, Twyford), planning permission be granted, subject to an amendment to the Update Sheet to read '**noise emitted**' and not 'noise omitted';

(iii) That in respect of item 6 (The Watercress Company, The Nythe, Bighton Road, Alresford) planning permission be granted, subject to: an amendment to Condition 2 to specify the location and the number of units to be occupied and those to be used as a rest room and to clarify each element in a measured approach; additional conditions to state that no more than five

mobile units are permitted on site; that mobile units must be removed if they cease to be used by seasonal workers; and confirmation of waste management disposal measures. The exact wording of conditions to be delegated to the Head of Development Management and the Planning and Information Solicitor for agreement, in consultation with the Chairman; and

(iv) That in respect of item 7 (Cedar Bungalow, Malthouse Lane, Bighton, Alresford) the Committee voted against the recommendation to refuse permission to vary the section106 agreement, and voted instead to allow a variation of the agreement to retain the dwelling known as Cedar Bungalow for occupation by an agricultural workers or a retired agricultural worker and to remove the requirement that the dwelling be demolished. This was due to the dwelling providing a functional need on the holding for agricultural workers/retired workers. The exact wording of Clauses 1 to 4 to be delegated to The Head of Development Management and the Planning and Information Solicitor, in consultation with the Chairman, following negotiation with the Applicant regarding the wording of the agreement, with no further requirement to demolish the dwelling, as previously set out in Clause 5 (to be removed).^[CB1]

The meeting commenced at 9.30am adjourned between 12.30pm and 2.00pm and 2.40pm and 2.45pm and concluded at 5.25pm.

Chairman