

PLANNING COMMITTEE

18 January 2018

Attendance:

Councillors:

Ruffell (Chairman) (P)

Clear

Evans (P)

Gottlieb (P)

Izard (P)

Jeffs (P)

Laming (P)

Read (P)

Tait (P)

Deputy Members:

Councillor Rutter (Standing Deputy for Councillor Clear)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Achwal, Pearson, Porter, Prince, Thompson and Weir

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 14 December 2017 be approved and adopted; and

2. That the minutes of the Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee held on 9 January 2018, be received (attached as Appendix A to these minutes).

2. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS SCHEDULE**
(Report PDC1101 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 PDC1101.

Councillor Ruffell made a personal statement in respect of item 1 (Land off Solent Way, Whiteley) explaining that he was the Chairman of the North Whiteley Development Forum which oversees development works in Whiteley however he has not had any detailed involvement in the current application.

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

Item 1: Erection of Lidl foodstore (Use Class A1) with customer car park and associated landscaping – Land off Solent Way, Whiteley
Case number: 17/00164/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which outlined: additional comments from Hampshire Highways and the Landscape Team; further information from the Applicant consisting of a response to the published committee report, a pack of documents described as a “Planning Committee Brochure” which had been circulated to Members by the applicant; a letter from the applicant’s drainage engineer; 90 additional comments (collated by the applicant) in support of the application and finally, 12 additional letters of support from local residents. The Update Sheet also suggested changing the two stage recommendation to a three stage recommendation with the addition of a new stage (renumbered part B) that the Head of Development Management be authorised to resolve the outstanding surface water issue and impose an appropriate condition before any decision notice was issued. The revised recommendation was now to read that, planning permission should be granted, subject to the completion of a s106 legal agreement consisting of the six elements listed in the report, the resolution of the surface water issue and changes to the conditions consisting of: removal of Condition 7 (Surface Water Drainage) and revisions to Conditions 2 (Approved Plans), 12 (Materials: hard surfaced areas) 13 (Landscaping), 19 (Car Parking Provision) and 20 (Opening Hours)

In addition, a verbal update was provided stating that a further letter in support of the application had been received just prior to the meeting but raising no new points to those previously considered.

During public participation Mike Evans (Whiteley Town Council) spoke in objection to the application and James Mitchell (Applicant) spoke in support of the application and both answered Members’ questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Achwal also spoke on this item as a Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Achwal stated that she was opposed to the application on highway grounds due to the insufficient capacity of the existing road network in Whiteley. She considered the £200k contribution towards off-site traffic improvement works and the levels of parking on site to be inadequate, resulting in customers parking on street which would exacerbate the existing parking problems in the area. She suggested that staff would likely travel to the site by car due to the poor bus service in this area and this would increase the volume of the 10,000 employees already travelling to and from the

business park at peak times. In conclusion, Councillor Achwal urged the Committee to refuse the application in the interests of public and highway safety at this stage, for resubmission once expected highway works had been completed.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons and subject to the s106 agreement, conditions and informatives set out in the Report as revised in the Update Sheet, and subject to an addition to the final paragraph of the second stage of the recommendation (part B) so that it now reads "...in the event that the outstanding surface water issue is not resolved the Head of Development Management be authorised to refuse the application".

Item 2: Change of use of former agricultural buildings to 4200sqm of commercial floorspace (B1 & B8 Uses), access, parking, landscaping and associated works - North Winchester Farm, Stoke Charity Road, Kings Worthy
Case number: 17/02495/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out an amendment to the hours in Condition 6 of the Report.

During public participation, Gordon Lockhart and Ian Gordon (Kings Worthy Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Richard Osborne and Sarah Andrews (Applicant) spoke in support of the application and all answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Porter also spoke on this item as a Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Porter stated that she was raising objection to the application for various reasons, particularly due to Traffic and Highway issues. As the development was set within the countryside, in view of its size, she considered that there should be a masterplan for the site. This opinion was also supported by her fellow Ward Member, Councillor Prince.

Councillor Porter made reference to the traffic constraints from north and south of the application site, the severe height restrictions, and the new railway bridge with restricted view. She expressed concern regarding the northbound traffic going from a 40mph zone into a 60mph zone and the high volume of traffic movements that currently exist in this area. Councillor Porter suggested that the change to operating hours to 0700 to 2300, as set out in the Update Sheet, would result in an excessive noise impact for residents in the hamlet and that access would become hazardous with no pedestrian or cyclist provision to the northern access.

In conclusion, Councillor Porter suggested that the solution would be the withdrawal of the application so the Council could request the development of a masterplan for the site, to enable a satisfactory outcome for the applicant, the residents and the area as a whole.

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 the Update Sheet.

Item 3: 4 no. new semi-detached dwellings with associated parking and landscaping

- Chingri Khal, Sleepers Hill, Winchester

Case number: 17/02457/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which referred to: a revision to Paragraph 1, Page 2; revised viability report which had been submitted to include the two 3 bedroom dwellings to the rear; revision to Page 8 'Recommendation' to read '...entering into a Section 106 legal agreement requiring a post development appraisal to be carried out and also requiring that both the proposed dwellings under this permission and the consented three bed dwelling to the rear of the site are constructed co-jointly...'

In addition, a verbal update was provided to Page 3, paragraph 2 (Affordable Housing) to note that a revised viability report had been submitted indicating that no contribution could be made. Therefore, the Estates Team had suggested that there be provision in the s106 agreement for a revised viability assessment to be submitted post development in order to enable the Council to assess whether any contribution towards affordable housing could be made. The appraisal would review the viability of the 4 units on this site and the 2 to the rear (granted by an earlier consent 16/01490/FUL which also requires a post appraisal review).

Councillor Thompson declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of Item 3, due to the close proximity of her late father in law's property to the application site. During public participation, she addressed the Committee answered questions thereon and subsequently left the meeting taking no further part in any discussion thereon

During public participation, Councillor Thompson spoke in objection to the application and Jason Murphy spoke in support of the application and both answered Members' questions thereon.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons and subject to the s106 agreement, conditions and informatives set out in the Report and the Update Sheet, and subject to the submission of a post development viability appraisal across the two schemes linked back to the earlier consent.

Item 4: Retain two of the temporary buildings to be used as secure storage facilities to house Scene of Crime (SOCO) vehicles recovered by Williams Garage for Hampshire Constabulary and vehicles awaiting servicing.
- Williams Garage, Main Road, Otterbourne,
Case Number: 17/02683/FUL

During public participation, Clive Jenvey spoke in objection to the application and Peter Whieldon 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.

Application inside the area of the South Downs National Park (SDNP):

Item 5: Construction of new access track – Hole Farm, Hole Lane, Hambledon, Waterlooville.
Case Number: SDNP/17/05947/FUL

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

In summary, Councillor Pearson stated that this was an area which represented the National Park and therefore had an impact on the natural character of the downland. He stated that he was viewing the application from an environmental perspective and suggested that any new track would stand out and change the character of the landscape which was why SDNP wished to preserve the view.

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

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

Item 6: AMENDED PLANS 06.12.2017 Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 4 dwellings – 5 Boyne Rose, Kings Worthy.
Case Number: 17/01474/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out the consultation response received from the Council's Urban Design Officer. A verbal update was also provided referring to: the receipt of five further letters of support and six letters of objection from new contributors; two additional sustainability conditions to be added to reflect the 'new housing'; wording as set out in Conditions 9 and 10 of the Report.

During public participation, Terry Foley and Ian Gordon (Kings Worthy Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Jeremy Tyrell and John Hearn (Agent and Architect) spoke in support of the application and all answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Prince also spoke on this item as a Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Prince stated that he had visited the site on three occasions to assess the potential impact on the surrounding area. If minded to support the application, he urged the Committee to carry out a full site visit to evaluate the nature of the site and the impact of the proposed development in context with the streetscene. He considered that the development constituted high density building which encroached on the building lines of other properties. He also expressed concern regarding the restricted turning ability for refuse bins, delivery vans and emergency vehicles accessing the site. In conclusion, Councillor Prince considered that the application resulted in significant overdevelopment of a small scale plot with inadequate access to the site.

The Committee agreed to defer the decision to a meeting of the Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee to be held on Monday 5 February 2018 at 10.30am. The Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee would visit the site in order to assess the proposed design of the dwellings in the context of their setting and relationship with neighbouring properties

Item 7: Demolition of a single storey side extension and alterations to the fenestration of the existing Overcross House and construction of a new 5 bedroom detached dwelling and detached double garage to the east of the existing house – Overcross House, Cross Way, Shawford .
Case number: 17/02457/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which recommended an additional Condition 14.

During public participation, Anthony Lewis and Councillor Jordan (Compton and Shawford Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Tony Boyle spoke in support of the application and all answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Thompson also spoke on this item, reading a statement on behalf of Ward Member, Councillor Bell.

In summary, Councillor Bell objected to the application. The most significant issue was the positioning of the detached garage which was forward of the building line. However, other points of concern raised were: the restrictions of the plot size; the proximity of deep foundations close to an important tree in the neighbouring garden; infill and backfill development. There were concerns that permitting a garage forward of the building line on this property would set a precedent for future applications and would be contrary to the Compton and Shawford Village Design Statement (VDS) 2011.

In conclusion, Councillor Bell considered the application to be contrary to Policies MTRA3, DM15, DM16, DM17 and DM18 and that the Committee should refuse the application.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse permission for the following reasons, contrary to: DM15 of the Local Plan Part 2 (local distinctiveness); DM16 (responding positively to the boundary); Compton and Shawford VDS settlement guidelines: density, plot sizes and hedge boundaries and Winchester High Quality Places SPD with the exact wording of the reasons for refusal delegated to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman.

Item 8: Construction of a new part single storey, part two storey dwelling with new access from Orient Drive – The Coach House 109 Harestock Road, Winchester

Case number: 17/02724/FUL

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

During public participation, Councillor Weir also spoke on this item as a Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Weir stated that it was essential that development was sustainable in terms of the impact on the character of the area; road safety and on site parking and considered the character of this application was dependent on the retention of the strong hedge in perpetuity, which would assist in alleviating a number of the concerns raised.

Councillor Weir stated that concern had also been raised regarding the access close to pinch points but that parking pressures had now been addressed so thanked officers accordingly on this point.

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.

Item 9: Demolition of existing single storey garage, store and rear conservatory. Proposed attic conversion and extension. New single storey front extension. New single storey car port to side. New single storey side and rear extension. – Madolyn, 7 Orchard Road, South Wonston

Case number: 17/02512/HOU

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which outlined an amendment to the measurements set out in the Report. In addition, a verbal update was provided to note that Page 2, paragraph 3 of the Report should read 'Orchard Close'.

During public participation, Tricia Crawley spoke in objection to the application and Nicholas Brook spoke in support of the application and both 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 the Update Sheet.

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 decision relating to each item, subject to the following:

(i) That in respect of item 1, permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the s106 agreement, conditions and informatives set out in the Report and the Update Sheet, and subject to an addition to the final paragraph of the second stage of the recommendation (part B) so that it now reads "in the event that the outstanding surface water issue is not resolved the Head of Development Management be authorised to refuse the application;

(ii) That in respect of item 3, permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the s106 agreement, conditions and informatives set out in the Report and the Update Sheet, and subject to the submission of a post development viability appraisal across the two schemes linked back to the earlier consent;

(iii) That in respect of item 6, the decision be deferred to a meeting of the Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee to be held on Monday 5 February 2018 at 10.30am. The Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee would visit the site in order to assess the proposed design of the dwellings in the context of its setting and relationship with neighbouring properties; and

(iv) That in respect of item 7, permission be refused for the following reasons, contrary to: DM15 of the Local Plan Part 2 (local distinctiveness); DM16 (responding positively to the boundary); Compton and Shawford VDS settlement guidelines: density, plot sizes and hedge boundaries and Winchester High Quality Places SPD with the exact wording of the reasons for refusal delegated to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am adjourned between 1.15pm and 2.05pm and concluded at 6.15pm.

Chairman