

PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 February 2018

Attendance:

Councillors:

Ruffell (Chairman) (P)

Clear

Evans (P)

Gottlieb (P)

Izard (P)

Jeffs (P)

Laming (P)

Read (P)

Tait (P) (absent
for Schedule item 5)

Deputy Members:

Councillor Rutter (Standing Deputy for Councillor Clear).

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Bell and Cutler.

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 18 January 2018 (Less Exempt Appendix) and the minutes of the Planning (Viewing) Sub Committee held on 5 February 2018 be approved and adopted.

2. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS SCHEDULE**
(Report PDC1103 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 PDC1103.

Councillor Jeffs declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 4 (34 Fair View, Alresford) as an objector to the application was known to himself and having a personal interest only he voted on this item.

Councillor Read declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 5 (Land adjacent to Oakley House, Trampers Lane, North Boarhunt) as

the applicant was known to himself and having a personal interest only he voted on this item.

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

Item 1: Demolition of the existing dwelling (Smallwood) and the erection of 3 no. five-bedroom dwelling houses, with associated access, garages, parking and landscaping. (AMENDED SITE LAYOUT RECEIVED 24.1.18)
Smallwood, Cross Way, Shawford
Case number: 17/03004/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which stated that on page 4 of the report under section headed 'Proposal' it should say 'the erection of three 5 bedroom dwellings'. On page 6 of the report under section headed 'Design/layout' the sentences that read 'the overall height of the dwellings has increased in comparison to the previously approved scheme. However these amended heights are comparable to other recent developments in the vicinity' should be omitted. The plans that were previously approved did not show the full front elevation with the basement level so did not show the full height. The heights were actually comparable to the consented scheme. On page 7 under section headed 'Highways/Parking' should read 'with a separate access to serve each dwelling', and on page 7 under Recommendation should say 'That planning permission be granted subject to the applicant entering in to a legal agreement to secure an off-site contribution of £60,000 towards affordable housing and subject to the following condition(s): (Note: If the Legal Agreement is not completed within 6 months then the application may be refused without further reference to Committee)'.

Further, an additional condition no. 15 be included to state: 'Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Classes A - H of Part 1 and Class A of Part 2 of the Order shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority - Reason: To protect the amenities of the locality, to maintain a good quality environment and to ensure that the development complies with policy CP2.

During public participation, Anthony Lewis (South Downs Residents Association) and Councillor Jordan representing Compton and Shawford Parish Council spoke in objection to the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Bell stated that the proposal conflicted with the Compton and Shawford Village Design Statement in terms of its style (which was not pastoral) the closeness of spacing (between dwellings) and the removal of garages. The proposals also represented overdevelopment and

the comparative roof heights (when compared with previously submitted schemes) were important as was the metrage of development. The resubmitted scheme was more than marginally different as it had narrower dwellings with a higher roof line, which affected the design. The raising of the roofline was to make the upper floors larger. Landscaping was also a concern due to the removal of trees and also the garage of plot 2 was close to the boundary. There was also no reason to provide such a wide driveway (to access the rear garage of plot 2), and a landscape plan was required.

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, subject to an additional condition that details of slab levels be submitted in order to determine height levels.

Item 2: Proposed development of two new dwellings and works to existing dwelling (AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED 1.12.17)
High Beech, 11 Harestock Road, Winchester
Case number: 17/01845/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which referred to corrections to page 14 of the report under the section headed 'proposal' which should read that 'the density of the site will be 21.42 dwellings per hectare'; to page 17 of the report under section headed 'Impact on amenities of neighbouring property' which should read 'there is approximately 1.8 metres between the side elevations and the boundaries with Three Maids Close and 13 Harestock Road'. In addition, Condition 13 should read as follows: 'The parking spaces shown shall be provided in accordance with the approved plans before the new dwellings are first occupied and thereafter permanently retained. The garage building, if constructed, should be used only for the purpose of accommodation for motor vehicles or other storage purposes incidental to the use of the associated dwelling as a residential dwelling'.

During public participation, Julie Ayre (speaking on behalf of Peter Finch) and Richard Barns spoke in objection to the application and Paul Airey (Agent) spoke in support of the application and all 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, subject to an additional condition to remove Permitted Development Rights.

Item 3: Construction of 2 dwellings with associated access from Petersfield Road.
24 Quarry Road, Winchester
Case number: 17/02784/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which referred to corrections to page 26, third line should read:

'Therefore the differences between the proposals are the most significant to assess'; to page 28 – Ecology section. No further update needed. Ecologist is happy with recommendations in the biodiversity survey. Therefore the last sentence in the section is withdrawn, and to page 28 – Ecology section, penultimate sentence should read: 'The ecologist had no objection subject to condition 13'.

During public participation, John Cooper (St Giles Hill Residents Association) spoke in objection to the application and Byrony Stala (Agent) and Hannah Smith (Architect) spoke in support of the application and all answered Members' questions thereon.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse permission for the reasons of Policies DM15, DM16 and DM17 with reference to the impact on the local character, the St Giles Hill Neighbourhood Design Statement and design policy, including the effect on high quality design, and also the overbearing impact on the neighbouring property – Mallory House, with the exact wording delegated to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman.

Item 4: Rear ground floor extension with loft conversion of all loft space.
34 Fair View, Alresford
Case number: 17/03163/HOU

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which referred to further neighbour comments that had been received. The comments provided raised no further objections to those addressed within the officer report, but did provide suggestions if planning permission were granted.

During public participation, Peter Blewett and Keith Divall spoke in objection to 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.

Item 5: Erection of dwelling
Land Adjacent To Oakley House, Trampers Lane, North Boarhunt.
Case number: 17/02829/FUL

During public participation, Linda Winter spoke in objection to the application and Neil March (Agent) and Daryll Pynigar (applicant) spoke in support of the application and all answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Cutler stated that the application concerned the interpretation of policy MTRA3 when applied to small villages without a defined boundary and also to policies to support the community other than via

the Neighbourhood Plan process. The Parish Council and 28 local residents were in support of the application and the interpretation of policy needed to be flexible. In addition, when considering the impact of the infill of gaps, there was no major material infill in the gap (between Oakley House and Archoyce) as it was hedged and a mobile unit was already in location (on the application site) and there would be no major material effect on the gap; therefore the interpretation of policy MTRA3 could be less rigidly applied. The applicant had close links with the village, being a member of the Parish Council and his residence in the village would help maintain his employment at Droxford Fire Station. A house on the site would also make it worthwhile to undertake further ecology work on the site, as the alternative was to keep horses (on the site) which would destroy its biodiversity. The proposal was for a family house which would add to the variety of housing in Boarhunt and he gave his personal support to the application as policy MTRA3 could be interpreted differently.

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

Item 6: (AMENDED PLANS) Two storey and single storey extensions, conversion of outbuilding and addition of covered area to the rear (PART-RETROSPECTIVE).

White Hart, Hambledon Road, Denmead, Waterlooville

Case number: 17/01583/FUL

During public participation, Councillor Morphett (Denmead Parish Council) spoke in objection to 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.

RESOLVED:

1. That the decisions taken on the Development Control Applications in relation to those applications 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 (Smallwood, Cross Way, Shawford) an additional condition be included that details of slab levels be submitted in order to determine height levels.
 - (ii) That in respect of item 2 (High Beech, 11 Harestock Road, Winchester) an additional condition be included to remove Permitted Development Rights..
 - (iii) That in respect of item 3 (24 Quarry Road, Winchester) the application be refused permission for the reasons of Policies DM15, DM16 and DM17 with reference to the impact on the local

character, the St Giles Hill Neighbourhood Design Statement and design policy including the effect on high quality design and also the overbearing impact on the neighbouring property – Mallory House, with the exact wording delegated to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman.

3. **PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS (APRIL TO DECEMBER 2017)**

(Report PDC1102 Refers)

The Committee gave consideration to the report which provided a summary of the enforcement appeals received for the period 1 April to 31 December 2017.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and adjourned between 12.30pm and 2.00pm and concluded at 3.15pm.

Chairman