

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, 31 October 2018**

Attendance:

Councillors  
Ruffell (Chairman)

Read  
Clear  
Cunningham

Izard  
McLean, (except for Item 14)  
Rutter

Deputy Members:

Councillor Weir (Standing Deputy for Councillor Evans) (except for Items 11 to 14)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Horrill (Leader), Cutler, Griffiths (Portfolio Holder for Health and Wellbeing), Hutchison, Huxstep, Laming, Learney, Murphy, Thompson and Warwick (Portfolio Holder for Environment).

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Becker, Bell, Brook (Portfolio Holder for Built Environment) and Prince.

Apologies for Absence:

Councillors Evans

---

### 1. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Weir declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 6 (Garrison Ground, Bar End Road) due to her role as Trustee of Winchester Action for Climate Change (WinACC).

Councillor Izard made a personal statement in respect of item 14 (6 Valley Close, Colden Common) that as a Ward and Parish Councillor he had refrained from taking part in discussions regarding this site, therefore he had not predetermined the application and took part in the discussion and vote thereon.

### 2. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS** (Report PDC1119 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 PDC1119.

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

3. **GARRISON GROUND, BAR END ROAD, WINCHESTER**

Item 6: Demolition of existing structures and erection of a new Winchester Sport and Leisure Centre, with associated access, landscaping, drainage and car parking

Garrison Ground, Bar End Road, Winchester

Case number: 18/01469/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out the full conditions of the application which had been re-worded and rearranged.

In addition, a verbal update was provided outlining a revision to the updated Condition 9 to read "BREEAM excellent".

During public participation, Tom Brenan (WinACC), Patrick Davies and Mary Tiles (City of Winchester Trust), John Doyle, Phil Gagg, Jeremy Mortimer, Janet Berry (Highcliffe Community Forum for Action (HCFfA)) and Emma Back (Winchester Sport, Art and Leisure Trust (SALT)) spoke in objection to the application and Mike Lawless (LA Architects), David Sherry (Winchester and District Athletics Club) and Mike Fisher (Penguins Swimming Club) spoke in support of the application and all answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Murphy spoke on this item as Ward Member. Councillors Laming (Badger Farm and Oliver's Battery), Learney (St Barnabas), Hutchison and Thompson (St Paul) also spoke on this item as Ward Members for their respective contiguous wards.

In addition, Councillors Griffiths (Portfolio Holder for Health and Wellbeing) and Warwick (Portfolio Holder for Environment) also addressed the Committee on this item in their capacity as Portfolio Holders.

A summary of the points raised by each of these Members is set out below:

Councillor Laming

- The pre-application did not meet the budget or facility mix;
- Building design only just reached the requirements of the green standard
- Maximised Carbon Reduction
- Use of polycarbonate material and maintenance costs
- Omission of the Depot Site from the application
- Layout fails to address design
- Failure to provide pedestrian link to residents in Milland Road
- Provision of electric vehicle charging points less than 75% of spaces

- Agree the need for a Leisure Centre but not at any cost – design does not meet aspirations
- Solar PV

#### Councillor Murphy

- Pre-application flaws with improvements to be made
- Adverse impact on traffic for the residents of Highcliffe and negative impact on neighbouring properties
- Children crossing hazardous
- Car Park taking up invaluable green space at the Garrison Ground
- Provision of disabled parking and pick up/drop off points
- Negative impact on the four aims of the Winchester Town Access Plan
- Failure to improve congestion and air quality
- Inadequate pedestrian and cycle routes – increase to the 40 bicycle spaces provided
- Noise and light pollution as a result of the hours of use – request reduction in this from 0500- 0000 hours to 0600 – 2300 hours
- Carbon footprint of the development – 50% more energy than current
- Winchester parking set to increase by 22%
- Contravenes Winchester Town Access Plan and the Lower Carbon Council vision

#### Councillor Learney

- Transport aspects – too far to travel for residents using public transport
- The increase to carbon footprint caused by car journeys
- Contrary to Local Plans Part 1 and Part 2 (LPP1 and LPP2) and policies
- Transport assessment is inadequate with proposed increase in traffic over city bridge
- Insufficient bus services with the No.4 bus service running less than hourly and no evening service and the park and ride bus service not scheduled to operate on a Sunday; only with the goodwill of Stagecoach currently – transport review required
- Pedestrian and cycling access routes inadequate
- Priority given to vehicles at the roundabout junction at Bar End causing access issues for pedestrians and cyclists
- Updated transport assessment required to make mitigation measures

#### Councillor Hutchison

- Supports new Sports and Leisure which provides a fantastic opportunity. However considered the application to be too premature
- Failure to adhere to LPP2, particularly Policy DM14 – outside the settlement boundary
- Does not fit in the surrounding neighbourhood
- Disconnected facilities
- Poor links with the Depot site and HCC building
- Missed opportunity for development to make a contribution to resource
- Application should contribute to wider regeneration objectives

### Councillor Thompson

- Would support a new Leisure Centre that provided facilities for all sports and abilities equally but considered that concerns existed in the facility mix of this application.
- Considered the application to be an aquatic facility primarily with the sports hall as add on. Sports hall and club facilities weak as contributed the same numbers as the existing River Park Leisure Centre and unable to cope with the growing population.
- Safe and attractive walking and cycling routes required to support the application
- Request an amendment to Condition 34 to reduce the hours of use due to conflicts with local residents and poor consultation on this matter
- Facilities expensive to manage
- A fully costed business plan was required – Operator yet to be appointed, in danger of granting permission for a Leisure Centre that cannot be afforded.

Councillor Warwick addressed the main issues raised by Members in respect of Energy Efficiency, Biodiversity and Traffic and Transport, as summarised below:

- The Council were working with experts to achieve an 'A' rated Energy Performance Certificate
- There would be a 16.8% reduction in CO2 which exceeded the building's energy regulation requirements.
- Photovoltaic cells were provided
- The new centre was 35% larger than the RPLC and also provided a 20metre training pool, splash zone, and hydrotherapy suite and therefore had a greater carbon footprint by comparison. However, this was offset by a reduction in emissions of 27% per sq. mtr from the existing centre
- The Leisure Centre was a facility for all- the many residents over the whole of the District and beyond.
- HCC had incorporated the Bar End location as part of their transport assessment. A new crossing point would be installed along Bar End Road, a new bus stop would be positioned close to the Leisure Centre as the Council would continue to work with HCC and the bus operator to investigate additional bus routes.
- Sustainable Travel Plan to be produced once an operator for the Leisure Centre had been appointed.

### Councillor Griffiths

- The application had received no objection from the statutory consultees.
- In 2013 the Council agreed that Bar End was the correct location for the provision of the new Leisure Centre, since this time there had been consultations and conversations with many residents, groups and skilled partners in the sports and leisure industry to listen and understand views to design one facility for all on the Garrison Ground, through to King George V.
- The development offered: soft landscaping design; cohesive links with the athletic track; drainage to the south of the site; energy efficiency; extensive use of glazing; sports and community events; connecting building externally;

- recycling materials; open viewing galleries which were accessible for all; a significant improvement to current facilities;
- When appointed, the operator would be tasked with producing a Traffic Management Plan, in conjunction with the Council and HCC to adhere to the Council's aims and aspirations.

During consideration of this item, a number of questions were raised by the Committee and the following responses were received:

In respect of the proposed hours of use, the Council's Environmental Health Scientific Officer clarified that advice given was not specific to the hours of use, set out in the report and that officers had sought to adequately control any potential impact from noise and lighting via thorough conditions. As a result, officers were satisfied with the hours of use proposed (0500 to 0000 hours) and advised that this would be a matter for the Committee to consider when reaching its decision.

Hampshire County Council's Highways Officer confirmed that the plans had been taken on board in respect of the Movement Strategy. In addition, he stated that there were existing bus services operating in Winchester and the surrounding area that ran to and from the facility and that it was anticipated that 68% of trips to the site would not travel through the town centre, with the majority of visitors expected by car, due to its close proximity to the motorway.

To address concerns regarding energy efficiency and sustainability, Members attention was drawn to the report which set out the CO2 savings submitted by the applicant that identified a 16.8% reduction in energy within the fabric of the building. The application provided three electric vehicle charging points on site, with possible scope to increase this level in the future based on need. The Head of Development Management clarified that the applicant had a Strategy in place to mitigate carbon emissions and the report covered this aspect in planning terms, therefore officers were satisfied that the application met Policy CP11 in this respect.

In relation to drainage measures for surface water on site, the Council's Head of Drainage and Special Maintenance clarified that the site was a naturally sloping site to an adjacent watercourse that led to the River Itchen via the Bar End Industrial Estate where there was good drainage provision. He stated that the proposed water would be held on site in a SUDS/Retention system and discharged to the adjacent watercourse at the naturally occurring greenfield run off rate so there wouldn't be any increase in the flow of water to the existing watercourse. It was confirmed that there will be a maintenance plan for the on site drainage, and all the required details for drainage have been adequately conditioned within the report and there were no concerns that this would not be achieved.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons and subject to the informatives set out in the Report and the revised conditions set out in the Update Sheet, subject to: the verbal update to amend the wording of revised Condition 9 to read 'BREEAM excellent'; an amendment to revised Condition 34 to change the hours of use to read 0500 to **2300** hours;

and an additional condition requesting details of the Travel Plan to be submitted to officers, with the precise wording of this condition to be delegated to the Head of Development Management, in consultation with the Chairman

4. **LAND AT STANMORE ESTATE, NORTH OF STANMORE LANE, WINCHESTER**

Item 8: Reserved matters application – consent for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for new dwellings behind St Lukes Church.

Land at Stanmore Estate, North of Stanmore Lane, Winchester

Case number: 18/01792/REM

During public participation, David Chafe 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.

5. **30 CLIFTON ROAD, WINCHESTER, SO22 5BU**

Item 9: Proposed light well and bike store

30 Clifton Road, Winchester, SO22 5BU

Case number: 18/01807/HOU

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out; an amendment to Condition 3; and an addition to Condition 5.

During public participation, John Hearn 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 the Update Sheet.

6. **34 CHALK RIDGE, WINCHESTER, SO23 0QW**

Item 10: Change of use from a 6 bedroom C4 class HMO to a 7 bedroom Sui Generis House in Multiple Occupation

34 Chalk Ridge, Winchester, SO23 0QW

Case number: 18/01782/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which made reference to the Article 4 Direction on the agenda on this item and stated that this direction did not apply to this particular application site.

During public participation, Tim Prowting 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 and the Update Sheet.

7. **THE BUNGALOW, SOUTHWICK ROAD, NORTH BOARHUNT, FAREHAM**

Item 11: Change of use of land from travelling showpersons permanent family plot to private residential garden for The Bungalow.  
The Bungalow, Southwick Road, North Boarhunt, Fareham  
Case number: 18/01732/FUL

In response to questions from Members, the Head of Strategic Planning clarified that there was an identified need assessed as part of the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document (DPD) requiring 15 pitches for gypsy and travellers and 24 pitches for travelling showpersons across the District.

It was noted that at present the Council had achieved the 15 pitch target for gypsy and travellers but had a shortfall in the provision of the number of travelling showpersons plots of eight plots; this was based on the evidence carried out in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2016. Therefore, there was a need for the site to be retained for this purpose and the application was recommended for refusal and contrary to Policies within the emerging Gypsy and Traveller DPD (Policy TR1) and adopted Local Plan Part 1 Policy CP5.

During public participation, Michael Knappett (agent) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Cutler raised the following points:

- Supported the application as the Gypsy and Traveller DPD had not yet been formally adopted by the Council as Policy and was therefore unenforceable.
- Local knowledge is that not all other pitches allocated for this purpose in Boarhunt are occupied by travelling showpersons suggesting there is no demand.
- Applicant trying to sell property for 14 months as no longer residing in this District and property remains unoccupied but unable to be sold due to this restriction.
- Suggested this is a virtual site which will never be able to be used by travelling showpersons as the owner would not allow its use so would not increase the Council's pitch provision in any event.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the following reason: The DPD has not yet been adopted and this site is not now available (as was proposed in the DPD).

8. **RENWOOD, OUTLANDS LANE, CURDRIDGE, SO30 2HD**

Item 12: Change of use from Nil use to Residential  
Renwood, Outlands Lane, Curdridge, SO30 2HD  
Case number: 18/01942/FUL

During public participation, Simon Fleming and Eric Bodger (Curdrige Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Ronald Ross (applicant) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Huxstep raised the following points:

- Land used as valuable amenity space by Outlands Road residents for informal parking on an unallocated basis
- No established need for this application
- Contrary to Policies DM15, DM16, DM17 and DM23 as land a local rural asset and should be refused.

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, subject to an amendment to Condition 3 to ensure that boundary hedging must not exceed 1.2 metres in height.

9. **BUSHMOOR FARM, WESTLEY LANE, SPARSHOLT, WINCHESTER**

Item 13: Erection of a 3 bedroom, two storey agricultural workers dwelling, car parking and garden area (AMENDED DESCRIPTION)

Bushmoor Farm, Westley Lane, Sparsholt

Case number: 18/01133/FUL

During public participation, Sue Wood (Sparsholt Parish Council), Tony Charles and Edward Wheeler (applicant) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Horrill raised the following points:

- Requested that the Committee consider approving the application for this house in its rural countryside location to support the applicant's successful farming business.
- Applicant received a DEFRA grant for butchers unit, purchased more land and possessed a commitment to farming of over 11 years
- Satisfied all other criteria of Bruton Knowles' assessment and meets the requirements of Policy DM11.
- 1.16 full time equivalents was the calculation used by Bruton Knowles but this did not incorporate the applicant's time spent in the butchering unit and the packaging of produce which all took place on site.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant permission for the following reasons: the proposal accords with Policy DM11. Conditions would be included to protect trees and ecology, to require details of materials and



drainage and to restrict occupation to an agricultural worker. with precise wording to be delegated to the Head of Development Management, in consultation with the Chairman.

10. **6 VALLEY CLOSE, COLDEN COMMON, SO21 1UN**

Item 14: (AMENDED PLANS) Development of a single dwelling on the land adjacent to number 6 Valley Close  
6 Valley Close, Colden Common, SO21 1UN  
Case number: 18/01809/FUL

During public participation, Mary Shields, David Harwood and Rob Veck spoke in objection to the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse permission for the following reasons: contrary to Policy DM16, does not respond positively in terms of its design, scale and layout.

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 6, permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the informatives set out in the Report and the revised conditions set out in the Update Sheet, subject to: the verbal update to amend the wording of revised Condition 9 to read 'BREEAM excellent'; an amendment to revised Condition 34 to change the hours of use to read 0500 to **2300** hours; and an additional condition requesting details of the Travel Plan to be submitted to officers, with the precise wording of this condition to be delegated to the Head of Development Management, in consultation with the Chairman

(ii) That in respect of item 11, permission be granted for the following reason: The DPD has not yet been adopted and this site is not now available (as was proposed in the DPD).

(iii) That in respect of item 12, permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Report, subject to an amendment to Condition 3 to ensure that boundary hedging must not exceed 1.2 metres in height.

(iv) That in respect of item 13, permission be granted for the following reasons: the proposal accords with Policy DM11. Conditions would be included to protect trees and ecology, to require details of materials and drainage and to restrict occupation to an agricultural worker, with precise wording to be

delegated to the Head of Development Management, in consultation with the Chairman; and

(v) That in respect of Item 14, permission be refused for the following reasons: contrary to Policy DM16, does not respond positively in terms of its design, scale and layout.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned between 12.45pm and 2.00pm and concluded at 5pm.

Chairman