

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Thursday, 12 September 2019**

Attendance:

Councillors  
Evans (Chairperson)

Rutter  
Bronk  
Clear  
Laming

McLean  
Read  
Ruffell

### **Deputy Members:**

Councillor Pearson (as deputy for Cunningham)

### **Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:**

Councillors Gottlieb, Hutchison, Horrill, Porter, Tod and Weir (Cabinet Member: Local Economy)

### **Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:**

Councillor Miller

### **Apologies for Absence:**

Councillors Cunningham

---

## 1. **CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chair made the following announcements:

- (i) That the consideration of Item 7 (Walcote Place) had been deferred to an additional meeting of the Planning Committee on 23 September 2019; and
- (ii) That, at the Chair's discretion, the total amount of speaking time for objectors and supporters who had registered to speak on Item 8 (Land East of Station Road) had been extended to 15 minutes each.

## 2. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Evans declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of Item 8 (Land East of Station Road, Winchester) due to her role as the Council's representative on the South Downs National Park (SDNP). However, as she had taken no part in their discussions of this matter thereon, she spoke and voted on this application.

At the invitation of the Service Lead: Built Environment, the Committee had visited the site relating to Item 8 on 10 September 2019, to assist them in assessing the proposal in relation to its setting. The site visit was attended by Members present on the Committee, with the exception of Councillor Pearson who stated that he was familiar with the site and would therefore take part in the discussion and vote thereon.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 August 2019, be approved and adopted.

4. **WHERE APPROPRIATE, TO ACCEPT THE UPDATE SHEET AS AN ADDENDUM TO THE REPORT.**

The Committee agreed to receive the Update Sheet as an addendum to Report PDC1144.

5. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

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

6. **WALCOTE PLACE, HIGH STREET, WINCHESTER (CASE NO. 19/01205/HOU) - DEFERRED APPLICATION FOLLOWING SITE VISIT ON 10 SEPTEMBER 2019**

Item 7: Single storey side extension to existing residential property.

Walcote Place, High Street, Winchester, SO23 9AP

Case number: 19/01205/HOU

This item was deferred to an additional meeting of the Planning Committee on 23 September 2019 at 10:00am in the Walton Suite.

7. **LAND EAST OF STATION ROAD, WINCHESTER, HAMPSHIRE. (CASE NUMBER: 19/00601/OUT)**

Item 8: (AMENDED DESCRIPTION AND REVISED PLANS) (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH ACCESS) Mixed Use development involving the erection of buildings up to 5 storeys from street level, a lower ground floor level and basement to provide up to 17,972 sqm of office (use classes B1), up to 1,896 sqm of mixed uses including potential retail, restaurant/cafe, bar and leisure uses (use class A1, A3, A4 and D2) and retention and refurbishment of the old registry office, associated car parking in basement (up to 95 spaces) and minimum of 156 cycle parking spaces and associated works.

Land East of Station Road, Winchester

Case number: 19/00601/OUT

The Service Lead: Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out a correction to Condition 2 to read P0021 – Proposed vertical limits of deviation from AOD – section AA' and advised that since the publication of the report, the following correspondence had been received:

A letter from the City of Winchester Trust; a petition signed by seven residents of Gladstone Street; an email circulated to Members from Councillor Gottlieb and

one further letter of objection. The matters raised in this correspondence did not introduce any new material reasons to alter the recommendations set out in the report.

During public participation, John Beveridge (City of Winchester Trust), Rose Burns, Patrick Davies, John Hearn and Chris Higgins spoke in objection to the application and Sarah Davis (Winchester Business Improvement District (BID)), Alex Lifschutz (Architect, Lifschutz Davidson Sandilands (LDS)), Rachel Murrell (Planning Agent: Baron Willmore) and Ian Charie (Applicant for Winchester City Council) spoke in support of the application and all answered Members' questions thereon.

The Chair reminded the Committee that correspondence had been received from WinACC raising objection to the application in respect of financial viability and transport blue print and also highlighted to Members its main objections.

During public participation, Councillors Tod and Hutchison spoke on this item as Ward Members, Councillors Gottlieb and Horrill spoke on this item as contiguous Ward Members for St Michael and Wonston and Micheldever respectively and Councillor Weir spoke on this item as Cabinet Member: Local Economy. In addition, Councillor Weir also incorporated a statement on behalf of Councillor Hiscock in his capacity as contiguous Ward Member for St Bartholomew as he was unable to attend the meeting due to personal reasons. All answered Members' questions thereon.

In summary, Councillor Tod raised the following points:

- Comments in respect of height, mass, car parking and street frontages;
- Welcomed the improvements to the level of car parking and the reduced height of the building;
- Planning Committee had an important role in making its decision whether to approve this outline planning application;
- The scheme provided high quality office space but it was recognised this was not perfect and that planning conditions had been used to secure additional measures;
- Noted that consultees had expressed concerns regarding the height and massing;
- Residents of Gladstone Street had also expressed concerns;
- Queried if the Council would have enough control over the development through reserved matters and requested that planners scrutinise this to ensure adequate conditions and measures were in place;
- Considered the reduction to 95 car parking spaces to be definite progress, wished to see this reduced further but also recognised the need for a level of parking to make the scheme viable;
- If minded to approve the application, suggested that the car parking be restricted by condition for use by the offices only and not for use as a general car park.

In summary, Councillor Gottlieb raised the following points:

- Stated that the site had a history and a high level of planning issues and he urged the Committee to defer the application for further consideration;
- Expressed concern regarding the scale, height and mass and the strong representations made in this respect by the City of Winchester Trust and many other groups, including the Historic Environment Officers who had raised concerns regarding the scale of the proposal;
- Only 2 images have been submitted – further images should be submitted to enable a fuller assessment of the proposals;
- Made a comment re: Conditions 3 & 4 stating that they did not give the control needed and were not enforceable;
- Condition 5 was not a reasonable condition;
- Residents of Gladstone Street will have an amenity towering over their homes;
- Fully supported the principle of the development and the benefit to the local economy but did not consider that this proposal to be the appropriate way to achieve the outcome.

In response to a question from the Committee, it was noted that the Design and Access statement had many images of the site and the proposal, but Cllr Gottlieb stated that these were not of the whole building and the wire lined drawings were not adequate.

In response to a question of clarification from the Committee, it was noted that the outline proposal was approving the height and dimension. In addition, it was emphasised that the proposal had received the support of the Winchester BID and the Hampshire Chamber of Commerce and that the objection being raised by Cllr Gottlieb related to the design.

In summary, Councillor Hutchison raised the following points:

- Supported the comments raised by Councillors Tod and Gottlieb;
- Considered the brief to be a problem: a balance was required for those that live in the area as well as those that work in the area;
- Design and scale were the primary concerns. Not in opposition to the principle of development;
- Many positive aspects of the project with a good team of Architects but stated that the outline planning application had been submitted too prematurely without adequate consideration of the points raised at the event held in February;
- Massing a major concern, not only for those involved in the consultation process but also to SDNP, Historic England and the Council's Historic Environment and Landscape Teams;
- Stated that there were other design issues such as access and parking especially given the Council's declaration of a climate emergency;
- Suggested that parking be looked at carefully, if the Committee was minded to approve the outline planning application and considered that the conditions were not robust enough to address the height, mass and scale of the development;

- Urged the Committee to defer the application to appoint an Architect to carry out detailed plans or refuse the outline planning consent.

In response to a clarification question raised by the Committee, Cllr Hutchinson confirmed that the architects appointed were a good team.

In summary, Councillor Horrill raised the following points:

- Winchester was an outstanding District that she was pleased to represent;
- Station Approach was an underperforming area from an economic point of view. The proposed scheme would generate £81m for the local economy and over 1,000 employment opportunities once completed;
- Stated that the scheme accords with Policy CP8 (economic growth and diversification), Policy CP14 (developing potential at all sites shall be maximised) and CP9 (redevelopment potential) and she urged the Committee to commit to its Policies;
- In the approved Local Plan the area had been identified as land for mixed use development;
- Councillor Horrill stated that significant efforts had been made to ensure the scheme enhanced and extended the public realm;
- The Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) grant funding was crucial towards achieving an important and positive development;
- The proposal seeks to retain and respect the records office and the registry office buildings;
- In order to respect the scale of adjacent residential properties the overall height of the scheme had been reduced;
- The scheme also improved provision for cyclists and public transport;
- She urged the Committee to approve the outline planning application.

In response to questions from the Committee regarding the level of consultation that had taken place, Councillor Horrill clarified that extensive discussions had taken place following the first aborted attempt at Station Approach, with Cabinet (Station Approach) Committee being held in public together with Councillors and interested parties welcome to attend. Many exhibitions, discussions and a considerable input from a broad level of consultees had also taken place.

In summary, Councillor Weir raised the following points on behalf of Councillor Hiscock:

- Wished to raise points also in his capacity as a Hampshire County Councillor;
- The proposal was a key part in the wider development of the area in the Movement Strategy;
- There was a chronic shortage of office space and this scheme provided this in a highly sustainable location;
- The LEP champions the development.

In summary, Councillor Weir raised the following points:

- Cabinet had sought third party advice from strategic advisors and the Council had been encouraged as the Planning Authority to take up a Regional Design Team prior to the consideration of this outline planning application;

- Measures had been taken to reduce the height and steps taken to reduce the upper limit of car parking to 95 spaces;
- Work would continue with local residents to consider the impact on the residential area;
- Stated that there was a narrow window to take advantage of this key development for Hampshire and the M3 corridor;
- The Council was in stronger position for funding to wider public realm improvements with an approval of the outline planning application at this stage;
- Recognise the need to strike a balance between the need to bring forward development in this area and the interests of residents and the historic nature of Winchester;
- The regional design team and the public open forum would have a crucial role in the design process;
- Councillor Weir stated that the scheme was an exemplary low carbon development which was essential for attracting new and retaining old businesses by improving growth and she urged the Committee to approve the application.

In response to a clarification question from the Committee, Cllr Weir confirmed that the proposal provided economic opportunities and was the right time for this site to be developed. She also confirmed that the architects appointed were highly skilled and that the delivery proposals for the scheme had previously been considered by the Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet at their meetings held on 14 August 2019 and 28 August 2019 respectively.

Sarah Davis (Winchester Business Improvement District) spoke in support of the proposal explaining that there was significant demand for high quality Grade A office space in a central location.

At the conclusion of his representation and in response to questions from Members regarding the location of the plant, Alex Lifschutz (LDS) clarified that relocation of part of the plant to the basement could be considered as a possibility. However, there would be a cost and an engineering outcome attached to this as well as a cost from the loss of area space. Any figures in this respect had not been factored into proposals for the scheme and estimates would need to be costed.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr Hickman, Head of Programme, addressed the Committee providing clarification on the reduction to the car parking proposed for the scheme which had been factored into the Movement Strategy and park and ride opportunities with an assessment due to be completed by the end of the year. It was reported that there was capacity in existing Park and Rides but it was hoped that the majority of people working and visiting the development would travel by rail due to the location of the site.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to grant outline planning 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 parking be restricted to commercial use for the development only, unless otherwise agreed in writing.

8. **MINSTRELS, UPLANDS ROAD, WINCHESTER SO22 6ER (CASE NUMBER: 19/01159/FUL)**

Item 10: Demolition of existing dwelling & replacement with 1 no. five bedroom dwelling

Minstrels, Uplands Road, Winchester, SO22 6ER

Case number: 19/01159/FUL

The Service Lead: Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out an addition to Page 57 of the report to read 'Recommendation: Application Approved'.

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

In summary, Councillor Weir raised the following points:

- Road made up of mostly bungalows with retired residents with an unadopted road causing problems for residents;
- There are concerns about this development and, if the Committee were minded to approve, it was suggested that a condition be added to ensure repair costs are met by the developer;
- Councillor Weir stated that she understood that one dwelling had been removed and sought clarification from the case officer on any intention to split the site.

In response to questions from the Committee in relation to private road access, the Planning Solicitor clarified that any concerns regarding access would be a property matter for the owners to discuss between themselves.

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.

9. **HOME LANE COTTAGE, HOME LANE, SPARSHOLT SO21 2NN (CASE NUMBER: 19/00585/HOU)**

Item 11: This proposal includes a two-storey extension to the existing dwelling on the south-west elevation, to provide extra lounge and bedroom accommodation and a single storey extension to the west elevation, to provide a kitchen/dining space. The scheme also includes an external double garage (amended plans)

Home Lane Cottage, Home Lane, Sparsholt, SO21 2NN

Case number: 19/00585/HOU

During public participation, Parish Councillor Sue Wood (Sparsholt Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Jon Walthoe (applicant) spoke in support of the application and all answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Horrill raised the following points:

- Thanked the applicant for endeavouring to find a satisfactory outcome with objectors but there were still concerns regarding this application;
- Much effort had gone into the development of the VDS for the village and Home Lane was particularly important to the settlement;
- Considered the design did not meet the quality of alterations expected within the VDS;
- Contrary to CP20 as the proposal did not conserve and enhance the historic environment through preparation of the conservation area;
- New development would be supported if it protected and enhanced the asset and the setting but this proposal was not considered suitable;
- Due consideration should be given to non heritage design assets at the design stage;
- Questioned that the extension met with Policy as it stands;
- Contrary to DM15 (local distinctiveness) – failed to respect the special quality of the conservation area, landscape or have regard to the cumulative effect on the character of the area;
- Urged the Committee to reject the application and recognise the need for a more sympathetic development.

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 additional condition requiring details of the window glazing to be used in the roof lights to be submitted for approval and an additional informative requiring construction traffic to be well managed to minimise disturbance to neighbouring properties.

10. **SHADY OAKS FARM, DURLEY BROOK ROAD, DURLEY SO32 2AR (CASE NUMBER: 19/01415/FUL)**

Item 12: Use of land for storage of caravans/camper vans in addition to the agricultural use which would be retained.

Shady Oaks Farm, Durley Brook Road, Durley, SO32 2AR

Case number: 19/01415/FUL

The Service Lead: Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out an addition to reason for refusal 2 to read ‘contrary to Policy DM23 of Winchester Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations’ and outlined the details of an email received from the agent to Committee Members which raised point in support of the application.

During public participation, Kim Blunt (agent) and Jade Reeves (applicant) 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 the Update Sheet.

11. **THE BUNGALOW, BOTLEY ROAD, BISHOPS WALTHAM SO32 1DR (CASE NUMBER: 19/00464/FUL)**

Item 13: Change of use of domestic swimming pool to commercial use

The Bungalow, Botley Road, Bishops Waltham, SO32 1DR

Case number: 19/00464/FUL



The Service Lead Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out further correspondence that had been received: a consultation from Hampshire Countryside Service and a response from the applicant's Transport Engineer; and an additional reason for refusal following the comments from Hampshire Countryside Service as follows:

'The proposal use has a significant adverse impact on the amenity and recreational value of the path and the enjoyment gained from its use by the public in general'.

In addition, a verbal update was provided stating that additional wording be added to the reasons for refusal: 'Contrary to Policy DM18 of the adopted Local Plan Part 2 (access and parking)'.

During public participation, Parish Councillor Robert Shields (Bishop Waltham Parish Council), Ricky Fernandez (applicant) and Laura Skilton spoke in support of the application and all answered Members' questions thereon.

In response to questions from Members, the Service Lead: Built Environment clarified that the Highways Authority had raised objection to the application as a statutory consultee, on the grounds of highway safety issues following consideration of a transport assessment which had been submitted by the applicant to support the proposal.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Report and the Update Sheet and the additional reasons for refusal to include 'Contrary to Policy DM18 of the adopted Local Plan Part 2 (access and parking), as set out above'.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the decisions taken on the Planning 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 8, permission be granted 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 parking be restricted to commercial use for the development only, unless otherwise agreed in writing.

(ii) That in respect of item 11, permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Report, subject to an additional condition requiring details of the window glazing to be used in the roof lights to be submitted and an additional informative requiring construction traffic to be well

managed to minimise disturbance to neighbouring properties; and

(iii) That in respect of item 13, permission be refused for the reasons set out in the Report and the Update Sheet and the additional reasons for refusal to include 'Contrary to Policy DM18 of the adopted Local Plan Part 2 (access and parking)'.

12. **CONFIRMATION OF TPO2259 - LAND AT TROSNANT, SUN LANE, ALRESFORD**  
(Report PDC1145 refers)

During public participation, Councillor Porter spoke on this item as Ward Member. In summary, Councillor Porter raised the following points:

- Tree overhanging into bowling club's green next door and having an effect on the edge of the bowling green;
- Conscious this specimen of tree can grow to a substantial size and concern has been expressed that this could cause further damage as the tree increases in size with potential that this could adversely effect the foundations of the clubhouse in future.

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 2259 be confirmed.

The meeting commenced at 9.45am, adjourned between 12.05pm and 2.00pm and concluded at 4.45 pm

Chair