

PLANNING COMMITTEE

14 February 2019

Attendance:

Councillors
Ruffell (Chairman)

Read	Izard
Clear	McLean
Cunningham	Rutter
Evans	Berry

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Weir

1. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Rutter declared that in respect of item 12 (Lower Farm, School Lane, Headbourne Worthy) she was a member of Headbourne Worthy Parish Council. She had not discussed or voted on this item when it was considered by the Parish Council and as she had not predetermined the application, she would speak and vote on this item.

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 10 January 2019 be approved and adopted.

3. **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 PDC1126

APPLICATIONS OUTSIDE OF THE AREA OF THE SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK

4. **15 SILWOOD CLOSE, WINCHESTER (CASE NO: 18/01986/FUL)**

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out an addition of condition 15 which read:

‘Development shall cease on site if, during any stage of the works, unexpected ground conditions or materials which suggest potential contamination are encountered, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Works shall not recommence before a site assessment has been

undertaken and details of the findings along with details of any remedial action required (including timing provision for implementation), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be completed other than in accordance with the approved details.

NB - potentially contaminated ground conditions include infilled ground, visual evidence of contamination or materials with an unusual odour or appearance.

Reason: In order to secure satisfactory development and in the interests of the safety and amenity of future occupants.'

During public participation, Deborah Willsher and Kim Blunt spoke in objection to the application and Jeremy Tyrell, Agent, spoke in support and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Weir stated that:

- There was not a Neighbourhood Design Statement or Plan for the Bereweke Road area and as there was a lack of designated housing sites it led to infill applications.
- It was a small site, with the development "shoe-horned in" next to the pavement and represented over development.
- There was an accumulative effect of development on road safety.
- It needed to be ensured that the beech tree was not put at risk.
- Potential problems with road safety from the access at peak times.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee resolved to refuse permission in accordance with policies DM15, DM16 and DM17, as the quantum of development would appear cramped in the street scene and it was out of character with the prevailing character of the area. The precise wording was delegated to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman.

5. **63 ST CROSS ROAD WINCHESTER, (CASE NO: 18/02549/HOU)**

During public participation, James Bone spoke in objection 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 that an additional condition be included to the effect that no lighting should be installed without first submitting details to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

6. **4 DE LUNN BUILDINGS, JEWRY STREET, WINCHESTER (CASE NO: 18/02661/FUL)**

During public participation, Zac Gurtekin, Ian Tait and Phrynette Dickens spoke in objection 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.

7. **LAND AT ST SWITHUNS CHURCH, LONDON ROAD, HEADBOURNE WORTHY (CASE NO: 18/01978/FUL)**

This item was not considered at this meeting and was deferred to the next meeting of the Committee.

8. **LOWER FARM, SCHOOL LANE, HEADBOURNE WORTHY, WINCHESTER (CASE NO: 18/02679/FUL)**

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out that the Tree Officer had withdrawn his objection following investigation into the root area of the Horse Chestnut to the west of the outbuilding. Therefore paragraph 2 of the Landscape and trees section was amended to read:

‘The landscape plan shows the removal of a number of smaller trees by the access, track and parking area. The loss of these smaller trees is considered to be acceptable. There is a significant Chestnut to the west of the outbuilding noted as T3 Horse Chestnut in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) that has a root protection area within the proposed excavation area, it is considered that this tree does not have a TPO served on it and is not readily visible in the street scene. While the loss of the tree would be lamentable it is not considered to have a high amenity value in the street scene for its loss to warrant a refusal reason.’

In addition, the Ecologist comments, last sentence should read: ‘The Ecologist raised no objection subject to conditions requiring the measures set out in the Ecological Assessment be followed’.

During public participation, Sam Chisnell spoke in objection to the application and Gimma Macpherson, Kings Worthy Parish Council, and Richard Osborn, Agent, spoke in support 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.

9. **ORCHARD GATE, LORDSWOOD, HIGHBRIDGE (CASE NO: 18/02332/HOU)**

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which stated that Condition 02 should read as follows:

‘The residential accommodation hereby permitted, as shown in drawing No. 02_Revision B, shall be occupied in association with the dwelling house or shall be used for the purposes ancillary to the dwelling house (Orchard Gate). At no time shall the building be occupied as an independent planning unit of residential accommodation, business, commercial or industrial purpose.’

During public participation, Maggie Hill, Colden Common Parish Council spoke in objection to the application and Mrs S Rayner spoke in support and answered Members' questions thereon.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse permission as the development was tantamount to a new dwelling in the countryside and was contrary to policy MTRA4. The precise wording was delegated to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman.

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 7 (15 Silwood Close) permission be refused in accordance with policies DM15, DM16 and DM17, as the quantum of development would appear cramped in the street scene and it was out of character with the prevailing character of the area. The precise wording was delegated to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman.

(ii) That in respect of item 8 (63 St Cross Road) permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Report and the Update Sheet and an additional condition be agreed to the effect that no lighting should be installed without first submitting details to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

(iii) That in respect of item 13 (Orchard Gate, Lordswood, Highbridge) permission be refused as the development was tantamount to a new dwelling in the countryside and was contrary to policy MTRA4. The precise wording was delegated to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman.

10. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2235 - WATER LANE, BISHOPS SUTTON, ALRESFORD (PDC1125)**

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 2235 be confirmed.

11. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2233 - PITT MANOR COTTAGE, KILHAM LANE (PDC1127)**

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 2233 be confirmed.

The meeting commenced at 9.30 am and adjourned between 12.10pm and 2.00pm and concluded at 4.10 pm

Chairman