

PLANNING COMMITTEE

24 September 2020

Attendance:

Councillors
Evans (Chair)

Clear
Gordon-Smith
Laming

McLean
Ruffell

Deputy Members:

Councillor Pearson (Standing Deputy for Councillor Read)
Councillor Bentote (Standing Deputy for Councillor Rutter)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Bell, Brook, Clementson and Ferguson (Cabinet Member for Local Economy)

Apologies for Absence:

Councillors Rutter and Read

[Full audio recording and video recording](#)

1. **APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR FOR THE MEETING**

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Clear be appointed as Vice-Chair for the meeting.

2. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Evans declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 1 (Winchester Cathedral Offices, 9 The Close, Winchester – case number: 20/01294/FUL) as a friend of Winchester Cathedral. However, she stated she had taken no part in discussions regarding the application, therefore she took part in the consideration of this item and voted thereon.

Councillor Pearson declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 1 (Winchester Cathedral Offices, 9 The Close, Winchester – case number: 20/01294/FUL) as a sideman and friend of Winchester Cathedral. However, he stated he had taken no part in discussions regarding the application, therefore he took part in the consideration of this item and voted thereon.

3. **MEMBERSHIP OF SUB-COMMITTEES ETC**

There was no action to report under this item.

4. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 20 August 2020 be approved and adopted.

5. **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 PDC1168.

6. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS (WCC ITEMS 7 - 9) (PDC1168 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 considered the following items:

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

7. **WINCHESTER CATHEDRAL OFFICES, 9 THE CLOSE, WINCHESTER, SO23 9LS (CASE NUMBER: 20/01294/FUL)**

Item 7: To site 112 chalets, 2 security chalets and a Nativity chalet within the grounds of Winchester Cathedral. Chalets will be located in the Inner Close, Outer Close, Paddock area around the Old Minster and war memorial, to form the annual Christmas Market but adjust to allow for broader distancing measures. A temporary walkway will be provided through the paddock and around the east end of the Cathedral for visitor safety. The market will operate between the hours of 1000 and 2000 from Thursday 19 November through to Tuesday 22 December.

Winchester Cathedral Offices, 9 The Close, Winchester, SO23 9LS
Case number: 20/01294/FUL

The Service Lead - Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out additional information and an amended presentation received from the applicant regarding visitor safety measures and confirmation of the applicant's willingness to erect a temporary fence at the western end of the site to provide further screening to address the concerns of residents.

During public participation, Steven Partridge spoke in objection to the application and Philip Holroyd-Smith spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Ferguson spoke on this item as Cabinet Member for Local Economy.

In summary, Councillor Ferguson stated that she was speaking as Cabinet Member for Local Economy and in support of the application to change the layout of the Winchester Christmas Market. She recognised the ongoing concerns regarding the spread of coronavirus and the need to closely monitor infection figures and the Government restrictions but stressed the importance of the Christmas market to the local economy with retailers struggling to recover after the recent lockdown restrictions. She stated that the Christmas market had a positive impact on the City and significantly increased the number of visitors to Winchester with market research indicating a third more people visiting for the Christmas markets, many from outside the local area generating vital footfall as the pandemic continued to have a negative impact on the high street.

In conclusion, Councillor Ferguson stated that the application sought to extend the area and space between chalets to create social distancing to ensure continued public safety and adherence to a comprehensive events management plan for agreement by the Safety Advisory Group for what was considered to be the best Christmas Market in the area. She urged the Committee to consider the importance of the Christmas market on the Winchester economy in these difficult times and the employment opportunities generated from this event and grant permission for the application.

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.

8. **144 LADWELL, LADWELL HOUSE, HURSLEY ROAD, HURSLEY, SO21 2LE (CASE NUMBER: 20/00377/FUL)**

Item 8: Section 73A application relating to decision no: 17/00375/FUL (Demolition of the existing house and erection of new house – 01/06/2020) (Retrospective)
144 Ladwell, Ladwell House, Hursley Road, Hursley SO21 2LE
Case number: 20/00377/FUL

The Service Lead - Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which provided planning history dates and set out in full changes to conditions 1 to 7 which would be required to reflect the nature of this application submitted under s73A if the committee were minded to approve the application.

During public participation, Councillor David Killeen (Hursley Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Neil March (agent) spoke in support of the application and all answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Bell stated that she was objecting to the Section 73A application as the new building was not compliant with what was agreed in 2017. She stated that Hursley Parish Council had not been notified in accordance with

due process and the demolished dwelling had been replaced by a new dwelling that was not compliant, was unsympathetic to the original dwelling and was out of keeping with the area.

In conclusion, Councillor Bell contested the planning officer report of 2017 which stated that the original dwelling was of no architectural merit and raised objection that the applicant was not required to make a Community Infrastructure Levy payment contribution and urged the committee to refuse the application.

At the conclusion of debate, the committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons and subject to the updated conditions and informatives set out in the Report and the Update Sheet.

9. **WHEATLANDS, WOODMAN LANE, SPARSHOLT, SO21 2NS (CASE NUMBER: 20/00293/HOU)**

Item 9: Replacement of a garden shed.

Wheatlands, Woodman Lane, Sparsholt, SO21 2NS

Case number: 20/00293/HOU

For clarification, the Council's Public Law Manager clarified that Caroline Horrill would be speaking in a personal capacity regarding the application but due to her interest in the application and in her role as Councillor, would be required to leave the meeting after giving her representation to the committee.

During public participation, Caroline Horrill (applicant) spoke in support of the application. Immediately after making her representation Caroline Horrill left the virtual meeting.

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.

10. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS (WCC ITEMS 11 & 12) (PDC1168 AND UPDATE SHEET REFERS)**

11. **LEXINGTON RIDGE, WELL HILL PADDOCK, HAMBLEDON ROAD, DENMEAD, HAMPSHIRE, PO7 6HB (CASE NUMBER: 20/00701/FUL)**

Item 11: Replacement fire destroyed stables for private and commercial veterinary use.

Lexington Ridge, Well Hill Paddock, Hambledon Road, Denmead

Case number: 20/00701/FUL

During public participation, Councillor Kevin Andreoli (Denmead Parish Council) and Robert Tutton (agent), spoke in objection to the application, although due to technical issues on Mr Tutton's virtual meeting connection, a statement was read out on behalf of Robert Tutton by the Democratic Services officer.

At the conclusion of debate, the committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Report.

12. **THE HAVEN, HAMBLEDON ROAD, DENMEAD, PO7 6ER (CASE NUMBER: 20/01383/FUL)**

Item 12: Application Reference Number: 17/00907/FUL

Date of Decision: 15/06/2017 Condition Number(s): Condition 9

Adjustment to condition 9, following consultation with HCC and the assigned Civil Engineers, to avoid any conflicts with neighbouring land. Proposal to reduce the 'x' distance for visibility splays at the access to Hambledon Road to 2m

The Haven, Hambledon Road, Denmead

Case number: 20/01383/FUL

The Service Lead Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out the following: full additional conditions 2 to 4 to be added to the decision, if the committee were minded to approve the application; and five additional letters of objection and one additional letter of support had been received.

During public participation, Sandra Wakefield and Councillor Kevin Andreoli (Denmead Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Jane-Anne Coulter and Jonny Ribbans (agent) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillors Clementson and Brook spoke on this item as Ward Members.

In summary, Councillor Clementson stated that she was speaking in support of the application having seen the development prolonged due to a number of factors. She refuted the comments made in objection and concurred with the views of Hampshire County Council and the assigned Civil Engineer that the 'x' distance for visibility splays at the access to Hambledon Road could be reduced from 2.4 metres to 2 metres and would not significantly cause risk to road safety. She agreed that Hambledon Road was a busy 'B' road, along with others in the area but traffic was not excessive in this location.

In conclusion, Councillor Clementson stated that she had been involved with the site since 2019 and had seen completion delayed. She stated that she had arranged a meeting with the adjacent landowners, the developers and other parties in order to address concerns regarding visibility splay, flooding and drainage and concluded that the cutting and continued maintenance of the hedgerow on the adjacent landowner's boundary would resolve the need for this application.

In summary, Councillor Brook stated that she was speaking in objection to this application as Ward Member and also referencing the points made by Mr Wakefield, the adjacent neighbour. She advised that she became aware of this proposal four years ago in respect of the need for the 2.4 metre 'x' distance for visibility splays at this access in order for the development to meet the planning permission given with any reduction to this distance putting public safety at risk with vehicles protruding onto the main carriageway. She explained that Hambledon Road was positioned on a hill with cars travelling downhill often

exceeding the 30mph speed limit and speed watch patrolling this site regularly with previous studies indicating 3,800 vehicle movements per day. She considered that developers had neglected the need to cut back or remove existing vegetation or to achieve a resolution with Mr & Mrs Wakefield as owners of the neighbouring property on this matter.

In conclusion, Councillor Brook stated that Hambledon Road was not a typical residential road. There were already existing difficulties with passing traffic without a limited visibility splay. In addition, she considered that although 2 metre visibility splays were usual on an urban residential street, Denmead was a rural location with no street lighting for half a mile in either direction so could not be treated as such and she urged the committee to support the objections raised by the Parish Council and local residents and refuse the application.

For clarification, the Public Law Manager reminded the committee that many of the issues raised were not material planning considerations and that this application should be determined on its planning merits which in this case related to highway safety.

In response to questions, Mr T Fisher, Senior Transport Planner, Hampshire Highways confirmed that the advice of the Highways Authority was that a 2 metre set back in this instance was considered acceptable and achievable. There was contentment with the characteristics and access of the road with a precedent of existing street frontages along the road evident and it was reported that there were no recorded accidents over the past five years in the vicinity.

In respect of the vegetation concerns, he clarified that the Highways Authority did have the ability to request and enforce vegetation trimming where it encroached upon public highway land and this would be concluded by Highways local area office who were responsible for local maintenance if it was deemed in the best interests of highway safety.

At the conclusion of debate, the committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons and subject to the updated conditions and informatives set out in the Report and the Update Sheet.

RESOLVED:

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 above.

The virtual meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned between 11.52am and 2pm and concluded at 3.45pm.

Chair