

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Thursday, 19 November 2020

Attendance:

Councillors
Evans (Chair)

Rutter
Clear
Gordon-Smith

Laming
McLean (except for item 8)
Ruffell

Deputy Members:

Councillor Pearson (as deputy for Read)

Other Members that addressed the meeting:

Councillors Cutler, Lumby, Power and Weir.

[Full audio recording and video recording](#)

1. **APOLOGIES AND DEPUTY MEMBERS**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Read, with Councillor Pearson attending as standing deputy member.

2. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Evans declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 14 (Wickham Group Surgery, Houghton Way, Wickham – case number: 20/01484/FUL) as a patient of the surgery and local resident and due to her role as Ward Member and Wickham Parish Councillor. Councillor Evans stated that she was asked by doctors to write a letter of support in principle, which she had stated she was happy to do but that she reserved her position as to a future planning application. Councillor Evans confirmed that she had taken no part in discussions regarding the application and that she had not pre-determined the planning application therefore she took part in the consideration of this item and voted thereon.

Councillor Clear declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 14 (Wickham Group Surgery, Houghton Way, Wickham – case number: 20/01484/FUL) as a patient of the surgery and local resident and due to her role as Ward Member and Chair of Wickham Parish Council. However, she stated that she had taken no part in discussions regarding the application, therefore she took part in the consideration of this item and voted thereon.

Councillor Laming declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 8 (Olivers Battery Road South, Olivers Battery – case number: 19/02852/FUL) due to his role as Ward Member. He took part in the discussion and vote thereon.

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

There was no action to report under this item.

4. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD 22 OCTOBER 2020 AND REVISED MINUTE FOR THE MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE 24 SEPTEMBER 2020 - LEXINGTON RIDGE, WELL HILL PADDOCK, HAMBLEDON ROAD, DENMEAD - CASE NUMBER: 20/00701/FUL**

RESOLVED:

1. That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 22 October 2020 be approved and adopted; and

2. That the revised minute for the meeting held on 24 September 2020, as set out on the agenda, in respect of Lexington Ridge, Well Hill Paddock, Hambledon Road, Denmead (item 11 – Case number: 20/00701/FUL), 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 PDC1171.

6. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS - WCC ITEMS 7 - 10 AND SDNP ITEM 12 AND WCC ITEMS 13 AND 14 AND UPDATE SHEET**

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. **BROADGATE LODGE, BROAD STREET, ALRESFORD, SO24 9AN (CASE NUMBER: 20/01373/HOU)**

Item 7: Erection of a new garage with first floor/office store within the curtilage of a listed building

Broadgate Lodge, Broad Street, Alresford, SO24 9AN

Case number: 20/01373/HOU

During public participation, James Ekins spoke in objection to the application and Philip Piper (agent) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Power stated that the concern was that now the garage projected in front of the building line of the adjacent garage, it was visible in the conservation area and in the setting of a listed building. It was no longer of a size or visibility commensurate with an ancillary building to a domestic dwelling. She referred to the pictures submitted by the agent which demonstrated how the garage dominated a pleasant flint wall typical of the architecture in the conservation area, which she stated contributed to the sense of place. Councillor Power also referred to the planning history of the site which highlighted the unacceptable density.

In conclusion, Councillor Power stated that the garage had no respect for its setting and therefore should not be permitted in a conservation area on the plot of a listed building.

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.

8. **93 - 95 OLIVERS BATTERY ROAD SOUTH, OLIVERS BATTERY**
(CASE NUMBER: 19/02852/FUL)

Item 8: (AMENDED PLANS 30.06.2020) Re-develop the land at the rear of 93-95 Olivers Battery Road South to provide seven new dwellings
93-95 Olivers Battery Road South, Olivers Battery
Case number: 19/02852/FUL

During the officer's presentation, Councillor McLean experienced technical difficulties which resulted in him being unable to listen to the presentation in its entirety. Following advice from the Council's Public Law Manager, Councillor McLean withdrew from the consideration of this item, taking no further part in the discussion or vote thereon.

The Service Lead - Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out an update to the section headed 'Principle' of the officer report, in response to a letter received on 16 November 2020 from Strutt and Parker relating to the viability and marketing of the site. However, the information contained in the letter did not change the officer's recommendation which was to permit the application.

During public participation, Roger Farthing, Nigel Smith and Councillor David Kirkby (Olivers Battery Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Jason Murphy (architect) 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, subject to additional wording: to Condition 4 (bullet point 3) 'including retention of existing landscaping features within the site'.

9. **112 TEG DOWN MEADS, WINCHESTER, SO22 5NZ**
(CASE NUMBER: 20/01390/FUL)

Item 9: Erection of 2no. 3 bedroom dwellings with associated vehicle access.
112 Teg Down Meads, Winchester, SO22 5NZ
Case number: 20/01390/FUL

During public participation, Joanne McLeod (Adams Hendry consulting on behalf of Mr and Mrs Brown) and Janine Wright spoke in objection to the application and Jeremy Tyrell (agent) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Weir stated that she was supporting over 30 local residents who were objecting to the application. Councillor Weir considered that planning policy criteria had not been adequately addressed prior to making the recommendation set out in the report and that the context of development had important ramifications for the character of the whole Teg Down area. She stated that on the planning criteria, the proposal was of questionable design quality and responded poorly to the neighbouring buildings and local context. It also resulted in a striking loss of green space, lacked distinctive character and reduced the quality of the local environment. Councillor Weir suggested that the increased density of two additional dwellings tipped the balance towards urbanisation and failed to respect the countryside feel of the area as a whole. She made reference to the objection submitted by the City of Winchester Trust, the development and its barriers towards wildlife corridors, the impact on the natural environment and also expressed concerns regarding insufficient parking provision.

In conclusion, Councillor Weir stated that the proposal was not for family homes, due to their limited amenity and recreational space. She believed that there were at least eight more corner plots that could be considered as alternative potential sites for development. Councillor Weir also referred to the principle of developing gateway sites in Teg Down which had been established with corner developments, whereby one additional two to three bed dwellings had been successfully built, offering generous off road parking and amenity space which this proposal failed to achieve. Therefore Councillor Weir urged the committee to refuse the application.

At the conclusion of debate, the committee voted to refuse permission for the following reasons: contrary to policy CP13 of Local Plan Part 1 and policies DM15 and DM16 of Local Plan Part 2 by reason of the number and size of the units, resulting in an overdevelopment of the site, out of keeping with the pattern and spatial characteristics of the area to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

10. **WARNER COURT, NORTHLANDS DRIVE, WINCHESTER, SO23 7AX
(CASE NUMBER: 20/01532/FUL)**

Item 10: Replacement of timber & metal balcony screens with glass screen/steel handrail and steel posts.

Warner Court, Northlands Drive, Winchester, SO23 7AX

Case number: 20/01532/FUL

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.

Application inside the area of the South Downs National Park (SDNP):

11. **THE OLD BANK, HIGH STREET, WEST MEON, HAMPSHIRE, GU32 1LJ
(CASE NUMBER: SDNP/19/05173/FUL)**

Item 12: (AMENDED PLANS received 31/07/2020) Erection of single detached dwelling.

The Old Bank, High Street, West Meon, GU32 1LJ

Case number: SDNP/19/05173/FUL

The Service Lead - Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out additional information in relation to the following: the status of additional roof plan provided to the Parish Council; an explanation of the abbreviations; ecology survey and water voles, and car parking, cycle storage and turning area.

During public participation, Neil March (Southern Planning Practice on behalf of Ingrid Sparshott and neighbours) spoke in objection to the application and Richard Lowe (agent) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Lumby highlighted the location of the site and outlined the detrimental impact of the proposal on neighbouring properties. He raised concerns regarding vehicle access along the A32 and the dangers encountered by existing road users, pedestrians and cyclists and made reference to the River Meon which he stated was a site of importance for nature conservation that the SDNP were duty bound to protect.

In conclusion, Councillor Lumby recognised that the officer's recommendation was finely balanced and he raised the concerns of local residents regarding the enforceability of the conditions set out in the report, should the application be permitted. He urged the committee to undertake a site visit to assess access concerns and overlooking issues on site prior to further consideration. Failing this, he suggested the committee refuse the application as contrary to SD1, SD2, SD11 and dark night skies policies.

At the conclusion of debate, the committee agreed to defer determination to a future meeting of the committee in order to allow for a site visit to view the proposal in the context of its location and to assess access and overlooking issues.

The committee was reminded that, in accordance with the Council's Constitution, previous speakers would have the right to restate their comments when this application came back to committee for consideration.

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

12. **MAXWELL HOUSE, MINCINGFIELD LANE, DURLEY, SO32 2BR**
(CASE NUMBER: 20/00720/HOU)

Item 13: (Part Retrospective) Erection of detached 4 bay garage with gym and home office with roof space. Associated alterations to ground levels including the erection of retaining walls.

Maxwell House, Mincingfield Lane, Durley, SO32 2BR

Case number: 20/00720/HOU

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.

13. **WICKHAM GROUP SURGERY, HOUGHTON WAY, WICKHAM, PO17 5GU**
(CASE NUMBER: 20/01484/FUL)

Item 14: Extension to Wickham Surgery of 3.8m (namely the Gudgeon Wing) and alterations to roof void (currently used as storage) to provide an additional 12 no. GP consulting rooms. Associated external works with hard and soft landscaping.

Wickham Group Surgery, Houghton Way, Wickham, PO17 5GU

Case number: 20/01484/FUL

The Service Lead - Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out amendments and points of clarification to the following areas of the report: an amendment to 'Impact on Character of the Area', an addition to the 'Design/Layout' and clarification of the number of letters supporting and objecting to the proposal and details of an additional representation received from Geoff Phillpotts (Vice Chair Wickham Community Land Trust).

During public participation, Wendy Greenish (on behalf of Wickham Society and Wickham Residents' Association) and Geoff Phillpotts (on behalf of Wickham Community Land Trust) spoke in objection to the application and Councillor Loraine Rappe (Wickham Parish Council), Ed Kennedy, Dr Ben Inglis and Martyn Rogers 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 stated that he was in support of the application as it provided a good, urgently required healthcare facility which was of importance to the local community. The surgery was currently at full capacity with significant waiting times reported. An additional facility would only improve the existing issues experienced by residents. He stated that he was satisfied with the assurances provided by Fareham Borough Council and developers that new residents at the anticipated Welborne development would not be registered at the Wickham surgery and would have alternative access to a new surgery to be provided on site.

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 informative: Recommend the applicants to liaise with other land owners using the road to the doctors' surgery and other facility and services to consider the display of signage in order to make users aware of the presence of pedestrians within the surrounding road network and also be considerate to others when parking.

RESOLVED:

That the decisions taken on the Planning Applications in relation to those applications outside and inside 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 (93-95 Olivers Battery Road South, Olivers Battery: Case number: 19/02852/FUL) permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Report and the Update Sheet, subject to additional wording: to Condition 4 (bullet point 3) 'including retention of existing landscaping features within the site'.
- (ii) That in respect of item 9 (112 Teg Down Meads, Winchester (Case number: 20/01390/FUL) permission be refused for the following reasons: contrary to policy CP13 of Local Plan Part 1 and policies DM15 and DM16 of Local Plan Part 2 by reason of the number and size of the units, resulting in an overdevelopment of the site, out of keeping with the pattern and spatial characteristics of the area to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
- (iii) That in respect of item 12 (The Old Bank, High Street, West Meon - Case number: SDNP/19/015173/FUL) determination of the application be deferred to a future meeting of the committee, in order to allow for a site visit to view the proposal in the context of its location and to assess access and overlooking issues.
- (iv) That in respect of item 14 (Wickham Group Surgery, Houghton Way, Wickham - Case number: 20/01484/FUL) 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 informative: Recommend the applicants to liaise with other land owners using the road to the doctors' surgery and other facility and services to consider the display of signage in order to make users aware of the presence of pedestrians within the surrounding road network and also be considerate of others when parking.

14. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2279 - 61 TOWER STREET, WINCHESTER (PDC1173)**

During public participation, Sarah Strangeway spoke in objection to the proposal.

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 2279 be confirmed.

The virtual meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned between 1.15pm and 2pm and concluded at 4.55pm.

Chair

1.