

PLANNING COMMITTEE

26 May 2021

Attendance:

Councillors:

Evans (Chair) (P)

Bentote (P)
Edwards
Laming (P)
Pearson (P)

Read (P)
Ruffell
Rutter (P)
Westwood

Deputy members:

Councillor Bronk (Standing Deputy for Councillor Westwood)

Councillor McLean (Standing Deputy for Councillor Ruffell)

Councillor Weir (Standing Deputy for Councillor Edwards)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Cook and Ferguson

1. **APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR FOR 2021/22**

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Rutter be appointed Vice-Chairperson of the Committee for the 2021/22 Municipal Year.

2. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Pearson made a personal statement in respect of Item 12 (Land off New Road, Swanmore) as he had previously commented on road safety issues on New Road but he had not commented on this application. Following advice from the Legal Officer at the meeting Councillor Pearson took part in the discussion and vote thereon.

Councillor Bentote made a personal statement in respect of item 12 (Land off New Road, Swanmore), that he was a resident of New Road and also that item 13 (Straight Path Paddock, Pricketts Hill, Shedfield) was located within the Whiteley and Shedfield parish which he represented and he spoke and voted on these items.

In respect of Item 14 (Greenwood Manor, Greenwood Lane, Durley), Councillor McLean declared a personal interest in that he had attended school with the applicant and he spoke and voted on this item.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 April 2021 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 PDC1184.

5. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS (WCC ITEMS 8-10) (PDC1184 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):

6. **WINNALL FLATS, WINNALL MANOR ROAD, WINCHESTER, SO23 0LX (CASE NUMBER: 20/02729/FUL)**

Item 8: 1. Erection of additional residential accommodation comprising 32 shared ownership apartments and 41 sub market rent apartments within two five storey apartment buildings and three shared ownership two storey dwellings. 2. Re-landscaping of site to provide pocket park and parking. 3. Upgrading of entrances to existing blocks.

Winnall Flats, Winnall Manor Road, Winchester

Case number: 20/02729/FUL

The Service Lead - Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out that comments had been received from the South Downs National Park Authority in January and that the SDNPA had 'no comments' on the proposal. The Update Sheet also set out details to changes in the Report to Condition 2 (landscaping plans) and also Conditions 5 and 6 (to refer to Passivhaus low energy standards). A verbal update was made to add the words "building standards" to condition 5.

During public participation, Brian Pitts and Patrick Davies spoke in objection to the application and Ross Alyward (Agent), Debbie Rhodes (Winchester City Council New Homes Delivery Team) and Mark Johnson (UBU Landscape

Architecture) 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 and in relation to condition 5 to add the word "building standards"

7. **RUTLAND HOUSE, 11 PARK ROAD, WINCHESTER, SO22 6AA (CASE NUMBER: 20/02543/FUL)**

Item 9: Erection of three dwelling houses, with associated landscaping, access and parking

Rutland House 11 Park Road Winchester

Case number: 20/02543/FUL

The Service Lead - Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet - in the section headed 'Impact on neighbouring property', the following was added to paragraph 3:

'Plot 3 does contain two windows in the north western elevation, one at ground floor level and one at first floor level. These windows will serve stairwells which are considered to be an internal area of low amenity value, and are not considered to generate a significant level of overlooking to the properties within the Kings Barton development to north of the site. This does not affect the officer recommendation to approve the application.'

During public participation, Mrs Burnley spoke in objection to the application and Nicole Servini was also present to answer questions and Chris Rees (Agent) spoke support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

- Residents had expressed serious concerns about the application.
- There was precedent for infill in Park Road but the size, height (being 3 stories and approximately 11 metres in height) and impact on neighbouring properties at the boundary to the north and west due to the change in ground levels would make the proposed development imposing.
- The drawings were schematic and did not show the height of the new houses. Plans would have been of benefit to show the relationship with neighbouring properties from within the plot.
- A site visit was required to understand the site, as Rutland House was imposing at approximately 12 metres in height, but the proposed development would be 11 metres in height and be much closer to the boundary with the Kings Barton development.
- The Kings Barton developments were approximately 2- 4.5 and 7 metres below ground level and the height of the proposed dwellings would result in an overbearing impact and loss of privacy and overlooking of gardens.
- There were also concerns about road safety on Park Road due to an increase in the number of vehicles, including refuse vehicles, accessing the

site. The nearby railway bridge resulted in oncoming traffic not being seen as it was single lane and possibility of parked vehicles on the road curve by the railway bridge was a concern to residents.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to visit the site on 22 June 2021 to view the site in the context of its surroundings and in particular its relationship with the Kings Barton development to the north and west and to consider traffic issues.

8. **1 EARLSDOWN, NORTHBROOK AVENUE, WINCHESTER, SO23 0JW
(CASE NUMBER: 20/01581/HOU)**

Item 10: Single storey extension, internal alterations and partial demolition to the West of the property.

1 Earlsdown, Northbrook Avenue, Winchester

Case number: 20/01581/HOU

During public participation Polly Lane (applicant) 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.

9. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS (WCC ITEMS 12 - 14) (PDC1184 AND UPDATE SHEET REFERS)**

10. **LAND OFF NEW ROAD, SWANMORE (CASE NUMBER: 19/02421/FUL)**

Item 12: Proposal Description: Residential development comprising 60 no. dwellings and 4 no. flats with access from New Road together with car parking, landscaping, public open space and associated works

Land off New Road, Swanmore

Case number: 19/02421/FUL

The Service Lead - Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which referred to a letter received from Swanmore Parish Council suggesting that the attenuation pond at the front of the site could and should be an underground storage tank. The Update Sheet also referred to an email received from the owner of the neighbouring property (Belmont Farm) to the effect that he had not been contacted by Persimmon Homes to request permission for ecological surveys on his land. There was also a typing error on page 130 of the report where the comment by Hampshire Swift Society should read 'many more'.

During public participation, Cllr Jon Woodman (Swanmore Parish Council) commented on the application and Greg Allison (Agent) 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.

11. **STRAIGHT PATH PADDOCK, PRICKETTS HILL, SHEDFIELD, HAMPSHIRE (CASE NUMBER: 20/02243/FUL)**

Item 13: Variation of conditions 2 and 4 to add an additional 3 mobile homes (18/01264/FUL)

Straight Path Paddock Pricketts Hill Shedfield

Case number: 20/02243/FUL

The Service Lead - Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out details of an additional Condition 15 relating to drainage and an additional comment received from Shedfield Parish Council.

In addition, a verbal update was provided stating that Condition 4 on page 183 of the Report was unclear and would require further discussion.

During public participation, Mr and Mrs Sherwood (applicant), Mr Angus Murdoch (Agent) and Mr Maurice Hickman 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 clarification of Condition 4 and also Condition 13 in respect of nitrate neutrality for the 3 additional pitches.

12. **GREENWOOD MANOR, GREENWOOD LANE, DURLEY, SO32 2AP (CASE NUMBER: 21/00471/HOU)**

Item 14: Proposal Description: Install 2no windows and external staircase and exit, with a gabled canopy, to rear elevation of previously-converted stable building; erect car port and enclosed garage combined to front drive and single equipment/store building in rear garden (within the curtilage of a listed building; amended proposal)

Greenwood Manor, Greenwood Lane, Durley

Case number: 21/00471/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.

RESOLVED:

1. That the decisions taken on the Planning Applications in relation to those applications inside and 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 9, the item be deferred to the next meeting of the Committee to allow for a visit to the site on 22 June 2021 to view the site in the context of its surroundings and in particular its relationship with the Kings Barton development to the north and west and to consider traffic issues.

(ii) That in respect of item 13, permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Report and the Update Sheet subject to clarification of Condition 4 and also Condition 13 in respect of nitrate neutrality for the 3 additional pitches.

13. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2294 - HOCKLEY GOLF CLUB, WINCHESTER ROAD, TWYFORD (PDC1183)**
(PDC1183)

Councillor Bronk stated that he had predetermined this item and would withdraw from the Committee for consideration of this item as he was a member of Twyford Parish Council and its Planning Committee and its full Council meeting which had sought the Tree Preservation Order. Councillor Bronk withdrew from the Committee and did not speak or vote on this item (although he remained in the room sitting apart from the Committee in the public gallery).

During public participation Councillor Cook read out a statement on behalf of Cllr Chris Corcoran from Twyford Parish Council who could not be in attendance.

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

- Hockley Golf course was located in a historic and important environmental setting.
- Some trees had been cleared to allow a reservoir to be more easily maintained.
- A yew tree had been removed to reduce shadowing on a course green.
- The healthy and mature trees enhanced the beauty of the South Downs National Park and their removal exposed the reservoir to view due to its hillside location.
- A management plan for the reservoir was required rather than the removal of the trees; the removal of which would lead to a sterile environment and the loss of biodiversity.
- The trees were prominent in the landscape and provided high visual amenity value.
- The representations of the Parish Council and the recommendations of the Tree Officer's report were supported.

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 2294 be confirmed.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned between 12.25pm and 2.00pm and concluded at 4.25pm.

Chair