

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 24 May 2023

Attendance:

Councillors
Rutter (Chairperson)

Edwards
Achwal
Small
Laming

Gordon-Smith
Cunningham
Read
Lee

Other members in attendance:

Councillors Porter and Warwick

[Video recording of this meeting](#)

1. **APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRPERSON FOR 2023/24**

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Edwards be appointed Vice-Chairperson of the committee for the 2023/24 municipal year.

2. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

Members advised that the following applications were within their respective wards.

- Agenda items 6 and 10 - Councillor Laming.
- Agenda item 8 – Councillor Read.
- Agenda item 9 – Councillor Rutter.
- Agenda item 11 Councillor Achwal and Councillor Small.

Regarding agenda item 10 (6 Pine Close, Olivers Battery, Winchester, SO22 4JX (Case number: 23/00617/HOU). Councillor Edwards advised that he had had a recent conversation with the applicant and had decided to withdraw from the meeting for this item only.

3. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING.**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 19 April 2023 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 the report.

5. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS (WCC ITEMS 7-10) (PDC1220 AND UPDATE SHEET REFERS)**

A copy of each planning application decision was available to view on the council's website under the respective planning application. The committee considered the following items:

6. **1 CATWAYS, HURSLEY, HAMPSHIRE, SO21 2JT (CASE NUMBER: 22/00951/FUL)**

Proposal Description: Proposed new dwelling on garden land at 1 Catways (AMENDED PLANS).

The application was introduced and during public participation, Polly Evans, and James Brownlie spoke in objection to the application, Caroline Downie spoke in support of the application and Councillor Eleanor Bell, on behalf of Hursley Parish Council spoke against the application and answered members' questions.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED

The committee voted against the recommendation to approve planning permission and instead voted to refuse permission for the proposal. In reaching this decision they raised the following planning matters which weighed in favour of refusing planning permission:

1. That the proposal was contrary to the requirements of Local Plan Part One CP10 and Local Plan Part Two DM18 as it failed to provide satisfactory vehicular access by utilising a pedestrian access and posed a risk to highway and pedestrian safety due to poor visibility.
2. That the proposal was contrary to Local Plan design and character policies DM15, DM16, and point 1 of DM17. It did not respond to the character of the area for reasons of siting, design, and compact layout with respect to the proximity to trees and pedestrian pathways and therefore harmful to the amenities of the area.
3. That a legal agreement was necessary to secure a package of treatment and mitigation for phosphates and this agreement had not been provided.

The precise wording of these reasons to be delegated to the Planning Delivery and Implementation Manager in liaison with the Chairperson of the Committee.

7. **THE MEDICAL CENTRE, FRIARSGATE, WINCHESTER (CASE NUMBER: 22/01882/FUL)**

Proposal Description: (AMENDED DESCRIPTION; AMENDED PLANS AND DOCUMENTS) Demolition of the derelict Friarsgate Medical Centre and installation of an interim public realm with archaeological interest, with modular street furniture installations and associated development to be used as a 'meanwhile use' development in Friarsgate, Winchester.

The application was introduced, and members were referred to the update sheet which provided additional information regarding the following matters.

1. The correction of a typographical error in paragraph 4 on page 60.
2. The deletion of the reference to a listed building application in the opening paragraph of the Historic Environment section on page 63.
3. The confirmation that the long-distance views of the site from key viewpoints such as St Giles Viewpoint had also been assessed.
4. The confirmation that the proposal also includes 4x 6m lighting columns spread throughout the site, alongside low-height lighting and strip lighting to illuminate the hoardings at the rear of the site.

During public participation, Ian Tait, and Richard Baker on behalf of the City of Winchester Trust spoke in objection to the application, and Stewart Pegum spoke in support of the application and answered members' questions.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED

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. **FOREST VIEW, FURZELEY ROAD DENMEAD HAMPSHIRE PO7 6TX (CASE NUMBER: 22/02074/FUL)**

Proposal Description: Construction of single-storey tourist accommodation building comprising 2No two bedroom lodges and 1No three bedroom lodge.

The application was introduced and during public participation, Ray Dudman and Ben Mugford spoke in support of the application and Councillor Kevin Andreoli, on behalf of Denmead Parish Council spoke against the application.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED

The committee agreed to refuse permission for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

9. **EVERSLEY PARK RECREATION GROUND, LOADER CLOSE, KINGS WORTHY (CASE NUMBER: 23/00485/FUL)**

Proposal Description: The installation of a play tower unit in Eversley Park play area as part of a larger replacement project.

The application was introduced, and members were referred to the update sheet which advised that a further objection had been received from a neighbour who had already commented on this application.

During public participation, Patricia Dowdell spoke in objection to the application, and Councillor Colin Crossburn spoke in support of the application and answered members' questions.

Councillor Jackie Porter spoke as a ward member and expressed several points on behalf of residents, which could be summarised as follows:

- That the playground had grown in size over time, indicating its popularity and importance within the community and offered a collection of play equipment that catered to the needs of many children daily.
- That residents in Holdaway Close had expressed concerns regarding the application. Residents were worried about older children using the playground as a watchtower or others using it to invade their privacy.
- That despite the presence of trees between the properties and the new equipment, residents stated that they had a clear view of the playground.
- That the orientation of the equipment could not be easily varied due to good practice guidelines that prevent slides from facing south.
- That there was a suggestion of implementing screening on the sides of the slide that are currently open, which could be an opaque surface to prevent people from looking through. Implementing screening would alleviate many of the concerns of the residents.
- That failure to address the concerns may lead to ongoing distress for the residents of Holdaway Close.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED

The committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and subject to an additional condition that details of additional planting including two additional trees be submitted and approved to in writing by the local planning authority before the use commencing. In addition, the condition would include the standard maintenance requirement of 5 years that should any tree be removed or die within that time frame.

The precise wording of the condition to be delegated to the Planning Delivery and Implementation Manager in liaison with the Chairperson of the Committee.

10. **6 PINE CLOSE, OLIVERS BATTERY, WINCHESTER, SO22 4JX (CASE NUMBER: 23/00617/HOU)**

Proposal Description: Single-storey front & side extension, partial raising of roof to provide first-floor master bedroom, porch canopy & elevational alterations.

The application was introduced and during public participation, Andy Bennett spoke in objection to the application, Sean Marquis spoke in support of the application and Brendan Gibbs (Parish Clerk, Olivers Battery Parish Council) spoke against the application and answered members' questions.

Councillor Warwick spoke as a ward member and expressed several points on behalf of residents which could be summarised as follows.

- That Olivers Battery was developed in the 1960s and 1970s with a core of two-storey houses and surrounding areas of single-story low-density bungalows with open plan gardens, Pine Close was a unique development consisting of six bungalows with occupancy ranging from one to three residents.
- That the proposed development generated a range of opinions from the local community. Some immediate neighbours expressed support for the proposed extension, while concerns were raised by others, and it was important to acknowledge the concerns raised by residents regarding the increased roof height and potential impact on neighbouring properties.
- That there was a concern about the increased height of the building and the new window overlooking neighbouring properties and impacting the enjoyment of their homes. In previous applications at Pine Close, the roof height was restricted to the original 4.25 meters.
- That the 2008 Olivers Battery Village Design Statement stated that the conversion or replacement of single-story dwellings with two-story dwellings should not be allowed if the resulting roof height and overall bulk dominated the street scene and adversely affected neighbouring properties.
- That consideration should be given to whether the size and scale of the proposals aligned with the national planning policy framework and city council policies, particularly in relation to density, layout, and cumulative effects on the character of the area.
- That the proposed extension would have been the first two-story extension on Pine Close, and while architecturally distinctive and of high quality, the scale and height would have been greater than the other five properties in the close.
- That it was important to strike a balance between progress and preserving the unique character of the neighbourhood, considering the impact on the existing landscape and the quality of life of residents.
- That the planning committee was urged to carefully evaluate all aspects of the proposal, to reach a decision that respected the integrity of Pine Close residents and maintained harmony within Olivers Battery.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED

The committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

11. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2332 - LAND AT HILL COPPICE, TITCHFIELD**

Proposal Description: Confirmation Of Tree Preservation Order 2332 - Land at Hill Coppice, Titchfield.

The proposal was introduced, and the committee proceeded to ask questions and debate it.

RESOLVED

That Tree Preservation Order 2332 be confirmed as set out in the report.

12. **PLANNING APPEALS - QUARTERLY REPORT**

The Planning Delivery and Implementation Manager introduced the report which provided the committee with a detailed summary of the four appeal decisions for the period 1 January 2023 to 31 March 2023. In summary, the report advised the following:

Appeals allowed = 0 (0%)

Appeals dismissed = 4 (100%)

Appeal withdrawn = 0 (0%)

Members discussed the contents of the report.

RESOLVED:

That the summary of appeal decisions received from 1 January 2023 to 31 March 2023 be noted.

The meeting commenced at 9.30 am and concluded at 2.45 pm

Chairperson