

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, 19 July 2023**

Attendance:

Councillors  
Rutter (Chairperson)

Edwards  
Achwal V  
Cunningham

Gordon-Smith  
Laming  
Small

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor Lee and Councillor Read

Deputy Members:

Councillor Pearson (as deputy for Councillor Read) and Councillor Wallace (as deputy for Councillor Lee)

Other members in attendance:

Councillors Cook, Langford-Smith, Westwood and Williams

[Video recording of this meeting](#)

---

### 1. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Achwal and Councillor Small advised that the application at agenda item 6 (Jasmine Cottage) was within their ward.

### 2. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING.**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 14 June 2023 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 the report.

4. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS (WCC ITEMS 6 - 8 & 10 - 12) & SDNP ITEM 9 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:

5. **BRAE HOUSE 31 CHILBOLTON AVENUE WINCHESTER HAMPSHIRE SO22 5HE (CASE REFERENCE:23/00239/FUL)**

Proposal Description: Removal of the existing dwelling (and associated outbuildings). The construction of 9 no new dwellings, associated garages, and landscaping (AMENDED PLANS).

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

1. The existing house had been assessed by the Historic Environment Team and it was concluded that it was not a non-designated heritage asset.
2. A further two objection letters had been received from residents that had previously objected to this proposal. Their comments had been noted and circulated to committee members.

In addition, the case officer advised that an update had been received from the Ecology Team regarding the biodiversity net gain report. The update confirmed that the trees proposed within the report were not sufficient to meet the necessary net gain. As a result, it was recommended to amend condition 15 to include a requirement for a revised biodiversity net gain report to be submitted to the local planning authority for approval prior to commencement of any development.

During public participation, Simon Machola 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, and subject to the following:

1. An amendment to condition 15 as outlined above.
2. The removal of permitted development rights, regarding the building of extensions, outbuildings etc, the details of which were to be delegated to the Principal Planning Officer Team Leader (North).

6. **JASMINE COTTAGE HILLSIDE KITNOCKS HILL CURDRIDGE**  
**SOUTHAMPTON SO32 2HJ (CASE REFERENCE:23/00841/HOU)**

Proposal Description: The proposed extension and refurbishment of an existing early 21st century, detached, four-bedroom dwelling with a detached double garage to include the demolition of existing extensions on all sides, the internal reconfiguration of the main dwelling, the addition of both single-storey extension and two-storey extensions and the addition of an annexe to the existing double garage.

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

1. Additional supporting comments received from neighbours at 5 Hillside supporting the plans.
2. An update to condition 04: The annexe hereby permitted shall be occupied in association with the dwelling house or shall be used for the purposes ancillary to the dwelling house. At no time shall the annexe be occupied as an independent unit of accommodation or be used as tourist accommodation.

Reason: To accord with the terms of the application and to prevent the creation of inappropriate units of accommodation, possibly leading to over-intensive use of the site.

3. Clarification that the existing dwelling was a 20th-century dwelling and not a 21st-century dwellings as stated.

In addition, the case officer advised that further comments had been received overnight objecting to the proposal.

During public participation, Steve Wallin spoke in objection to the application, Adam Knibb (Architect) spoke in support of the application and Councillor Eric Bodger, Curdridge Parish Council spoke against the application, specifically regarding the annexe and answered members' questions.

The committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

**RESOLVED**

1. 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 material planning matters which weighed in favour of refusing planning permission:
2. That due to the scale, positioning, and relationship with the neighbouring boundary, the annexe building had an adverse, overbearing impact on the residential amenity of No 6, Hillside and was therefore contrary to Policy DM17 of the Local Plan part two. The precise wording of this was to be delegated to the Principal Planning Officer Team Leader (South).

7. **MEADOWS FARM, ERVILLS ROAD, WORLDS END, HAMBLEDON PO7 4QU (CASE REFERENCE:22/01309/FUL)**

Proposal Description: Continued use of the ground-floor unit in northwest element of building for storage and distribution purposes (Class B8) by tea distribution company; Addition of door and window to north elevation of barn.

The application was introduced and during public participation, Robert Tutton spoke in support of the application and Councillor Kevin Andreoli, Denmead Parish Council spoke against the application and answered members' questions.

Councillor Paula Langford Smith spoke as a ward member against the application and expressed several points on behalf of residents which could be summarised as follows:

1. That the area was a beautiful water meadow located in the ancient woodland of the Forest of Bere, a public footpath (King's Way) ran through the water meadow. The landscape had been treasured for decades, with Meadows Farm listed as a valued landscape in Hampshire Treasures.
2. That over the last ten years, significant development had taken place on the farm, not related to agriculture but rather a variety of businesses. That many planning permissions were granted under agricultural prior notification, even though the developments were not for farming activities.
3. That the original barns were replaced with much larger structures, not fitting with the surroundings, and some were converted into non-agricultural uses. The farm's Victorian bridge was demolished to accommodate heavy goods lorries, and unauthorised track widening had occurred.
4. That concerns had been raised by Hampshire County Council about excessive concrete laying without permission and residents had expressed concerns to the city and parish councils, documenting the developments with photographs.
5. That there had been 21 planning applications or prior notifications for agricultural change of use on the site since 2014. That the latest application sought to change another barn to flexible use, potentially turning it into an industrial warehouse for a tea distribution company.
6. That this change would result in additional heavy goods vehicle movements and increased staff driving, as there was no public transport available.
7. Councillor Langford Smith urged the committee to refuse the application to prevent the transformation of the farm into an industrial estate, which was not suitable for the community's interests and requested that the committee visits the site to observe the actual use and assess the location's appropriateness for such a business.

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.

8. **2 WOODLAND DROVE MAIN ROAD TWYFORD MOORS HAMPSHIRE SO21 1EX (CASE REFERENCE: SDNP/23/00245/HOUS)**

Proposal Description: Demolition of an existing rear conservatory and construction of a new single-storey rear extension. Conversion and extension of an existing garage to habitable accommodation.

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

During public participation, Richard Pennell spoke in objection to the application, and Andy Partridge (Agent) spoke in support of the application and answered members' questions.

Councillor Susan Cook spoke as a ward member against the application and expressed several points on behalf of residents which could be summarised as follows:

1. That, considering the Twyford Neighbourhood Plan and the South Downs National Plan policy, the application should be refused as it appeared not to meet certain policies.
2. That, the concerns included issues of being out of character, loss of privacy, loss of light, increase in noise, and disturbance to both adjacent residents and those behind.
3. That, the proposed application was overbearing in its design and would be detrimental to the amenity of nearby neighbours.
4. That, the original home had two bedrooms, but with the addition of a staircase and Velux windows, it could potentially be turned into a three-bedroom property.
5. That, there were concerns about the proposed new bedroom's increased height being significantly higher than the current conservatory.
6. That, the Twyford Local Plan contains policies for local housing needs to protect the limited supply of smaller properties within the national park.
7. That concerns had been raised regarding the 30% limit on household extensions.
8. That, the proposal sought to extend the use of the garage as a kitchen, which was not originally intended and may affect the enjoyment and value of adjacent properties.

9. That, the planning officer's report mentioned no objections in terms of design impairments, but the resident of the neighbouring property, did raise objections.
10. That, Planning Policy stated proposals should be of a high standard of design and be sympathetic to minimize overshadowing and light deprivation.
11. That, as a committee, there was a responsibility to ensure any changes to existing homes enhance the environment for the majority and consider the impact on neighbours.
12. That, the current application did not meet these criteria, and the application should be refused.

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.

9. **53 CHERITON ROAD WINCHESTER SO22 5AX (CASE REFERENCE:23/01165/TPO)**

Proposal Description: Mature Holm Oak in rear garden approximately 15m from rear of house. The application was for permission to fell the tree on the grounds of the potential risk to people and property, excessive shading in the owners and neighbouring gardens because of the tree's dense canopy and year-round leaf cover, high maintenance burden, drying-out of the ground by the root system and the tree's low ecological value.

The application was introduced and during public participation, Stuart Dorward spoke in support of the application and answered members' questions.

Councillor Chris Westwood spoke as a ward member in support of the application and expressed several points on behalf of residents which could be summarised as follows:

1. That, the first issue to discuss was the amenity value of the tree, which was significant. The tree had been protected by a TPO since 1992.
2. That, 31 years later, the tree had grown too large for its current setting, and the amenity value recognised in 1992 had been lost. That, the officer's report states that the tree had good public visual amenity value, but the wider amenity value may not be as great as portrayed.
3. That, the tree was having an impact on the owner's mental health. The tree's size and maintenance were stressful for the homeowners, impacting their well-being.
4. That, there were liability concerns. Trees in the area had a history of being impacted by gales, and there was a risk of damage or injury.

5. That, on balance he felt that removing the TPO restrictions and replacing the tree with a native tree would be more suitable.
6. That, this would restore the amenity value, increase biodiversity, and remove the stress of having an inappropriate-sized tree in a suburban garden.
7. That this approach would significantly increase the biodiversity of several suburban gardens and serve as a suitable approach in this case.

The committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED

The committee agreed to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the report.

10. **LAND AT OAKTREE FARM SCIVIERS LANE UPHAM WINCHESTER SO32 1HB (CASE REFERENCE: TPO2333)**  
**Proposal Description: To consider confirmation of Tree Preservation Order 2333 to which one letter of objection had been received.**

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

1. That application 22/01852/FUL clarified that the removal of 2 trees was authorised, subject to this TPO confirmation. The case officer, considering all relevant factors, approved the removal based on submitted arboricultural reports. The applicant had the option to proceed with tree removal as per the application.
2. The recommendation for TPO 2333 includes the 2 trees subject to removal under the above application. This was to ensure that the trees were retained in the event that 22/01852/FUL was not implemented.

During public participation, Matthew Jenson and Stefan Rose spoke in objection to the application. The committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED

That Tree Preservation Order 2333 be confirmed as set out in the report.

11. **LAND AT WINCHESTER RAILWAY STATION WINCHESTER (CASE REFERENCE: TPO2334)**

Proposal Description: To consider confirmation of Tree Preservation Order 2334 to which one letter of objection had been received.

The application was introduced and during public participation, Graham Smith (on behalf of Network Rail) spoke in objection to the application.

The committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

**RESOLVED**

That Tree Preservation Order 2334 be confirmed as set out in the report.

The meeting commenced at 9.30 am and concluded at 1.00 pm

Chairperson