

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Thursday, 12 December 2024

Attendance:

Councillors
Rutter (Chairperson)

Williams
Laming
Small

Langford-Smith
White

Apologies for Absence:

Councillors V Achwal, Clear and Cunningham

Deputy Members:

Councillor Godfrey (as deputy for Councillor Cunningham) and Councillor Pett (as deputy for Councillor Clear)

Other members in attendance:

Councillors Latham, Pinniger and Power

[Video recording of this meeting](#)

1. **APOLOGIES AND DEPUTY MEMBERS**

Apologies were noted as above.

2. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Williams declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in respect of the agenda item: Land Adjacent To The Farmers Home, Heathen Street, Durley, Hampshire (24/01751/FUL): due to his role as a Ward Member. However, he had taken no part in discussions regarding the application, therefore he took part in the consideration of the items.

Councillor Langford Smith declared an interest in two agenda items:

1. Regarding Firgrove, 65 Anmore Road, Denmead, Waterlooville, Hampshire, PO7 6NT (24/01697/FUL). Councillor Langford Smith advised that the application was within her ward and that she was also a Parish Councillor at Denmead Parish Council. Councillor Langford Smith advised that the landowner was also a Denmead Parish Councillor so she would leave the room for that item and take no part in the determination of the application.
2. Regarding Land At The Elms, Tanners Lane, Denmead, Hampshire (24/00337/FUL), Councillor Langford Smith advised that the application was within her ward and that she was also a Parish Councillor at Denmead Parish

Council. She had previously voted on that item whilst a member of the Parish Council. She would leave the room for that item and take no part in the determination of the application.

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 November 2024 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 6-10) (REPORTS, PRESENTATIONS 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. **YETTAN, 72 JACKLYNS LANE, ALRESFORD, HAMPSHIRE, SO24 9LJ (24/01547/FUL)**

Proposal Description: Residential redevelopment of part of 72 Jacklyns Lane comprising 4 no. three bedroom semi detached houses and 1 no. three bedroom detached chalet bungalow with associated new crossover, access, parking, binstore and landscaping works. (Amended Plans).

The application was introduced. Councillors were referred to the update sheet which provided additional information regarding several matters and in particular the updated and additional conditions.

1. An updated drawing (Unit 5 Proposed Plans & Elevations LWP-1223-P05 Revision B) had been received.
2. Within the report pack, under the Neighbouring Amenity section, paragraph 6 on page 34 had been updated.
3. Paragraph 7 on page 34 the previous sentence addressing potential overlooking towards the neighbour at 3 Jacklyns Close, had been updated.
4. As a point of clarification, an additional drawing had been received that shows site levels overlaid onto the previously received drawing Proposed Rear. Street Scene & Bin Store. The newly received version is Revision D.
5. As a result of the above, condition 2 had been updated to show the revised drawing numbers which were set out in full within the update sheet.
6. Condition 15 had been updated to include the restriction of additional classes of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the General Permitted Development Order. In addition, the reason for the condition had been amended which was set out in full within the update sheet.

7. Condition 5, relating to hard and soft landscaping, had been updated which was set out in full within the update sheet.
8. An additional condition 16 would be included as follows:

The hedges as shown marked as 'hedge to be retained' in the Site Comparison Plan on drawing number LWP-1223-P02 Revision C to the front of the site shall be retained and maintained at a height of 2m, and to the northeast of the site at a height of 1.8m, or at heights as otherwise agreed in writing with the local Planning Authority, for the lifetime of the development.

If any trees, shrubs or plants die, are removed or, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or defective, others of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, in the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To maintain the visual amenities of the application site and the character of the area and in the interest of the neighbouring amenities, in accordance with policies DM15 and DM17.

9. An Additional condition would be included as follows

Obscured glazing.

The hereby permitted ground floor window and roof light, both in the northeast elevation of Unit 5 and as shown on drawing LWP-1223-P05 Revision B, shall be glazed with obscure glass which achieves an obscuration level at least equivalent to Pilkington Obscure Glass Privacy Level 4, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, and the glazing shall thereafter be retained in this condition at all times.

Reason: To protect the amenity and privacy of the adjoining residential properties.

It was noted that the majority of the committee had visited the application site on 11 December 2024 to enable members to observe the site in context and to gain a better appreciation of the proposals.

During public participation, Tony Mott spoke in objection to the application, Oliver Kubicki spoke in support of the application and Councillor Marilyn Weston on behalf of New Alresford Town Council spoke against the application and answered members' questions.

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

1. She disagreed with the developer's comparison to Prospect Place, arguing it was invalid as that site was in a light industrial area.
2. She highlighted a more relevant case in Kings Worthy (reference number 01375) that was refused due to overdevelopment, access, and vehicle turning issues.

3. She expressed concerns about parking on Jacklyns Close, suggesting it could become a major accident hotspot, and questioned whether the Highways department had assessed the site in person.
4. While acknowledging the need for development, she argued the current proposal constituted overdevelopment and would negatively impact neighbouring amenities.
5. She concluded by reiterating her objection due to overdevelopment concerns.

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

1. That the upstairs bathroom window of the Dormer bungalow (Unit 5) would overlook the gardens of 3 Jacklyns Close. Despite the obscure glass, open windows could still allow sightlines to the bedrooms.
2. The height of the proposed development's roof would result in a loss of sky view for the garden of 3 Jacklyns Close.
3. The bin stores for the five proposed dwellings appeared inadequate, potentially leading to 10 bins lining the verge each week.
4. There was a discrepancy between the 15 double bedrooms and only 11 parking spaces, including a visitor space. She believed this would cause problems, unlike the situation at Prospect Place, where ample parking is available in the evening.
5. While the application might not be overdevelopment based on land use standards, the access difficulties and impact on neighbouring dwellings made it overdevelopment in this case. She urged the committee to reject the application.

The committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application and received advice from the Legal Officer concerning biodiversity net gain and the legal mechanisms used to ensure compliance with biodiversity net gain requirements, including Section 106 agreements, habitat management and monitoring plans.

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.

7. **FIRGROVE, 65 ANMORE ROAD, DENMEAD, WATERLOOVILLE, HAMPSHIRE, PO7 6NT (24/01697/FUL)**
Proposal Description: Erection of 4No. new dwellings with car parking along with use of existing access onto Anmore Road.

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

1. A revised Site Section Plan had been provided.
2. The additional site plan mentioned above had been included within the approved plans condition (condition 2):
Proposed Site Section Plan 26 REV B
3. Correspondence from neighbouring residents had been received and sent to members.
4. Condition 14 had been amended and was set out in full within the update sheet.
5. For clarity, the Permitted Development Rights removed under condition 14 are:
 - A – enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse
 - AA- enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of additional storeys
 - B – additions etc to the roof of a dwellinghouse
 - C – other alterations to the roof of a dwellinghouse
 - D – porches
 - E – buildings etc incidental to the enjoyment of a dwellinghouse
 - F – hard surfaces incidental to the enjoyment of a dwellinghouse
 - G – chimneys, flues, etc on a dwellinghouse

In addition, the reason for condition 14 had been amended as follows:

Reason: To ensure that the development is proportionate to the site in order to protect the amenities of the neighbouring properties and wider locality and to maintain a good quality environment in accordance with DM15 and DM16.

6. Condition 15 was clarified and set out in full within the update sheet.

It was noted that the majority of the committee had visited the application site on 11 December 2024 to enable members to observe the site in context and to gain a better appreciation of the proposals.

During public participation, Brian Simpson and Timothy Beazley spoke in objection to the application, Philip Dudley spoke in support of the application and Councillor Martin Clay on behalf of Denmead Parish Council spoke in objection to the application and answered members' questions.

The committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application and received advice from the Legal Officer concerning the weight to be given to the opinions of statutory consultees, specifically Southern Water, during planning decisions and the requirements should the committee choose to deviate from the statutory consultee's recommendation.

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. **LAND AT THE ELMS, TANNERS LANE, DENMEAD, HAMPSHIRE**
(24/00337/FUL)

Proposal Description: Erection of 11 dwellings with new access from Tanners Lane, associated parking, drainage pumping station and landscaping following demolition of existing outbuildings.

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

1. Additional information in regard to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) had been submitted on the 5th of December. It was not considered that this was sufficient to remove the reason for refusal 3.
2. Further correspondence had been received from the applicant on 11 December 2024 regarding the reason for refusal 2. It was found that this information did not fully address previous concerns raised leading to the reason for refusal 2.
3. An additional comment had been submitted by the Anmore Action Group regarding:
 - Flooding and drainage
 - Unsuitable access
 - Unacceptable change to the rural character of the area
 - Use of pumping station for foul removal due to energy needed to function.
4. An additional letter had been received from the agent asking members to defer deciding on the application. It was the Officer's view that several issues had been raised and discussed at length with the agent and applicant and, as laid out in the report, no satisfactory solution had been submitted.
5. Amendment to Reason for Refusal 1:
 1. The proposed development is contrary to Policy 2(ii) of the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan, Policies MTRA2, CP10 and CP13 of the Local Plan Part 1 and DM15, DM16, DM18 and DM23 of the Local Plan Part 2 in that it:
 - presents an unacceptable cramped layout due to the use of Tanners Lane for access and the removal of part of the allocation site and the constraints this introduces. The layout, siting and density fail to take account of the site's countryside setting and local context and do not provide an appropriate landscape buffer to Tanners Lane.
 - would result in a loss of tranquillity to the surrounding rural area which would be exacerbated by the works to Tanners Lane. The changes required to Tanners Lane to make the proposed access acceptable would also result in the erosion of the rural character to the detriment of the character of the area and the rural setting of the village.
 - had a constrained layout and isolated access to the site, therefore, additional parking on the site for visitors and residents with additional cars beyond the SPD requirements

would lead to over-spill parking that cannot be accommodated on the site or the surrounding rural lanes.

6. Following the submission of additional information on 29th November comments from the Landscape architect were received:

During public participation, Phillip Harrison and Keith Hayward spoke in objection to the application, Michael Knappett spoke in support of the application and Councillor Martin Clay on behalf of Denmead Parish Council spoke in objection to the application and answered members' questions.

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 and the update sheet.

9. **LAND ADJACENT TO THE FARMERS HOME, HEATHEN STREET, DURLEY, HAMPSHIRE (24/01751/FUL)**

Proposal Description: Construction of 4 x single-storey, timber-clad cabins for use as holiday lets.

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

1. Additional comments had been received from Natural England advising that they had no objection to the application subject to appropriate mitigation being secured.
2. The wording of Condition 3 to be amended which was set out in full within the update sheet.

During public participation, Gill Mulley spoke in objection to the application, and Louise Cutts spoke in support of the application and answered members' questions.

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

1. He acknowledged the planning officer's report and its compliance with policies but highlighted two major issues.
2. He described the recurring problem of raw sewage overflow in Heathen Street near the proposed development site, and questioned Southern Water's ability to handle the increased load despite their assurances. He urged the committee to consider the real-world situation and local residents' experiences, arguing that the development could breach policy DM-17 Part 3.

3. He raised concerns about the need for additional tourist accommodation in Durley, noting the absence of allocated sites in the current or emerging local plan and suggesting that the provision was driven by supply rather than demand.
4. He highlighted the existence of numerous holiday properties already available in Durley, citing 10 listings on Airbnb with a combined capacity of 50 beds.
5. He referred to Local Plan Policy Part 2 policy DM-10, which required a demonstrated need for development to override the presumption against non-essential development in the countryside, questioning whether Durley still qualified as an appropriate location for further development of this type.
6. He questioned the definition of "small scale" in policy MTRA 4, and highlighted the cumulative impact of multiple small-scale developments on the rural character of the village.
7. He concluded by requesting the committee to withhold permission until the foul water issues are resolved by Southern Water and evidence of the need for more holiday accommodation in Durley was provided.

The committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application and received advice from the Legal Officer concerning a number of matters including: the distinction between holiday lets and dwelling houses, and enforcement measures,

RESOLVED:

The committee voted against the recommendation to permit 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:

The proposed development of four units on the site was considered inappropriate in the context of the immediate area, particularly when assessed against the character and setting of neighbouring uses and surrounding development. The committee raised concerns that the scale and nature of the proposal did not reflect the low-key nature of the area and was not in keeping with its immediate context. Furthermore, while it was acknowledged that the site could support alternative uses in accordance with relevant policies, the committee felt the proposal failed to demonstrate sufficient compatibility with Policy MTRA4. It was agreed that the detail of the reason for refusal should be delegated to the Service Lead: Built Environment in consultation with the Chairperson to finalise.

10. **LAND BETWEEN PARK VIEW AND FOREST GATE, FOREST LANE, WICKHAM, HAMPSHIRE (23/02638/OUT)**

Proposal Description: Outline Application for two holiday lets; access; package treatment plant.

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

Wording of Condition 5 to be amended and set out in full within the update sheet.

Wording of Condition 4 to be updated which was set out in full within the update sheet.

Reserved and other matters: -

- (a) The layout and design (external appearance and scale) of all buildings, (detailed elevations and floor plans) including the colour and texture of external materials to be used together with samples of all external facing and roofing materials (to be informed by relevant ecological assessments undertaken on the site)
- (b) Full detailed proposals for the disposal of foul and surface water (including package treatment plant siting, performance and specification)
- (c) The provision to be made for the access, parking, turning, loading and unloading of vehicles –
- (d) The provision to be made for the storage and disposal of refuse
- (e) The finished levels, above ordnance datum, of the ground floor of the proposed building(s), and their relationship to the levels of any existing adjoining buildings
- (f) Transect and static bat detector surveys to assess the effects of bats and to inform the detailed design of the development

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

1. For clarification, an outline planning application also needs to indicate the area of area where access points to the development will be situated. This had been demonstrated within the submission. The final details of the access arrangements will form part of the future Reserved Matters application.

An additional public comment had been received and uploaded to the public file, matters raised have been considered in the officer's report and did not alter the recommendation.

During public participation, Charles Gale spoke in objection to the application, and Ian Donohue spoke in support of the application and answered members' questions.

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 subject to an amendment to condition 5 The amendment was required to clarify that this condition relates to each unit of tourist accommodation individually and to remove the word “developer” .

The meeting commenced at 9.30 am and concluded at 1.45 pm

Chairperson