

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 26 May 2026

Attendance:

Councillors
Williams (Chairperson)

Gordon-Smith
Laming
Langford-Smith

Small
White
Ablitt

Apologies for Absence:

Councillors Rutter and Aron

Deputy Members:

Councillor Pett (as deputy for Councillor Rutter)

Other members in attendance:

Councillor Wallace

[Video recording of this meeting](#)

1. **APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRPERSON FOR 2026/27**

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Williams be appointed Vice-Chairperson for the 2026/27 municipal year.

Due to apologies being received from Councillor Rutter, Councillor Williams assumed the role of Chairperson for this meeting. Councillor Small was nominated as Vice Chairperson for this meeting which was seconded and agreed by the committee

2. **APOLOGIES AND DEPUTY MEMBERS**

Apologies were noted as above.

3. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Jerry Pett declared a disclosable pecuniary interest due to his role as a member of the South Downs National Park Authority in any item that may relate to the National Park. However, as there was no material conflict of interest, he remained in the room, spoke and voted under the dispensation granted on behalf of the Audit and Governance Committee.

Councillor Suzanne White made a personal statement due to her role as Ward Member in respect of item: Dene Cottage New Road Swanmore Southampton (Case Ref: 25/01431/OUT) Ward: Central Meon Valley. However, she had taken

no part in discussions regarding the application, and therefore took part in the consideration of the item and voted thereon.

Councillors Anne Small and Jonathan Williams declared a disclosable pecuniary interest due to their role as Hampshire County Councillors in any item which might have a County Council involvement. However, as there was no material conflict of interest, they remained in the room, spoke and voted under the dispensation granted on behalf of the Audit and Governance Committee.

4. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING.**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 15 April 2026 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 the report.

6. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS - ITEMS 7 TO 11 REPORTS, PRESENTATIONS 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:

7. **KINGS SCHOOL ROMSEY ROAD WINCHESTER HAMPSHIRE SO22 5PN (CASE REF: 25/02160/FUL) - WARD: ST PAUL**

Proposal Description: Creation of a 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) with perimeter fencing, hardstanding areas, storage container, floodlights, acoustic barrier, access paths and parking area.

The application was introduced. Members were referred to the update sheet which provided additional information regarding policy considerations and the site selection process which was set out in full on the update sheet but could be summarised as follows:

1. Policy NE2 of the Winchester Local Plan 2020-2040 was noted as relevant, supporting the development of rural educational establishments that bolster economic prosperity.
2. The site selection process had rejected alternative areas on the Kings School site:
 - (i) The Middle Field Area: Too narrow for a 3G pitch and would require tree removal.
 - (ii) The Right-Hand Field: Its development would significantly reduce sports provision for rugby, cricket, and athletics, and eliminate the area's only 400m grass track. Such loss would

conflict with Policy NE3, prompt a Sport England objection, and cause negative ecological impacts.

3. The school had emphasised safeguarding the right-hand field for long-term sporting benefits. Consequently, the proposed location was deemed the most suitable for maximizing community and athletic advantages.

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

During public participation, Andrew Griffiths and Reuben Peckham spoke in objection to the application, and James Adams spoke in support of the application and answered members' questions.

The committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application. During discussion on the item, the committee received advice from the Legal Adviser, regarding matters relating to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding and associated CIL issues. Clarification was also provided regarding the role of statutory consultees and the appropriate legal weight to be applied to their representations and other material considerations in the determination of the application.

RESOLVED:

That 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 an additional condition requiring a formal parking management plan to manage traffic and parking impacts on the local road network.

8. LAND ADJACENT LAXTON LEAZE WATERLOOVILLE (CASE REF:23/01457/OUT) WARD: DENMEAD

Proposal Description: Outline application for residential development up to 69 dwellings with access in detail. All other matters reserved. (amended Plans Submitted, amended description).

The committee was advised that the application had been withdrawn from the agenda for this meeting.

9. DENE COTTAGE NEW ROAD SWANMORE SOUTHAMPTON (CASE REF: 25/01431/OUT) WARD: CENTRAL MEON VALLEY

Proposal Description: Proposed new 4-bedroom self-build house and garage within the rear garden of Dene Cottage.

The application was introduced. During public participation, Christopher Jenkins spoke in objection to the application, and Councillor Jon Woodman (on behalf of Swanmore Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and answered members' questions.

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

1. He asked the committee to consider the fundamental planning question of whether the site was appropriate for development
2. He acknowledged that whilst the site lay within the settlement boundary, the general presumption in favour of development was not unconditional and required proposals to respect the character, layout, and pattern of the area, and to comply with the Swanmore Village Design Statement.
3. He highlighted that the proposal would disrupt the consistent pattern of development on New Road—which consisted of houses fronting the road with long rear gardens and a strong building line—by introducing an uncharacteristic form of back land development.
4. He argued that physical capacity and access were not the primary tests, as the long rear gardens were a defining feature of the established pattern of the area rather than spare land.
5. He felt that the proposal conflicted with the Swanmore Village Design Statement, which advised that garden plots should be protected from overdevelopment and inappropriate infilling, and that new developments must respect the scale, spacing, and relationship of neighbouring properties.
6. He referenced a similar, nearby proposal, which was refused by the council because a rear garden dwelling was deemed cramped, inappropriate, harmful to character and residential amenity, and set an unwelcome precedent.
7. He questioned the report's emphasis on the application being in outline form, stating that the concerns of residents and the parish council related to the principle of development in this location, which would be difficult to address at the reserved matters stage once established.
8. He raised concerns regarding the precedent this development would set, warning that it would make resisting similar proposals difficult and could lead to a gradual, cumulative erosion of the area's character.
9. He urged the committee to give weight to the strength of local concern, the policy context of the Village Design Statement, and the importance of maintaining the character of Swanmore when making their decision.

The committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application. During discussion on the item, the committee received advice from the Legal Adviser regarding the statutory framework governing self-build and custom housebuilding, specifically regarding the relevance of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 and the council's register as material planning considerations.

RESOLVED:

That the committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report, in addition it was agreed that the subsequent reserved matters application be brought back to the committee for determination to ensure scrutiny of the detailed design, layout, and potential overlooking impacts on neighbouring properties.

10. **COLEBROOK COTTAGE 15A COLEBROOK STREET WINCHESTER HAMPSHIRE SO23 9LH (CASE REF: 25/02508/HOU) WARD: ST MICHAEL**
Proposal Description: Ground Floor Extension.

The application was introduced and during public participation, Robert Little and Patrick Daniell spoke in objection to the application.

The committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application. During discussion on the item, concerns were raised regarding the scale, height, and visual impact of the proposed 3.6-metre-high western boundary wall on the historic character of Colebrook Place and the wider Winchester Conservation Area. It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred to allow planning officers to negotiate with the applicant to seek a reduction in the height of the boundary wall.

RESOLVED:

That the committee agreed to defer the application to enable further negotiation with the applicant concerning the scale, height, and visual impact of the proposed western boundary wall

11. **HIGH LAND LANHAM LANE WINCHESTER HAMPSHIRE SO22 5JS (CASE REF: 25/01287/FUL) WARD: ST BARNABAS**

Proposal Description: The proposal is for the construction of a new two storey detached dwelling at High Land, Lanham Lane.

The application was introduced. The committee was advised that this application was previously approved by the committee on 20 January 2026, subject to a legal agreement which was subsequently signed on 1 May 2026. However, in the intervening period (March 2026), a new local plan was adopted. As a result, the policies listed on the original conditions no longer applied and had been superseded by the newly adopted local plan. The application was therefore brought back to the committee as an addendum to amend conditions 14 and 15 and to delete condition 7.

The committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED:

That the committee agreed to permit the application with the changes to the conditions as set out in the report.

Chairperson