

# Public Document Pack

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 23 June 2020

Attendance:

Councillors  
Evans (Chair)

Rutter  
Clear  
Gordon-Smith  
Laming

McLean  
Pearson  
Read  
Ruffell, (except for Item 10)

Other Members that addressed the meeting:

Councillors Cook, Horrill, Porter and Williams.

Audio recording of the meeting

A full audio recording of this meeting is available via this link:

[Audio recording](#)

Apologies for Absence:

All members were in attendance.

---

1. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

No disclosures of interest were declared.

2. **MEMBERSHIP OF SUB-COMMITTEES ETC**

There was no action to report under this item.

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 Report PDC1163.

4. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS (PDC1163) - WCC ITEMS 6 - 8 AND WCC ITEMS 10 AND 11 AND UPDATE SHEET**

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:

5. **49 BROAD STREET, ALRESFORD**  
**(CASE NO: 19/01525/FUL)**

Item 6: Erection of new house to rear of 49 Broad Street, Alresford (WITHIN THE CURTILAGE OF A LISTED BUILDING) (AMENDED PLANS)  
49 Broad Street, Alresford, SO24 9AS  
Case number: 19/01525/FUL

At its meeting on 3 June 2020, the committee had agreed to defer the determination of this item to allow for a pre-emptive site visit to take place to view the application in the context of its location. A site visit was attended by all members of the committee and the application was before the committee for further consideration.

The Service Lead - Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which provided copies of historic maps showing development within the plot, as requested by Members at the viewing site visit.

During public participation, Councillor Ann Bean (New Alresford Town Council) had registered to speak in objection to the application. However, due to a last minute emergency, she was unable to attend the meeting and a statement was read out on her behalf.

At the conclusion of debate, the committee agreed to refuse permission for the following reasons: contrary to section 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and policy DM27 as the application failed to preserve the setting of the listed building and altered and affected the character of the burgage plot, representing overdevelopment of the site. The exact wording to be delegated to the Service Lead: Built Environment for agreement in consultation with the Chair.

6. **LAND EAST OF MAIN ROAD, OTTERBOURNE**  
**(CASE NO: 20/00163/FUL)**

Item 7: Change of use of agricultural land to a pony paddock and the erection of a stable block with associated hard standing and access track  
Land East of Main Road, Otterbourne  
Case number: 20/00163/FUL

The Service Lead - Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out an aerial photo showing the location of the stables within the red line area for clarification.

During public participation, Sophie Heritage (agent) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Williams spoke on this item as Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Williams stated that this land was heavily used by the community using the footpaths and was a great resource for the village. She considered that additional traffic entering and leaving the site onto a busy road with an existing flow would be hazardous and that there was insufficient space to turn in the site for larger vehicles with poor sight lines and she believed the building would have a detrimental impact on the area. She stated that if the committee were minded to approve the application, a caveat should be put in place to ensure that the site stays as private use for the family under policy DM12 as this was not an appropriate location for commercial use of the site. Furthermore, Councillor Williams suggested that the storage of equipment should be kept to a minimum with no erection of new buildings or features such as hard standings and that there are no changes to materials or installation of external lighting to ensure the landscape is kept within the village.

In addition, Councillor Williams also expressed concerns that a building in this location could result in further development rights and that this should not be permitted and that the proposed open track and horse paddock in an area nearby to a footpath that was frequented by parishioners walking their dogs would be inadequate.

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 the following: an amendment to condition 3 to read 'no more than three horses' and the reason for condition 3 to add the following 'to limit the vehicle movements to and from the site which could be unneighbourly'; and an addition to informative 5 to include the removal of manure (cross referenced to condition 6).

7. **THE ROD BOX, LONDON ROAD, KINGS WORTHY**  
**(CASE NO: 19/02057/FUL)**

Item 8: (AMENDED PLANS) Alterations to existing first floor flat reducing it from three bedrooms to two. First floor extension, loft conversion and roof alterations to create an additional two bedroom flat. Proposed single storey outbuilding to the rear of the property in addition to that previously permitted under application ref no. 18/02758/FUL. Alterations to existing parking layout at front and rear of property.

The Rod Box, London Road, Kings Worthy, SO23 7QN  
Case number: 19/02057/FUL

The Service Lead: Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out: an additional letter that had been received from the church warden of St Mary's Church expressing concern regarding access and the provision of parking vehicles for services; and additional wording to the following sections of the report: Consultations - Environment Service Lead: Environmental Protection, Highways/Parking and Landscape/Trees.

In addition, a verbal update was made at the meeting advising that the applicant had confirmed that the works to the access from St Mary's Close were undertaken under the A1 and B1 mixed use. However, it was still considered that the new access could be determined under this application.

During public participation, Penny Westlake and Liam Presley spoke in objection to the application and Dan Salanson (applicant) and Jeremy Tyrell (agent) spoke in support of the application and all answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Porter spoke on this item as Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Porter stated that she believed the applicants had outgrown their current premises and she had previously called in this application to committee. She considered that the application was overdevelopment of the plot in a conservation area taking up approximately 48% of the plot with no provision for storage and the use of commercial vehicles. She made reference to the break into St Mary's Close which had taken place without the permission of residents who manage the road and this had caused dissension. The increase in traffic was expected to double and change in character which would impact on this popular walking route and cause excessive traffic demand on the road with bin collections, deliveries and collection of food which would have a daily impact on the green environment of the lane and route and the quality of the route for walking.

In addition, Councillor Porter stated that the applicants were using public highway spaces, that were the responsibility of Hampshire County Council, for loading, parking and waste storage space purposes which should not be used for this solely. In conclusion, she stated that she was raising objection to this application as she considered it was overdevelopment of the site in a conservation area.

During discussion, the planning case officer clarified that, if the committee were minded to approve the application, the applicant had agreed to an additional condition to state that delivery vehicles and lorry access the site from the front with restricted access to the rear for staff use only.

At the conclusion of debate, the committee agreed to refuse permission for the following reasons: The development to create a two bed flat and outbuilding for the business at the site with associated access and parking at the rear, results in overdevelopment, harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the intensification of the use proposed results in a detrimental impact to neighbour amenities. The exact wording to be delegated to the Service Lead: Built Environment for agreement in consultation with the Chair.

8. **WATLEY GRANARY, LOCKS LANE, SPARSHOLT**  
**(CASE NO: 19/02366/FUL)**

Item 10: Change of use of ancillary accommodation building to holiday let.  
Watley Granary, Locks Lane, Sparsholt, SO21 2LU  
Case number: 19/02366/FUL

Due to technical issues, Councillor Ruffell withdrew from the committee during consideration of this particular item and took no part in the vote thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Sue Wood (Sparsholt Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Mark Hasted (applicant) and Neil March (agent) spoke in support of the application and all answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Horrill spoke on this item as Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Horrill stated that access to the building could only be obtained via a bridleway which was used frequently by walkers and raised concerns that the use of vehicles on a bridleway required a legal access right which had not been suitably addressed and was an offence under the countryside and rights of way act to drive over a bridleway without authority. She considered that the proposal would create additional traffic if it was used as a holiday let, of which there was no specific need in the area, would be a public nuisance to other users and believed the application failed to adequately address the requirements of policy MTRA4.

In conclusion, Councillor Horrill stated that, as the property had been subject to enforcement action, there was nothing in place to ensure this would not become a separate independent dwelling and asked the committee to look closely at the technicalities and the background to the property and development and refuse permission for the holiday let.

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.

9. **BROWN EAVES, 170 MAIN ROAD, COLDEN COMMON**  
**(CASE NO: 20/00855/FUL)**

Item 11: Variation of condition 1 of application reference no. 19/01049/HOU to allow building to be used solely for purposes ancillary to the occupation of the property known as Brown Eaves. The building shall not be occupied as an independent unit of residential accommodation.

Brown Eaves, 170 Main Road, Colden Common, SO21 1TJ

Case number: 20/00855/FUL

The Service Lead Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out additional information from the agent regarding work that had been carried out to implement the approved and additional landscape planting to provide more screening along southern boundary and referred to a recent permission for a similar proposal in Kytes Lane, Durley.

During public participation, Councillor Maggie Hill (Colden Common Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Louise Cutts (agent) spoke in support of the application and both answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Cook spoke on this item as Ward Member.

In summary, Councillor Cook made reference to the clause which she stated should not be removed or changed at any stage, she concurred with the comments in opposition to the application, raised by the Parish Council and set out the chequered history of the site, the previous applications and the reasons given and considered that the proposal was contrary to policy MTRA4.

Furthermore, Councillor Cook stated that the building should not be occupied as an independent unit of residential accommodation or for any business use other than the occupants of Brown Eaves and made reference to the letters of objection which were all from local residents, whereas the letters of support were not.

During debate, the Service Lead: Built Environment reminded the committee that this application was to vary a planning condition that already allowed the building to be used incidentally to the main house, therefore it was for the committee to determine if it was appropriate to go from an incidental use to an ancillary use. It was envisaged with the ancillary use that overnight sleeping by the person occupying the unit would take place within that unit, therefore any person living there should be related to the residents of the main dwelling.

At the conclusion of debate, the committee agreed to refuse permission for the following reasons: contrary to policy MTRA4 as it was considered tantamount to a new dwelling in the countryside, the removal of this condition would result in a combination that it would be occupied separately from Brown Eaves. The exact wording to be delegated to the Service Lead: Built Environment for agreement in consultation with the Chair.

#### RESOLVED:

That the decisions taken on the Planning Applications in relation to those applications 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 6 (49 Broad Street, Alresford: Case number: 19/01525/FUL) permission be refused for the following reasons: contrary to section 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and policy DM27, as the proposal failed to preserve the setting of the listed building and altered and affected the character of the burgage plot, representing overdevelopment of the site. The exact wording to be delegated to the Service Lead: Built Environment for agreement in consultation with the Chair.
- (ii) That in respect of item 7 (Land East of Main Road, Otterbourne: Case number: 20/00163/FUL) permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Report and the Update Sheet, subject to the following:

amendments to condition 3 to read 'no more than three horses' and the reason for condition 3 to add the following: 'to limit the vehicle movements to and from the site which could be unneighbourly'; and an addition to informative 5 to include the removal of manure (cross referenced to condition 6).

(iii) That in respect of item 8 (The Rod Box, London Road, Kings Worthy: Case number: 19/02057/FUL) permission be refused for the following reasons: The development to create a two bed flat and outbuilding for the business at the site with associated access and parking at the rear, results in overdevelopment, harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the intensification of the use proposed results in a detrimental impact to neighbour amenities. The exact wording to be delegated to the Service Lead: Built Environment for agreement in consultation with the Chair.

(iv) That in respect of item 11 (Brown Eaves, 170 Main Road, Colden Common: Case number: 20/00855/FUL) permission be refused for the following reasons: contrary to policy MTRA4 as it was considered tantamount to a new dwelling in the countryside, the removal of this condition would result in a combination that it would be occupied separately from Brown Eaves. The exact wording to be delegated to the Service Lead: Built Environment for agreement in consultation with the Chair.

The virtual meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned between 12.40pm and 2pm and concluded at 4pm.

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank