

# **Planning Committee**

## **Update Sheet**

**21/01/21**

**The information set out in this Update Sheet includes details relating to public speaking and any change in circumstances and/or additional information received after the agenda was published.**

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
7	20/01554/FUL	1-4 , Woodpeckers Drive, Winchester, SO22 5JJ	Permit
<p><b>Officer Presenting:</b> Megan Osborn</p> <p><b>Public Speaking</b>  <b>Objector:</b> Elizabeth and Roger King, Mr Russell Blackman  <b>Parish Council representative:</b> None  <b>Ward Councillor:</b> Cllr Anne Weir  <b>Supporter:</b> Chris Rees - Applicant</p> <p><u>Update</u></p> <p>None</p>			

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
8	20/01901/HOU	Holly Tree Cottage , Park Road, Winchester, SO23 7BE	Permit
<p><b>Officer Presenting:</b> Cameron Taylor</p> <p><b>Public Speaking</b>  <b>Objector:</b> Sean McPike  <b>Parish Council representative:</b> None  <b>Ward Councillor:</b> Cllr Dominic Hiscock  <b>Supporter:</b> Tom Oldroyd - Applicant</p> <p><u>Update</u></p> <p>None</p>			

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
9	20/01589/FUL	The Garden House , Southdown Road, Shawford, SO21 2BX	Permit
<p><b>Officer Presenting:</b> Catherine Watson</p> <p><b>Public Speaking</b>  <b>Objector:</b> None  <b>Parish Council representative:</b> None  <b>Ward Councillor:</b> Cllr Eleanor Bell  <b>Supporter:</b> Gary Bradford - Agent</p>			

Update

None

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
11	20/02156/HOU	16 Cold Harbour Close, Wickham, PO17 5PT	Permit

**Officer Presenting:** Marge Ballinger

**Public Speaking**

**Objector:** John Farrow, Andrew Hudson

**Parish Council representative:** None

**Ward Councillor:** None

**Supporter:** Mr C Duffy - Applicant

Update

One neighbour letter received in support of the proposal (adjacent no.15).

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
12	SDNP/20/01416/ FUL	28 Churchfields, Twyford, SO21 1NN	Permit

**Officer Presenting:** Sarah Tose

**Public Speaking**

**Objector:** None

**Parish Council representative:** None

**Ward Councillor:** Cllr Sue Cook

**Supporter:** Rob Powter

Update

**Background of the appeal**

The previous application (SDNP/17/04754/FUL) was refused by the planning committee and dismissed at appeal. Below is an extract from the appeal decision outlining the reasons why the appeal was dismissed. The full appeal decision has been included as an appendix to this Update Paper.

Character of area:

- The proposed development would entail construction of a compact detached dwelling of irregular form, on an irregular tapering plot, the size of which would be noticeably smaller than that of other dwellings along the south side

of the green.

- Though a broad frontage would be provided, the dwelling would be positioned uncharacteristically close to the gable end of No 28, and similarly close to a single storey structure attached to No 29.
- This atypical positioning, combined with the immediate backdrop provided by the rear/side elevations of No 29, and 5 The Crescent, would provide an excessively cramped appearance, acutely at odds with the existing spacious character of development along the south side of the green.
- The proposed dwelling would as such appear incongruous within the street scene, and the adverse effect would be amplified by the prominent positioning of the dwelling at the beginning of the sequence around the green.

Design:

- The appellant claims that the proposed design would appear more architecturally interesting than that of original dwellings along Churchfields.
- A 'contemporary' style has been similarly employed at No 30, and in modifications to the west elevation of No 29. However neither forms part of the street scene within which the proposed dwelling would be principally viewed.
- Significant differences in the shape, size and proportions of the proposed dwelling relative both to the semi-detached pair of No 28 forms part, and matching buildings on the south side of the green, would, in my opinion, act to further accentuate the incongruous appearance of the proposed development.

Settlement boundary clarification

Ward Members requested clarification from SDNPA regarding the current settlement boundary policy position. The response from the South Downs National Park Planning Policy Manager is copied below for information:

'Policy SD30: Replacement Dwellings is only applicable to land in the National Park outwith settlement boundaries. Policy SD25: Development Strategy identifies settlements in the National Park where the principle of development is acceptable subject to a number of criteria. All the settlements named in Policy 25 should have settlement boundaries set either in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan and these boundaries are shown on the Policies Map. However, the parish of Twyford and one other parish in the National Park have not progressed their neighbourhood plans to a stage whereby the proposed settlement boundary can be shown on the Policies Map. The Twyford Neighbourhood Plan has been submitted to the Authority and the submission consultation will start shortly. It is only when a neighbourhood plan has passed examination that its policies can be given significant weight in the determination of planning applications. Therefore the village of Twyford does not currently have a settlement boundary. In the absence of a settlement boundary, I would conclude that Policy SD30 does apply to this application as it is outwith any settlement boundaries and is located in the open countryside.

However, I would add a pragmatic note to the above. Prior to the adoption of the South Downs Local Plan, the site was within the settlement policy boundary set by the Joint Core Strategy. The site is within the settlement boundary proposed in the Submission version of the Twyford Neighbourhood Plan. The existing house is within what an ordinary person would consider to be the built up area of the village. It could therefore be argued that Planning Committee should take a pragmatic approach and say that the site should be within the settlement of Twyford and that Policy SD30 should not apply.

We have cross referenced the application with the current version of the neighbourhood plan and the site is within the proposed settlement boundary. Therefore if this application were to be determined after the plan had been made and the settlement boundary remained unaltered, then Policy SD30 would not be relevant as the site would be within the settlement boundary for Twyford.

In summary, whether Policy SD30 should be applied in this case is a matter of judgement. In planning terms, the site is located outwith any settlement boundaries and so Policy SD30 is relevant. A more pragmatic approach is that the site is located in the village and so the policy should not be applied.'

Representations

A further neighbour representation has been sent to Members, however no new issues have been raised.

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
13	SDNP/20/053 27/TCA	Manor House, High Street, Meonstoke SO32 3NH	Permit

**Officer Presenting: Ivan Gurdler**

**Public Speaking**

**Objector:** None

**Parish Council representative:** None

**Ward Councillor:** None

**Supporter:** Mrs Lumby

Update

None

**End of Updates**