

Public Document Pack

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Thursday, 25 February 2021

Attendance:

Councillors
Evans (Chair)

Clear	McLean
Gordon-Smith	Read, (except for item 13)
Laming, (except for items 8 & 13)	Ruffell

Deputy Members:

Councillor Bentote (as deputy for Rutter)

Other Members that addressed the meeting:

Councillors Bell, Horrill, Laming, Weston and Williams

[Full audio recording and video recording](#)

1. APOLOGIES AND DEPUTY MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Rutter, with Councillor Bentote attending as standing deputy member.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR FOR THE MEETING

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Clear be appointed Vice-Chair for the meeting

3. DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS

Councillor Laming declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of items 8 (Hampshire Constabulary HQ, Romsey Road, Winchester – case number: 20/01498/FUL) and left the meeting for consideration of the item, taking no part in the discussion and vote thereon.

In addition, Councillor Laming declared that in respect of item 13 (Confirmation of TPO 2288 – Combe Folly, Cliff Way) he had predetermined the application and spoke as a Ward Member on this item, taking no part in the discussion or vote thereon.

Councillor Ruffell declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 12 (Long Ash, Pitcot Lane, Owslebury – case number: SDNP/20/04221/HOUS) as a local resident and Ward Member. However, Councillor Ruffell stated that he had taken no part in any discussions regarding the application and therefore took part in the consideration of this item and voted thereon.

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

There was no action to report under this item.

5. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meetings held on 17 December 2020 and 21 January 2021 be approved and adopted

6. **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 PDC1178.

7. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS (WCC ITEMS 7-9 AND SDNP ITEMS 11 & 12) (PDC1178 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:

Applications outside the area of the South Downs National Park (WCC):

8. **COLLINGWOOD, LOWER CHASE ROAD, SWANMORE, SO32 2PB (CASE NUMBER: 20/01850/FUL)**

Item 7: Erection of new detached dwelling and detached garage with car parking and use of existing access road from Lower Chase Road Collingwood, Lower Chase Road, Swanmore
Case number: 20/01850/FUL

A verbal update was made at the meeting, that the wording of condition 13 be amended to read "No additional windows shall be constructed in the first floor, north and northwest elevations of the property hereby permitted."

During public participation, Brendan Dineen spoke in objection to the application and Philip Dudley (agent) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Weston made reference to the proposed large executive development which she considered would be crammed into an important garden area which would be harmful and wholly out of keeping with the local distinctiveness of the Swanmore village and the existing low density dwellings at the edge of the village. Councillor Weston stated that the proposal failed to respond positively to the special characteristics of Lower Chase Road and the immediate surroundings.

In addition, Councillor Weston raised concerns regarding the number of conditions listed within the report which sought mitigation and enhancement plans and stated that the new development would result in an intrusion in its built form and would impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties by being a visually intrusive and overbearing form of development. Furthermore, she considered the proposal would increase light pollution and surface water run-off and would have a detrimental impact on ecology in the area, as well as being contrary to the Swanmore Village Design Statement and the Council's Climate Emergency policies.

In conclusion, Councillor Weston urged the committee to refuse the application which she considered failed to respond positively to the environment or enhance the special character of Swanmore village.

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 verbal update to condition 13 set out above, subject to an amendment to condition 12 to include wording to ensure that works are undertaken in accordance with the ecological survey assessment.

9. **HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY HQ, ROMSEY ROAD, WINCHESTER, SO22 5DB**
(CASE NUMBER: 20/01498/FUL)

Item 8: To extend the temporary permission granted for a period of two years (16/00957/FUL, Condition 1)
Hampshire Constabulary HQ, Romsey Road, Winchester
Case number: 20/01498/FUL

The Service Lead - Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out that an additional 21 letters of objection had been received since the publication of the report.

During public participation, Kate MacIntosh and Tim Montagu spoke in objection to the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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 Update Sheet.

10. **THE LODGE, HOME LANE, SPARSHOLT, WINCHESTER, SO21 2NN**
(CASE NUMBER: 20/00084/HOU)

Item 9: 1. Construction of a replacement garage (Amended Plans)
2. Construction of a single storey side and rear extension (Amended Plans)
3. Internal reconfiguration

The Lodge, Home Lane, Sparsholt, Winchester

Case number: 20/00084/HOU

The Service Lead - Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out that a further letter of support had been received from the applicant.

During public participation, Mr Tovey showed a video presentation raising objection to the application and Councillor Sue Wood (Sparsholt Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and both answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Horrill stated that she had reached out to the residents to find a compromise about the application as there had been limited response to the house extension but significant concern locally regarding the garage but to no avail. Furthermore, the applicant had not approached the Parish Council until after the application had been submitted.

Councillor Horrill queried why there was a need for a sound good sized garage to be demolished and rebuilt, particularly in light of the clear green agenda at the council and questioned the assertion made by the case officer that the garage would be less prominent from the public view and that it did not detract from the conservation area features.

In addition, Councillor Horrill made reference to the visual presentation provided by Mr Tovey which tried to demonstrate the issues regarding the relocation of the garage and recommended that a site visit be undertaken to assess the rural setting, the tree location (the reason for the tree preservation orders) and the concerns about the shared drive and traffic movements. Councillor Horrill expressed concern that the application did not include a report from Historic Environment and queried if the decision was sound without this being made available.

In conclusion, Councillor Horrill stated that the previous reasons for refusal of a garage in this location had not altered and the updated planning policies had also not changed significantly to permit this application and she urged the committee to refuse the application to find a suitable alternative application that would benefit all parties and the conservation area.

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 additional wording to Condition 8 to ensure that the development be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.'

Applications inside the area of the South Downs National Park (SDNP):

11. **LION HILL HOUSE, ALTON ROAD, WEST MEON, GU32 1JF**
(CASE NUMBER: SDNP/20/03665/FUL)

Item 11: New single storey dwelling
Lion Hill House, Alton Road, West Meon
Case number: SDNP/20/03665/FUL

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.

12. **LONG ASH, PITCOT LANE, OWSLEBURY, SO21 1LR**
(CASE NUMBER: SDNP/20/04221/HOUS)

Item 12: Ground floor and first floor rear extension
Long Ash, Pitcot Lane, Owslebury
Case number: SDNP/20/04221/HOUS

During public participation, John Foster and Councillor Paul Bowes (Owslebury Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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.

RESOLVED:

That the decisions taken on the Planning Applications in relation to those applications outside and inside 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 7 (Collingwood, Lower Chase Road, Swanmore: Case number: 20/01850/FUL) permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Report and the verbal update to condition 13 set out above, subject to an amendment to condition 12 to include wording to ensure that works are undertaken in accordance with the ecological survey assessment.

(ii) That in respect of item 9 (The Lodge, Home Lane, Sparsholt: Case number: 20/00084/HOU) permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Report and the Update Sheet, subject to additional wording to Condition 8 to ensure that the development be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

13. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER TPO 2288 - COMBE FOLLY, CLIFF WAY, WINCHESTER.**

(Agenda Item 13 - Report PDC1177)

During the consideration of this item, due to technical issues Councillor Read left the meeting taking no part in the consideration of this application.

The Service Lead - Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out that an additional nine letters of objection had been received since the publication of the report.

During public participation, Una Stevens, Roger Stevens and Jenny Livy spoke in objection to the proposed confirmation and answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillors Williams, Bell and Laming spoke on this item as a Ward Members.

In summary, Councillor Williams stated that there were four key points of contention within the report. She believed the trees were not under threat by development more so than any other and that the homeowners had lived at the property for over 30 years and had maintained, protected and cared for the trees at their own time and cost using a locally registered arboricultural specialist over this time and wished to have the right to continue to do so without the need to restrict them in this process by having tree preservation order (TPO) in place. Furthermore, she stated that due to the location of the trees in a road largely used for access purposes only, they provided little visual public amenity. Councillor Williams considered that the trees were not under threat as the homeowners had no intention of felling the trees and that there was no significant justification why these specific trees required a TPO.

In conclusion, Councillor Williams made reference to the Tree Evaluation Method for Tree Preservation Orders (TEMPO) score which she suggested only just met the threshold to warrant a TPO, queried that other points raised were largely negligible and urged the committee to refuse the confirmation of this TPO.

In summary, Councillor Laming stated that he agreed with the points raised by Councillor Williams. He did not believe the two trees listed as worthy of a TPO were of any greater significance to the other species of trees that belonged to the homeowners and as he considered the threshold to be borderline he also urged the committee to refuse the confirmation of this TPO.

In summary, Councillor Bell stated that she also agreed with the points made by her fellow Ward Members and was first made aware of this case several weeks ago by the homeowner who was distressed about the situation. She confirmed that there had been a large number of letters of objection submitted by local residents who had all stated how well the homeowners maintained and cared for the trees in their garden and that they believed there was no threat of felling or development at this property.

In conclusion, Councillor Bell urged the committee to not confirm this particular TPO and to allow it to expire.

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations made and received, Tree Preservation Order 2288 be not confirmed.

14. **PLANNING APPEALS**

(Report PDC1179)

The Service Lead Built Environment provided the committee with a detailed summary of the 11 appeal decisions for the period October to December 2020 and set out some amendments to the figures set out in the report.

RESOLVED:

That the summary of appeal decisions received during October to December 2020 be noted.

The virtual meeting commenced at 9:30am, adjourned between 12:30pm and 2:00pm and concluded at 4:40pm.

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank