

# Public Document Pack

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Thursday, 22 April 2021**

Attendance:

Councillors  
Evans (Chair)

Rutter  
Clear  
Gordon-Smith  
Laming

McLean  
Read  
Ruffell

Other Members that addressed the meeting:

Councillors Learney (Cabinet Member for Housing and Asset Management),  
Mather, Tod (Cabinet Member for Service Quality and Transformation) and Weir

[Full audio recording and video recording](#)

---

### 1. **APOLOGIES AND DEPUTY MEMBERS**

All members were present and in attendance.

### 2. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

No disclosures of interest were declared.

### 3. **MEMBERSHIP OF SUB-COMMITTEES ETC**

There was no action to report under this item.

### 4. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 24 March 2021  
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 Report  
PDC1182.

6. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS (WCC ITEMS 7-9) (PDC1182 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):**

7. **COVENTRY HOUSE, BARFIELD CLOSE, WINCHESTER, SO23 9SQ (CASE NUMBER: 21/00219/FUL)**

Item 7: The erection of a multi storey car park to provide 287 park and ride car parking spaces including 800m<sup>2</sup> of photovoltaic panels, 16 Electric Vehicles (EV) charging bays with associated access, turning and landscape proposals. Coventry House, Barfield Close, Winchester, SO23 9SQ  
Case number: 21/00219/FUL

The Service Lead – Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out points of clarification regarding parking on site, outlined that 53 objections had been received from 53 households and set out in full a typographical error and the acronyms referred to within the report.

During public participation, Ian Ford and James Miller spoke in objection to the application and Catherine Bartlett (agent), Andy Hickman (on behalf of the applicant Winchester City Council), Sophie Moy (Middlemarch Environmental Ltd), Sarah Jones-Morris (Landsmith Associates), Michael O'Byrne (Goldbeck) and Jon Carlton (Wilmott Dixon) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

During public participation, Councillor Mather spoke on this item as Ward Member and Councillor Tod spoke on this item as Cabinet Member for Service Quality and Transformation.

In summary, Councillor Mather stated that this was a highly sensitive SSSI site (Site of Special Scientific Interest) with its ancient history and high quality countryside within the South Downs National Park which blended into this Winchester City Centre location. She made reference to the high number of objections submitted by residents expressing concerns regarding a multi-storey car park in this location and stated that this would result in a significant detrimental effect on residents of Domum Road and the surrounding area and considered that car parking spaces would be better placed in a less sensitive site where it did not have a massive dominance over the buildings below it.

In conclusion, Councillor Mather stated that the concerns of residents had not been adequately addressed and that the noise and general business of cars arriving and leaving a multi-storey car park, the adverse impacts on air quality and the SSSI and excessive light spillage would all be unacceptable and highly intrusive in this location and she urged the committee to refuse this application.

In summary, Councillor Tod stated that a number of issues had been raised by objectors, primarily relating to the scale and the visual impact on the rural area, lighting and safety. He referred to the initial consultation proposals for a larger car park on site and stated that at that stage residents' concerns were of lighting and visual impact and to address this, plans had been amended to reduce car parking to 287 spaces, improve headlight barriers and move its location nearer to Barfield Close, with most of the shielding now placed on the Domum Road side to try and mitigate concerns.

Councillor Tod referred to the visual impact concerns raised by objectors and provided an illustrative presentation of the scale and height of the site and of the overall visual impact once built out.

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 an addition to Condition 5 regarding the care of the green wall, with the exact wording of this to be delegated to the Service Lead-Built Environment.

8. **BRAMBLE COTTAGE, 4 DEAN LANE, WINCHESTER, SO22 5LH**  
**(CASE NUMBER: 19/00391/FUL)**

Item 8: (AMENDED PLANS – 23/02/21 and 19/06/19), New dwelling in garden and single garage

Bramble Cottage, 4 Dean Lane, Winchester, SO22 5LH

Case number: 19/00391/FUL

The Service Lead – Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out that a further 19 letters of objection and five letters of support had been received and outlined in full amendments to conditions 6, 10 and 11.

During public participation, Adrian Longdon spoke in objection to the application and Nathan Thomas (applicant) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Learney stated that this resubmission still did not overcome the previous reasons for refusal on the December 2018 application and created new concerns with the small changes that had been made to it. She believed it was still contrary to Policy DM17 and did have an unacceptable adverse impact on the neighbouring properties amenity and had a greater impact on some of their windows and considered that the revised plans still failed to respond positively to the character and appearance of the local environment so was also contrary to policy DM16. Residents did not believe the building was a positive addition and that its design and character did not reflect that of Bramble Cottage or the leafy semi-rural nature of the surrounding area.

In addition, Councillor Learney stated that Bramble Cottage and the proposed new house would be left with small gardens for substantial dwellings and

arrangements for traffic movements on and off the site failed to respond positively to the committee's previous concerns with increased traffic movements opposite the entrance to Teg Down Meads which already had an existing high volume of vehicle and pedestrians movements.

In conclusion, Councillor Learney raised concerns regarding the replacement of the proposed car port and garage as it was unclear how the necessary foundations for this would impact on the surrounding trees. Furthermore, she drew Members' attention to the quality of the information for the planning application which she suggested was inadequate and urged the committee to refuse the application.

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 an additional condition that permitted development rights (Classes A to E of Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015) be removed due to the limited plot size and potential detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity.

9. **36 DEAN LANE, WINCHESTER, SO22 5LS (CASE NUMBER: 20/02734/FUL)**

Item 9: (AMENDED PLANS) Replacement dwelling  
36 Dean Lane, Winchester, SO22 5LS  
Case number: 20/02734/FUL

The Service Lead – Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out in full some amendments to the wording on pages 100 and 101 and to condition 12.

During public participation, Anna Morgan spoke in objection to the application and Ian Dighe (applicant) and Justin Nicholson (agent) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Weir stated that this was a walking, cycling and recreational route connecting the Town Centre to the rural area of the Downs and the woods. She considered that the rural character of Dean Lane was rapidly disappearing with the volume of development in this area when it should be conserved. Residents had expressed concerns regarding the substantial increase in height of the dwelling and the bearing this would have on overlooking and loss of light. In addition, concerns had also been expressed regarding materials for surfacing the drive and it was requested that these should be highly permeable due to the existing flood risk in this area.

In conclusion, Councillor Weir stated that her principal concerns in respect of development control in this location were in relation to traffic and on-site parking which were already problematic as a direct route into Winchester and that it was crucial that adequate traffic calming measures were put in place with the continued growth in development in this 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.

10. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS (WCC ITEMS 11 & 12) (PDC1182 AND UPDATE SHEET REFERS)**

11. **LAND OFF NEW ROAD, SWANMORE, HAMPSHIRE (CASE NUMBER: 19/02421/FUL)**

Item 11: Residential development comprising 60 no. dwellings and 4 no. flats with access from New Road together with car parking, landscaping, public open space and associated works

Land off New Road, Swanmore

Case number: 19/02421/FUL

This application was deferred for consideration at a future meeting.

12. **WALCOTE PLACE, HIGH STREET, WINCHESTER, SO23 9AP (CASE NUMBER: 20/02714/HOU)**

Item 12: Retrospective application for works to courtyard garden

Walcote Place, High Street, Winchester

Case number: 20/02714/HOU

The Service Lead – Built Environment referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out the dates of previous planning applications and an alternative map of the site.

In addition, a verbal update was made at the meeting that the map set out on page 173 of the report was correct.

During public participation, Professor Keith Baker spoke in objection to the application and Josh Mathias (applicant) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

At the conclusion of debate, the committee refused permission for the following reason: the development is overbearing to neighbours' residential amenity by reason of size and form contrary to policy DM17(vii) in that the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook that is harmful to neighbouring amenity.

**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 7 (Coventry House, Barfield Close, Winchester: Case number: 21/00219/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 an addition to Condition 5 regarding the care of the green wall, with the exact wording of this addition to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

- (ii) That in respect of item 8 (Bramble Cottage, 4 Dean Lane, Winchester: Case number: 19/00391/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 an additional condition that permitted development rights (Classes A to E of Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015) be removed due to the limited plot size and detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity.
- (iii) That in respect of item 12 (Walcote Place, High Street, Winchester: Case number: 20/02714/HOU) permission be refused for the following reason: the development is overbearing to neighbours' residential amenity by reason of size and form contrary to policy DM17(vii) in that the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook that is harmful to neighbouring amenity.

The virtual meeting commenced at 9:30am, adjourned between 1pm and 2:30pm and concluded at 3:45pm.

Chair

1.