

# **Planning Committee**

## **Update Sheet**

**17/11/21**

**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 |
|---|--------------|---|----------------|
| 6   | 20/02165/FUL | Fairgone, Black Horse Lane, Shedfield, SO32 2HT | Permit         |
| <p><b>Officer Presenting:</b> Nikki Clayton<br/> <b>Public Speaking</b><br/> <b>Objector:</b> Alice Drew-On behalf of Mr and Mrs Walsh<br/> <b>Parish Council representative:</b> None<br/> <b>Ward Councillor:</b> None<br/> <b>Supporter:</b> None</p> <p><u>Updates</u></p> <p>To clarify the new track (to the rear of the site) is outside of the red line plan and therefore it cannot be considered as part of the application.</p> <p>Solomon's Lane is an unclassified road so planning permission is not required to form a new access or track if used in conjunction with the equestrian/agricultural uses of the area to the rear of the site.</p> |              |   |                |

| Item No  | Ref No       | Address   | Recommendation |
|--|--------------|---|----------------|
| 7  | 21/01322/FUL | The Long Barn, Old Sheep Fair, Bishops Sutton Road, Alresford, Hampshire SO24 9EJ | Permit         |
| <p><b>Officer Presenting:</b> Catherine Watson<br/> <b>Public Speaking</b><br/> <b>Objector:</b> Simon Evans<br/> <b>Parish Council representative:</b> None<br/> <b>Ward Councillor:</b> Cllr Margot Power<br/> <b>Supporter:</b> Jane Marsden - Applicant</p> <p><u>Update</u></p> <p>None</p> |              |   |                |

| Item No | Ref No       | Address  | Recommendation |
|---------|--------------|--|----------------|
| 8       | 21/02063/FUL | Homewell , 7 Bereweeke Road,<br>Winchester, SO22 6AN | Permit         |

**Officer Presenting:** Catherine Watson

**Public Speaking**

**Objector:** Gina Cherrett

**Parish Council representative:** None

**Ward Councillor:** None

**Supporter:** Jeremy Tyrrell – Agent, Colin Dickens - Applicant

**Update**

Condition 2 (approved plans) to have proposed *Site Plan as Proposed* (1802\_PR\_010 A) superseded by 1802\_PR\_010 D. This is in order to clarify the nature of the front boundary treatment.

Further to publication of the officer's report, additional correspondence has been received by Dr Petford of 15a Bereweeke Close with regards to the previous appeal decision at 7 Bereweeke Road (the application site).

Application number 18/02927/FUL at the same address for a detached dwelling to the rear of the existing property, was recommended for refusal and agreed by the Committee. The appeal was dismissed and a copy is attached at Appendix A. The reason for refusal of the 2018 application was as follows:

*The proposal is considered to represent a cramped form of development within the plot and is not in keeping with the spatial characteristics of the surrounding area, thereby having a harmful and unneighbourly impact on the character of the area and surrounding properties contrary to policies CP2 and CP14 of LPP1, DM15, DM16 and DM17 of LPP2 and the High Quality Places SPD (policies UC2, GP1, GP4, GP8, AB3, AB6, HQS1-2, HQS9, HQB2).*

An additional condition is to be added removing certain elements of PD from the site:

*Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Classes A, B, C, D and E of Part 1; of Schedule 2 of the Order, shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason: To ensure that the development is proportionate to the site in order to protect the amenities of the locality and to maintain a good quality environment.*

| Item No  | Ref No                | Address   | Recommendation |
|--|-----------------------|---|----------------|
| 9  | SDNP/21/03322/<br>FUL | King George Farm, Stakes Lane,<br>Upham, SO32 1QA | Permit         |
| <p><b>Officer Presenting:</b> Lisa Booth<br/> <b>Public Speaking</b><br/> <b>Objector:</b> Mrs Ali Harrison-pre-prepared statement to be read on her behalf<br/> <b>Parish Council representative:</b> None<br/> <b>Ward Councillor:</b> None<br/> <b>Supporter:</b> None</p> <p><u>Update</u></p> <p>None</p> |                       |   |                |

| Item No  | Ref No       | Address                       | Recommendation |
|--|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 11   | 21/01780/HOU | 9 Manningford Close, SO23 7EU | PERMIT         |
| <p><b>Officer Presenting:</b> Marge Ballinger<br/> <b>Public Speaking</b><br/> <b>Objector:</b> Mr William O'Brien<br/> <b>Parish Council representative:</b> None<br/> <b>Ward Councillor:</b> Cllr Paula Ferguson<br/> <b>Supporter:</b> Louise Cutts-Agent</p> <p><u>Update</u></p> <p><u>Page 107 of the reports pack:</u> The existing parking was noted as 4 off-road spaces. Due to the angle of the drive, there are currently 3 off-road parking spaces that meet the 2.4m x 4.8m parking spaces for residential parking.</p> |              |                               |                |

| Item No  | Ref No       | Address   | Recommendation |
|--|--------------|---|----------------|
| 12   | 21/02107/HOU | Habayita , 42 St Faiths Road,<br>Winchester, SO23 9QD | Permit         |
| <p><b>Officer Presenting:</b> Rose Lister</p> <p><b>Public Speaking</b><br/> <b>Objector:</b> Mrs Carrie Lowe<br/> <b>Parish Council representative:</b> None<br/> <b>Ward Councillor:</b> None<br/> <b>Supporter:</b> Mrs Sophie Beer</p> |              |   |                |

### Update

Additional comments have been received from Mr and Mrs Lowe of number 41 and Mrs Wiseman of number 43 St Faiths Road on the 13<sup>th</sup> November

The proposed ground floor rear extension is approximately 3.5m to the ridge. The planning applications 00/02653/FUL (number 41) and 14/02851/FUL (number 43) indicate that the ground floor extensions immediately adjacent to the application site are 4m (no 41) and 3.8m (no 43) to the ridge. Therefore the proposed ground floor extension would be lower than the neighbouring properties.

As the application has been examined on site it was not considered necessary to request contextual drawings in this instance.

The first floor window at number 41 adjacent to the proposed first floor extension would serve a bedroom, not a bathroom as stated. The 45 degree test was conducted and indicated a small section of the proposed extension would be included in the visibility area. Therefore, the assessment of the impact of the proposal in terms of overbearing and overshadowing has not changed as a result of this, and is considered to be acceptable.

Additional photographs have been submitted showing the rear elevations of St Faiths Road and the view from number 40. The application site is situated on a west/east orientation with the rear elevations facing east. The orientation of the dwellings indicates that the majority of light is reached during the morning and early afternoon. It is considered that the proposed first floor extension would be to the south of both numbers 40 and 41 and therefore would have an impact on the amount of light reaching these windows in the late afternoon and evening. The property at number 40 is approximately 8.5m from the application site and therefore, it is considered that there is sufficient space to prevent direct overshadowing until late afternoon/early evening. The assessment of light impact on the window adjacent to the proposed extension at number 41 remains the same, in that there would be a limited loss of light to the window in the afternoon/early evening. The impact of light loss to these spaces is therefore considered to be to an acceptable degree and would not result in detrimental impacts to the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties which justifies refusal of the application.

As the orientation of these properties and the path of the sun is known, it is not necessary to require sunlight/daylight assessments in this instance.

Additional photos of the front elevation have been submitted looking south, showing the existing roof light and the ridge. Concerns have been raised regarding the visibility of the proposed dormer window on the street scene. It is considered that the proposed dormer would match the ridge of the site. Therefore, it is not considered that this would be visible in the street scene.

Finally, concerns have been raised regarding a flue pipe on the front elevation. An additional pipe was proposed as part of the previous application and was not included as part of this application. Therefore, this has not been considered.

**End of Updates**