

Planning Committee

Update Sheet

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	22/00683/FUL	6 Skintle Green, Colden Common, Hampshire, SO21 1UB	Permit

Officer Presenting: Cameron Finch

Speaking

Objector: Peter Catchpole (with presentation)

Parish Council representative: Cllr Alex Loughran

Ward Councillor: Cllr Sue Cook

Supporter: Phillip Robinson (agent) (with presentation)

Update

The emerging Local Plan contains a policy which has a requirement for a minimum buffer of 15m between development and ancient woodland or veteran trees. The trees neighbouring the site are not designated as Ancient Woodland and have not been identified as veteran trees in the Arboriculture Assessment therefore this buffer distance is not needed to ensure the appropriate protection of these trees.

For clarification regarding the height of the proposed dwelling, the ordinance survey datum of the current house ridge height is 46.00 while the new dwelling is 47.65. This is a difference of 1.65 metres.

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
7	23/02742/FUL	10 Baigent Close, Winchester, SO23 0PE	Permit
<p>Officer Presenting: Catherine Watson</p> <p>Public Speaking</p> <p>Objector: Anthony Hill (with presentation) Parish Council representative: None Ward Councillor: Cllr John Tippet-Cooper Supporter: Jeremy Tyrrell (agent)</p> <p><u>Update</u> Signed and completed allocation agreement in respect of nutrient mitigation received 01.11.2024. This confirms that appropriate nutrient mitigation can be delivered if the application is approved.</p> <p>Suggested additional condition is application is approved: <i>No development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, to include details of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i. construction traffic routes in the local area</i> <i>ii. parking and turning of operative, construction and visitor vehicles</i> <i>iii. deliveries, loading and unloading of plant and materials</i> <i>iv. storage of plant and materials</i> <i>v. programme of works (including measures for traffic management)</i> <p><i>The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CMP details during the construction period.</i></p> <p><i>Reason: To ensure that development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users or result in any other significant harm to the amenity of local residents, or to existing natural features.</i></p>			

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
8	23/02436/FUL	Moorside Retail Park, Moorside Road, Winchester, Hampshire	Permit
<p>Officer Presenting: Megan Osborn</p> <p><u>Public Speaking</u></p> <p>Objector: Peter Evans, Phil Hall (with presentation) Parish Council representative: None Ward Councillor: None Supporter: Jonathan Wadcock (agent)</p> <p><u>Update</u></p> <p>None</p>			

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
9	24/00876/FUL	Land At Wangfield Lane And Vicarage Lane, Curdridge, Hampshire	Permit
<p>Officer Presenting: Liz Young</p> <p><u>Public Speaking</u></p> <p>Objector: None Parish Council representative: Cllr Jonathan Carkeet (with presentation) Ward Councillor: None Supporter: Claire Carvalho (agent)</p> <p><u>Update</u></p> <p>Comments received from Drainage Engineer (dated 7 November 2024) raising no objections subject to the standard drainage condition being imposed. Therefore, it is recommended that an additional condition should be added to the report as follows:</p> <p><i>9. Detailed proposals for the disposal of surface water shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the commencement of the development hereby permitted. The development shall not be occupied until the approved measures have been implemented.</i></p> <p><i>Reason: To ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere, that opportunities to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding within the District are addressed and that wastewater infrastructure to service new development is provided as required by Policy CP17 of the Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy Adopted March 2013</i></p>			

Additionally, an amended version of the proposed site layout plan was uploaded 7 November (Drawing Reference C9_24_21_PL_100_A). The only change is that the hedgerow planting (secured through condition 3 of consent 23/01775/FUL and now in place) is shown.

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
10	24/01317/FUL	Land Opposite Lockhams Hill, Lockhams Road, Curdridge, Hampshire	Refuse

Officer Presenting: Rose Chapman

Public Speaking

Objector: Sue Bishop, Damon Weir

Parish Council representative: None

Ward Councillor: None

Supporter: Alice Drew (agent), Miles Willshire (with presentation)

Update

Page 150 of the report pack para 4 should read:

As part of this application's statutory consultation, 47 comments were submitted in objection in total, of these **36** were from residents within the Parish of Curdridge. These comments were submitted with commentary on the application and therefore have been given materially weight.

Page 152 - Impact on character and appearance of the Area section. Final sentence should read:

' The proposal therefore accords with policies DM15 and DM16.'

Additional presentation slide between pages 164 and 165. Proposed street scene.

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
12	24/00939/FUL	Mount Pleasant, Bighton, Alresford, SO24 9RB	Refuse

Officer Presenting: Catherine Watson

Public Speaking

Objector: None

Parish Council representative: None

Ward Councillor: Cllr Margot Power

Supporter: Simon Packer, Henry McCowen

Update

Revised plan (drawing number 10857.002 G) submitted 07.11.2024 with annotations showing ownership of the blue-lined land.

Paragraph 8 of page 203 of the committee report refers to paragraph of the NPPF. The correct paragraph number is 209 although the wording is the same. The second reason for refusal on page 188 (loss of non-designated heritage asset) is removed.

Paragraph 1 (Reasons for Recommendation) on page 178 is amended with the *sentence in Italics*:

The development is recommended for refusal because it does not consist of the infilling of a continuously developed road frontage and therefore there is no justification for a new dwelling in the countryside. Due to the size and scale of the dwellings and the amount of hard landscaping, the proposals would also represent an overdevelopment of the site which would be visually prominent and incongruous in this setting. It would also result in the loss of an undesignated heritage asset *although this is outweighed by other material considerations*. Insufficient information with regards to BNG and ecological enhancements and mitigation has been provided.

Paragraph 4 on page 184 is amended as follows:

(Retained text) "The applicant's Heritage Statement has been assessed by the Council's Historic Environment team. This confirms that whilst the building is in a poor condition and has been altered over the years, including by the addition of an unsympathetic single storey addition, the limited architectural value of the building does not diminish its historic and communal interest. The view that this building should be considered to be a non-designated heritage asset, albeit one of low significance, is reinforced. The demolition of any heritage asset is harmful to its significance. The proposals would result in the total loss (the highest degree of harm) to a heritage asset of low significance. *(Amended text) Paragraph 209 of the NPPF states that the "effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of*

any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset". In making this balanced judgement, the following has been weighed up. The primary significance of the building lies within its historic and communal interest as a National School and complete demolition would result in its total loss which is the highest level of harm. The heritage officer has assessed that the building itself is in poor structural condition with the loss of some of the original features and the building fabric is in poor repair. Additionally, the building has been in residential use for many decades. It is noted that there has been no physical assessment by the applicant of the state of the building which looks at the feasibility of retaining the building. Another material consideration of significant weight is that Class B of Schedule 2, Part 11 of the GPDO 2015 (As Amended) enables the building to be demolished under permitted development rights. In accordance with the guidance contained within NPPF Paragraph 209, whilst the scale of the harm is high due to the loss of the building, when balanced within the significance of the heritage asset and the fallback position of permitted development it is not possible to recommend refusal on this basis".

The planning balance and conclusion section (paragraph 9 on page 187) has been amended as follows (see Italics):

*"In conclusion, the proposal is not considered to be acceptable and is recommended for refusal. Policy MTRA3 allows for infill development in settlements without a boundary however, this plot's position is at the end of a row of houses and therefore cannot be considered as "infill". The proposal constitutes overdevelopment of the site with buildings and associated hard landscaping that is significantly greater than at present. The building has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset. The proposed removal of the existing building will result in irreparable harm to the asset *however, this is outweighed by the fallback position of permitted development.* Insufficient information with regards to BNG and ecological enhancements and mitigation has been provided.*

Therefore, the proposal is contrary to policies MTRA3, MTRA4, CP13, CP16 and CP20 of the LPP1 and DM15, DM16, DM17 and DM23 of the LPP2 as well as sections 15 and 16 of the NPPF".

Paragraph 7-10 of pages 185-186 refer to ecological documents which were superseded in August 2024. The requirements of BNG were not completely fulfilled and therefore the reason for refusal still stands.

Item No	Ref No	Address	Recommendation
13	24/01675/HOU	The Spinney, Hundred Acres Road, Wickham, Fareham, Hampshire, PO17 6HY	Permit
<p>Officer Presenting: Ethan Townsend</p> <p>Objector: Sara Day (with presentation)</p> <p>Parish Council representative: Cllr Sandy Phillips-Lee</p> <p>Ward Councillor: None</p> <p>Supporter: Giordana Burns (with presentation)</p> <p><u>Update</u></p> <p>None</p>			

End of Updates