

Public Document Pack

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 13 November 2024

Attendance:

Councillors
Rutter (Chairperson)

Achwal V
Clear
Cunningham
Laming

Langford-Smith
Small (except for Item 10)
White
Williams

Other Members that did address the meeting:

Councillors S Achwal, Cook, Power and Tippett-Cooper

[Full recording of the meeting.](#)

The Chairperson announced that due to a fire alarm in the Guildhall, there had been a delay to the start of the meeting to that advised on the agenda.

1. **APOLOGIES AND DEPUTY MEMBERS**

No apologies were received for this meeting

2. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Williams declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 6 (Skintle Green, Colden Common - case number: 22/00683/FUL) due to application falling within his county council division. However, he had taken no part on discussions regarding the application, therefore he took part in the consideration of the item and voted thereon.

Councillors Small and V Achwal declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 9 (Land at Wangfield Lane and Vicarage Lane, Curdrige - case number: 24/00876/FUL) due to their role as Ward Members. However, they had taken no part on discussions regarding the application, therefore they took part in the consideration of the item and voted thereon.

In addition, Councillor V Achwal declared the same interest in respect of Item 10 (Land Opposite Lockhams Hill, Lockhams Road, Curdrige – case number: 24/01317/FUL) due to her role as Ward Member. However, she had taken no

part on discussions regarding the application, therefore she took part in the consideration of the item and voted thereon.

Councillor Small declared a pre-determination in respect of Item 10 (Land Opposite Lockhams Hill, Lockhams Road, Curdridge – case number: 24/01317/FUL) as she had taken part in discussions with the applicant and local residents regarding the application. Councillor Small stated that she would take no part in the determination of the application and left the meeting for the consideration of the item taking no part in the discussion or vote thereon.

3. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING.**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 October 2024 be approved and adopted.

4. **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 the report.

5. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS (WCC ITEMS 6-10 AND 12 AND 13) (REPORT 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):

6. **6 SKINTLE GREEN, COLDEN COMMON, HAMPSHIRE, SO21 1UB
CASE NUMBER: 22/00683/FUL**

Proposal Description: Item 6: Erection of detached dwelling

It was noted that the majority of the committee had visited the application site on 12 November 2024 to enable members to observe the site in context and to gain a better appreciation of the proposals.

The application was introduced. Members were referred to the Update Sheet which set out the following:

- (i) The emerging Local Plan contained a policy which has a requirement for a minimum buffer of 15 metres 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 was not needed to ensure the appropriate protection of these trees.

- (ii) 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.

During public participation, Peter Catchpole and Councillor Alex Loughran (Colden Common Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Phillip Robinson (agent) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

Councillor Cook spoke as Ward Member. In summary, Councillor Cook raised the following points:

- She acknowledged that the planning officer recommended the application for permission and they considered it would not adversely impact the character of the area and was in accordance with policies DM15 and DM16, nor harm neighbouring residential amenity in accordance with policy DM17 of Local Plan Part Two (LPP2). She noted that it was the neighbour who was the applicant of No.6.
- She questioned the recommendation's assertion that the development would not harm adjacent protected trees, referencing policy DM24. She pointed out that the emerging local plan policy DNE15 advises against building within 15 metres of trees.
- She highlighted that the proposed three-storey, four-bedroom property does not meet the minimum parking standards despite changes to the parking layout at the rear of No.6.
- Concerns were raised about the proximity of the new build to footpath number 11, an ancient right of way, the felling of trees, and the overdevelopment of the current spacious street scene.
- She referenced the Village Design Statement, which identifies the characteristic layout and open spaces of the Brickmaker Estate, designed by Chilworth Homes, which won numerous awards.
- She argued that the estate, designed in the 1960s to provide family homes in a spacious and thoughtful manner, was predominantly two-storey, and the proposed three-storey development was overdevelopment, inappropriate, and harmful to the character of the green and surrounding homes.
- If the committee were minded to permit the application, she urged that consideration be given to the Winchester City Council Tree Officer's report from May 2022, which suggested tree protection conditions if consent were granted.
- She expressed gratitude for the site visit and noted the excitement of reviewing plans but described the application as attempting to "put a pint into a half pint glass", indicating it was imaginative, but out of character, deviating greatly from the original development.
- She urged the committee to refuse the application in its current design, height, and size. If permitted, she suggested the applicant consider making changes to their current home to fulfil their desire to build something special, as the family wishes to remain in Colden Common, a village she praised as an excellent place to live.

In response to questions, the council's Senior Planning and Litigation Lawyer clarified that the possibility of subsidence from trees would be a matter for building control to determine and for the applicant and builders to ensure that conditions were suitable for current building practices.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED:

The committee agreed to refuse permission for the following reasons:

- (i) Contrary to policies: CP13 of Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1), DM15 and DM16 of Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) and the Colden Common Village Design Statement (VDS) 2021, for reasons of height, size and siting in relation to the trees (which have tree protection orders) and the public right of way which results in a cramped and overbearing layout and appearance that fails to ensure adequate space for parking and manoeuvring with potential future pressure to fell trees given the limited space available. Therefore, the proposal fails to respect the characteristics or contribute to the distinctiveness of the area and will result in a harmful impact to the visual amenities and the wider character of this part of Colden Common. The precise wording to be delegated to the Chair of Planning Committee, and approved by the Vice-Chair, in consultation with the Service Lead: Built Environment.

**7. 10 BAIGENT CLOSE, WINCHESTER, HAMPSHIRE, SO23 0PE
CASE NUMBER: 23/02742/FUL**

Proposal Description: Item 7: Proposed new dwelling attached to no.10 Baigent Close. Demolition of existing outbuilding and proposed outbuilding within the garden of proposed dwelling.

The application was introduced. Members were referred to the Update Sheet which set out the following matters:

- (i) Signed and completed allocation agreement in respect of nutrient mitigation received on 1 November 2024, confirming that appropriate nutrient mitigation can be delivered if approved.
- (ii) An additional condition as follows:

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. construction traffic routes in the local area

- ii. parking and turning of operative, construction and visitor vehicles
- iii. deliveries, loading and unloading of plant and materials
- iv. storage of plant and materials
- v. programme of works (including measures for traffic management)

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CMP details during the construction period.

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.

During public participation, Anthony Hill spoke in objection to the application and Jeremy Tyrell (agent) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

Councillor Tippett-Cooper spoke as Ward Member. In summary, Councillor Tippett-Cooper raised the following points:

- Stated that he was primarily there to support the residents of Baigent Close and their concerns about the application.
- Acknowledged the officer's report and findings, noting that the key material planning considerations were the impact on the character of the street and the wider area, as well as the impact on neighbouring amenity.
- Expressed real concerns about the suggestion that the application does not cause material harm to the neighbouring residential amenity.
- Made reference to Mr Hill's opposition to the application, highlighting that the proposed new house in a small, densely built close would sit on top of a hill, with an additional outbuilding planned on even higher land.
- He argued that such an application in a larger street of detached homes would result in significant concerns, and in a dense area like this, the concerns should be even more acute.
- He disagreed with the report's assessment that the overshadowing impact on No. 9 Baigent Close would be limited, calling it a subjective assessment and suggesting it would be much more extensive.
- He noted that Mr Hill had provided evidence showing how the new building would overshadow and overlook numbers 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 Baigent Close, issues not fully addressed in the report.
- He pointed out a striking demonstration in the presentation showing how the proposed dwelling would loom over 11 Baigent Close and a large part of the tight-knit community.
- Emphasised that many residents had voiced their concerns through Mr Hill, who spoke effectively on their behalf.
- Councillor Tippett-Cooper argued that the development would have a real and material harm on their amenity and stressed the importance of considering evidence from residents.

- He quoted an email from Mr Hill, highlighting the major impact of the development within a high-density residential area and its close proximity to existing dwellings.
- Councillor Tippet-Cooper urged the committee to consider the actual human impact on local residents, who would have to live through a disruptive period of demolition and building work, and thereafter in the shadow of the development.
- It was noted that these were small properties without the luxury of unaffected garden areas or quiet parts of the house, and that some residents were elderly and would find the intrusion difficult to bear.
- In conclusion, Councillor Tippet-Cooper asked the committee to carefully consider the overlooking and overshadowing impacts before making a decision on the application.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED:

The committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Report and Update Sheet, with an additional condition to remove Permitted Development Rights.

8. **MOORSIDE RETAIL PARK, MOORSIDE ROAD, WINCHESTER, HAMPSHIRE**
CASE NUMBER: 23/02436/FUL

Proposal Description: Item 8: Use of Unit 3 as a gym or for retail purposes within Class E (additional information).

The application was introduced. During public participation, Peter Evans spoke in objection to the application and Jonathan Wadcock (agent) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED:

The committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Report.

9. **LAND AT WANGFIELD LANE AND VICARAGE LANE, CURDRIDGE,**
HAMPSHIRE
CASE NUMBER: 24/00876/FUL

Proposal Description: Item 9: The Erection of a Barn, Stable Block and Extension of Hardstanding (Amended Plans).

The application was introduced. Members were referred to the Update Sheet which set out the following matters:

- (i) Comments received from the Drainage Engineer on 7 November 2024 raising no objection, subject to a standard drainage condition being imposed.
- (ii) An additional condition 9 as follows:

Condition 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.

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.

- (iii) An amended version of the proposed site layout plan was uploaded on 7 November 2024 (Drawing Reference C9_24_21_PL_100_A). The only change showing the hedgerow planting (secured through condition 3 of consent 23/01775/FUL and now in place).

During public participation, Councillor Jonathan Carkeet (Curdrige Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Claire Carvalho (agent) spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

Councillor Sudhakar Achwal spoke as Ward Member. In summary, Councillor Achwal raised the following points:

- The application site previously formed part of a larger 4-hectare site. Planning permission was granted earlier this year (or possibly late last year) for a barn to provide storage for machinery and to graze one horse.
- The latest application seeks to add stables and other buildings for a further three horses. The British Horse Society recommends a ratio of one horse per 4 to 6 hectares. The site was approximately 0.9 hectares, hence a maximum of two horses could be accommodated on this site.
- Councillor Achwal expressed concern that the 4-hectare farmland was slowly being turned into an alternate use, which was not in accordance with Winchester City Council's equestrian development policy DM12.
- He argued that the buildings are out of proportion and would have a detrimental impact on the existing landscape, which was not in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- In conclusion, he urged the committee to refuse the application which he stated was contrary to policies CP20-1 and MTRA4.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED:

The committee agreed to refuse permission for the following reasons:

- (i) Contrary to Policy DM12 – The siting of an additional equestrian enterprise and the appearance and intensification as a result, in respect of cumulative impact in the context of the area, the proposal would therefore fail to respect and minimise the visual impact in the location. The application failed to adhere to Criterion 3: should not involve the erection of new buildings, such as hardstanding's that could be isolated or scattered; and Criterion 4: does not harm the character of the area by reason of cumulative impact when considered with other similar enterprises in the area. The precise wording to be delegated to the Chair of Planning Committee in consultation with the Service Lead: Built Environment

10. **LAND OPPOSITE LOCKHAMS HILL, LOCKHAMS ROAD, CURDRIDGE, HAMPSHIRE**
CASE NUMBER: 24/01317/FUL

Proposal Description: Item 10: Erection of 3 detached 4 bedroom dwellings with private amenity space, off-road parking, soft landscaping and associated works.

The application was introduced. Members were referred to the Update Sheet which set out in full amendments to the wording within Page 150 (paragraph 4) and Page 152 of the report and an additional presentation slide in respect of the proposed street scene.

During public participation, Sue Bishop and Damon Weir spoke in objection to the application and Alice Drew (agent) and Miles Willshire spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED:

The committee agreed to refuse permission for the reasons as set out in the Report and the Update Sheet.

11. **MOUNT PLEASANT, BIGHTON, ALRESFORD, HAMPSHIRE, SO24 9RB**
CASE NUMBER: 24/00939/FUL

Proposal Description: Item 12: Full planning permission for the demolition of the existing property and remains of bakery building with 2 linked detached two bed bungalows, revised access, parking, drainage and landscaping at Mount Pleasant, Bighton (AFFECTS THE SETTING OF THE PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY)

The application was introduced. Members were referred to the Update Sheet which set out in full the following matters:

- (i) Revised plan submitted on 7 November 2024 with annotations showing ownership of the blue-lined area.
- (ii) An amendment to paragraph 8 (page 203) in respect of the NPPF to use the wording set out on page 209 of the report and removal of the second reason for refusal (loss of non-designated heritage asset) set out on page 188.
- (iii) An amendment to the wording of paragraph 1 – reasons for recommendation (page 178).
- (iv) An amendment to the wording of paragraph 4 (page 184).
- (v) An amendment to the wording of paragraph 9 – planning balance and conclusion section (page 187).
- (vi) Paragraphs 7 – 10 of pages 185-186 refer to ecological documents which were superseded in August 2024. The requirements of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) were not completely fulfilled and therefore the reason for refusal still stands.

During public participation, Simon Packer and Henry McCowen spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

Councillor Power spoke as Ward Member. In summary, Councillor Power raised the following points:

- It was noted that the officer's report described the site as a property, which did not represent what it had become, as supported by the parish council. It was not considered a heritage asset in the village.
- Councillor Power emphasised her mission to gain small dwellings in the countryside, noting that such dwellings are often extended. She believed the limitations of this site would preclude extensions to the proposed homes and would be delighted if this could be conditioned.
- She expressed a desire to see the properties conditioned to prevent them from being used for short-term holiday accommodation, though she believed this might not be possible and asked the Chairperson to check this with officers.
- Turning to the reasons for refusal, she mentioned policy MTRA4 and the issue of extending the frontage. She argued that if permission for the two properties was not granted, it would result in yet another five-bedroom house in the village, of which there are already too many.
- Councillor Power noted that the historic aspect of the building condition had been removed and stressed the importance of providing parking on-site, given the village has no regular bus service, with only the No. 240 bus running twice a week. She highlighted that a two-bedroom property would likely have at least two vehicles, possibly three, and the site is right on a junction, necessitating off-road parking.
- Regarding the amount of open space, she believed that the remaining open space for any occupants would be a delight compared to new council-built housing, describing the site as very open and light, and thus did not believe the condition should apply.

- In conclusion, Councillor Power addressed the last reason for refusal, the biodiversity net gain (BNG), referring to a comment from Mr Nick Cutler on the planning website, stating that he believed the BNG could be met by conditions. Councillor Power emphasised the importance of achieving BNG and expressed her hopes for the approval of the application.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED:

The committee agreed to grant permission for the following reasons and subject to the following conditions set out below. The precise wording to be delegated to the Chair of Planning Committee in consultation with the Service Lead: Built Environment.

- (i) The proposal outweighs the concerns of policy MTRA3 and 4 due to the weight to be given to other material planning considerations outweighing the development policy. In terms of character issues, these were not considered to be materially harmful and the site not being a continuously built-up frontage was debated as it sits in a row of dwellings. The weight given to representations received in respect of small housing need and the unmet need for small dwellings was given significant weight based on known longstanding unmet need that was difficult to be delivered through MTRA3 given the unique nature of Bighton;
- (ii) The application meets the need for small dwellings as defined by local plan policy DM3 in respect of having houses that are under 120sqm which will restrict the size of the houses in the future; and
- (iii) Other material considerations given weight include the fall-back position for a replacement dwelling

Conditions:

- (i) Time limits and clarification of approved plans.
- (ii) Samples of materials to be submitted to the Local planning Authority for approval prior to the commencement of the construction of surfaces.
- (iii) Water efficiency and nutrients.
- (iv) Details of hard and soft landscaping works.
- (v) Implementation condition to ensure planting in accordance with plans.
- (vi) Lighting plans and position and direction of illuminates to minimise impact.
- (vii) Biodiversity New Gain conditions.
- (viii) Ecology enhancements.
- (ix) Code for sustainable homes standards.

- (x) Car Parking layout including details of the installation of electric charging points.
- (xi) No short-term holiday lets permitted.
- (xii) Photographic records of non-designated heritage assets.
- (xiii) Construction Management Plan.
- (xiv) Bighton footpath 3 (condition generated by Hampshire County Council).
- (xv) Removal of permitted development rights.

12. **THE SPINNEY, HUNDRED ACRES ROAD, WICKHAM, FAREHAM, HAMPSHIRE, PO17 6HY**
CASE NUMBER: 24/01675/HOU

Proposal Description: Item 13: New two storey porch. Two new gable dormers to front elevation of the existing house and garage roof, one new flat roof dormer to rear elevation garage roof.

The application was introduced. During public participation, Sara Day and Councillor Sandy Phillips-Lee (Wickham and Knowle Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Giordana Burns spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED:

The committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Report.

The meeting commenced at 9.45 am, adjourned between 1 pm and 2 pm and concluded at 3.20 pm.

Chairperson

This page is intentionally left blank