

Public Document Pack

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Thursday, 11 December 2025

Attendance:

Councillors
Rutter (Chairperson)

Williams	Langford-Smith
Cunningham	Pett
Gordon-Smith	Small
Laming	White

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor Aron

Deputy Members:

Councillor Pett (deputy member for Councillor Aron)

Other Members that addressed the meeting:

Councillors Thompson and Westwood

[Full recording of the meeting](#)

1. APOLOGIES AND DEPUTY MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were noted as above.

2. DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS

Councillor Small made a personal statement that she was the Ward Member in respect of Item 8 (Unit F4 Whiteley Shopping Centre, Whiteley Way – case number: 25/01883/VAR). However, she had taken no part in discussions regarding the application, therefore she took part in the consideration of the item and voted thereon.

Councillor White made a personal statement that she was the Ward Member in respect of Item 9 (Land adjacent to Church Lane, Swanmore – case number: SDNP/25/00564/FUL). However, she had taken no part in discussions regarding the application, therefore she took part in the consideration of the item and voted thereon.

Councillor Pett declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of agenda item 9 (Land adjacent to Church Lane, Swanmore – case number: SDNP/25/00564/FUL) due to being a member of the South Downs National Park Authority. However, as there was no material conflict of interest, he remained in the room, spoke and voted under the dispensation granted by the Monitoring Officer that enabled him to participate and vote on such matters.

Councillor Williams declared a disclosable pecuniary interest due to his role as Hampshire County Councillor. However, as there was no material conflict of interest, he remained in the room, spoke and voted under the dispensation granted on behalf of the Audit and Governance Committee to participate and vote in all matters which might have a County Council involvement.

Furthermore, Councillor Williams made a personal statement that he was Ward Member in respect of Item 7 (Knowsley, Hoe Road, Bishops Waltham – case number: 25/00680/FUL). However, he had taken no part in discussions regarding the application, therefore he took part in the consideration of this item and voted thereon.

3. CHAIRPERSON'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairperson reminded members that the next meeting of the Planning Committee had been changed and would now take place on Tuesday, 20 January 2026 at 9.30am

4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 15 October 2025, 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 the report.

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS (WCC ITEMS 6-8 AND SDNP ITEM 9 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):

7. THE WHITE HOUSE, SLEEPERS HILL, WINCHESTER, SO22 4NA (CASE NUMBER: 25/00994/FUL)

Proposal Description: Item 6: (AMENDED) Construction of six houses and associated works

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

- (i) An error on the application description, that this application was for 5 dwellings and not 6 as stated. Furthermore, permitted development has been removed by Condition 20 for classes A (extensions), B (roof alterations), C (any other alteration to the roof), and E (outbuildings).
- (ii) Appropriate Assessment – The applicant has provided a revised technical note and calculations in relation to the nutrients for this site, as set out in full within the Update Sheet.
- (iii) An amendment to Condition 17 to ensure each dwelling has EV charging on site as follows:1 to ensure provision for cycle parking as follows:

Condition 17. An electric vehicle charging point (EVCP) shall be installed **for each dwelling** prior to the commencement of the parking hereby approved, and thereafter maintained and kept in good working order for the lifetime of the permission.

- (iv) A further condition was proposed in relation to the management of the site as follows:

Condition 23:

Before any development pursuant to this permission is commenced, written details including a plan showing details of measures to be adopted by the applicant or any other party becoming responsible for the development, for the management and maintenance of un-adopted common areas comprising shared land outside the private garden areas and dwellings; shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory future arrangements for the maintenance of the common parts of the development are secured in the interests of good planning and the amenities of future residents, since the development is not to be adopted by the local authority.

In addition, the planning case officer gave a verbal update at the meeting noting an error within the report in relation to the trees on the eastern side of the site which had been referred to as a TPO. However, this was only the case for a section of the eastern side of the site, as referenced in the case officer's presentation.

During public participation, Ian Galvin and Iain Flemming (presentation shown) spoke in objection to the application and Stuart Garnett spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

Councillor Westwood and Councillor Thompson spoke as Ward Members in objection to the application.

In summary, Councillor Westwood raised the following points:

1. He was supportive of new housing on the site in principle but had three main concerns with the proposal.
2. The first concern related to the scale and density of the development. He believed it negatively impacted adjacent properties due to its close proximity and overbearing height. He noted it would create a new Close, not just a new house, with no provision for refuse vehicle access, requiring up to 15 bins to be placed on the narrow road.
3. He stated that the development further degraded biodiversity on a site where many mature trees had already been felled, and that the proposal failed to comply with Winchester District Local Plan Policies DM15, DM16, and CP20.
4. His second concern was that the development did not fit within the character of the Sleeper's Hill area. He highlighted that the Sleeper's Hill local area design statement identified the leafy, wooded character as its most important feature and that this development was not in keeping with it.
5. He warned that the development set a precedent for dense development in the area, drawing a comparison to the high-density infill that had occurred on Chilbolton Avenue.
6. Lastly, he raised concern regarding the revisions to the proposal. While the number of properties was reduced from six to five, the building heights were increased, therefore the total internal area had only reduced by 4%. He quoted the council's landscape officer, who had described a marginally larger scheme as "overdevelopment" that conflicted with the character of Sleeper's Hill.
7. In conclusion, if minded to approve, Councillor Westwood urged the committee to request a site visit before making a final decision to understand the full impact, which he considered was not conveyed by the plans and photos.

In summary, Councillor Thompson raised the following points:

1. She spoke in support of nearby residents' raising objection to the application.
2. While not against building on the site, she felt the five proposed houses constituted an overdevelopment. She noted that although the scheme was altered from six houses to five, this did not address the proximity of buildings to existing trees, and the remaining houses were increased in size and height. She added that plot one appeared squeezed onto a narrow driveway.
3. She described the Sleeper's Hill area as being characterised by large plots with mature trees and low-density housing, as set out in the Sleeper's Hill Local Area Design Statement, which she considered an important document.
4. She quoted the council's landscape team's response, which highlighted a lack of space for substantial trees to screen the development and raised issues with TPO trees and the adverse effect on views from Sleeper's Hill.
5. She echoed the concern that Sleeper's Hill was becoming the "next Chilbolton Avenue," with developers building as many homes as possible on large plots.
6. In conclusion, Councillor Thompson also considered that it was important for the committee to conduct a site visit to fully understand the context of the plot before making a decision.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

In response to questions, the Council's Senior Planning and Litigation Lawyer clarified the appropriate tests that need to be applied in the imposition of any additional planning conditions, the proposed siting of the trees for plot 1 on the landscape plan and the criminal law in respect of damage to trees served with tree preservation orders.

RESOLVED:

The committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatics set out in the Report, the Update Sheet and the verbal update.

8. **KNOWSLEY, HOE ROAD, BISHOPS WALTHAM, HAMPSHIRE (CASE NUMBER: 25/00680/FUL)**

Proposal Description: Item 7: Demolition of dwellinghouse

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

- (i) An additional comment received from the adjoining property raising concerns that the proposal may cause damage to their property. It was noted that the red line plan identified the application site with all works confined to this area and a condition was recommended requiring details on the method of demolition to ensure minimal disruption to neighbouring properties. Any damage that occurred as a result of demolition would be considered a civil matter.

During public participation, Emma Houghton spoke in objection to 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 informatics set out in the Report and the Update Sheet.

9. **UNIT F4, WHITELEY SHOPPING CENTRE, WHITELEY WAY, HAMPSHIRE (CASE NUMBER: 25/01883/VAR)**

Proposal Description: Item 8: Variation of condition 4 of planning application 14/02677/FUL relating to the extension of operating hours for unit F4

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

- (i) The application was triggered to Planning Committee at the request of ward member, Councillor Vivian Achwal. Not due to the number of objections.
- (ii) An update to Condition 14 to read:

14. Unless approved in accordance with Condition 4 removable chairs, tables and associated paraphernalia only shall be placed outside in the location adjacent to the frontages of the ground floor units identified on the approved site plan. The chairs, tables and associated paraphernalia shall only be used for patrons of the ground floor units within the hours set out in Condition 2, namely 07.00 to 23.00 Monday to Saturday and 10.00 to 22.00 on Sundays and recognised public holidays except for units F6 and F7 which shall only be used between the hours of 07.00 to 23.00 Monday to Saturday and the hours of 10.00 to 22.30 on Sunday and recognised public holidays and Unit F4 which shall not be open to customers or patrons outside the hours of 08:00 to 00:00 Monday to Sunday and recognised public holidays, outside of which times they shall not be available to customers or patrons, being stacked and secured or stored to prevent their use. Outside of the operating hours detailed in Condition 2 tables and chairs shall be stored within the building hereby approved.

Reason: In the interests of nearby residential amenities.

During public participation, David Leslie and Councillor Mike Evans (Whiteley Town Council) spoke in objection to the application and Jamie Pyper spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

A statement was read out by the Chairperson on behalf of the Ward Member, Councillor Vivian Achwal, as summarised below:

1. Apologies for not attending due to a mayoral event. The council was not against businesses opening in the district, we actively encourage it, but this objection was to the proposed late opening hours. Serving alcohol until 2330 hours and closing hours at 0000hours.
2. There were two other units in the same complex, Nandos and Bar and Block, that sold alcohol. However, both closed at 2200 hours. The nearest pub to the proposed Wetherspoons was the Parsons Collar (approximately 1 mile away) and that closed at 2300 hours.
3. There are several homes within meters of this proposed drinking establishment. There was concern about the possible antisocial behaviour that might occur if the pub was allowed to close at midnight.
4. Whiteley Town Council also raised objection to the extension of the proposed opening hours.
5. In conclusion, Councillor Achwal urged the committee to object the application to extend the opening hour until midnight to prevent public nuisance and keep the opening hours to no later than 2300 hours.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

In response to questions, the Council's Senior Planning and Litigation Lawyer clarified the planning and licensing regimes, emphasising that the premises licence could be called in for review by a Licensing Sub-Committee should there be any reported breaches to the four licensing objectives.

RESOLVED:

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

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

10. **LAND ADJACENT TO CHURCH LANE, SWANMORE, SOUTHAMPTON
(CASE NUMBER: SDNP/25/00564/FUL)**

Proposal Description: Item 9: Erection of a portal framed timber barn with associated landscaping and works.

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

- (i) Several typographical errors to the report.
- (ii) A change to Condition 4 to note that 'The building hereby approved shall only be used for agriculture'.
- (iii) An amendment to Informative 15 to align in with Condition 2.
- (iv) Additional objection comments received from neighbouring property at Old Hill Farm, Droxford Road.

During public participation, Neil Armitage (also on behalf of Angus and Lauren Campbell spoke in objection to the application. In addition, a statement was read out on behalf of Councillor Jonathan Woodman (Swanmore Parish Council) in objection to the application. Natalie Fellows 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 informatics set out in the Report and the Update Sheet.

The meeting commenced at 9.30 am and concluded at 12.10 pm.

Chairperson

This page is intentionally left blank