

PLANNING COMMITTEE

14 February 2019

Attendance:

Councillors

Ruffell (Chairman)

Berry

Clear

Cunningham

Evans

Izard

McLean

Read

Rutter

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Weir

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 10 January 2019 be approved and adopted.

2. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS SCHEDULE** (Report PDC1126 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 agreed to receive the Update Sheet as an addendum to Report PDC1126.

Councillor Rutter declared that in respect of item 12 (Lower Farm, School Lane, Headbourne Worthy) she was a member of Headbourne Worthy Parish Council. She had not discussed or voted on this item when it was considered by the Parish Council and as she had not predetermined the application, she would speak and vote on this item.

Applications outside the area of the South Downs National Park (SDNP):

Item 7: Erection of 1no. two bedroom dwelling
15 Silwood Close, Winchester
Case number: 18/01986/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out an addition of condition 15 which read:

‘Development shall cease on site if, during any stage of the works, unexpected ground conditions or materials which suggest potential contamination are encountered, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Works shall not recommence before a site assessment has been undertaken and details of the findings along with details of any remedial action required (including timing provision for implementation), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be completed other than in accordance with the approved details.

NB - potentially contaminated ground conditions include infilled ground, visual evidence of contamination or materials with an unusual odour or appearance.

Reason: In order to secure satisfactory development and in the interests of the safety and amenity of future occupants.’

During public participation, Deborah Willsher and Kim Blunt spoke in objection to the application and Jeremy Tyrell, Agent, spoke in support and answered Members’ questions thereon.

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

In summary, Councillor Weir stated that:

- There was not a Neighbourhood Design Statement or Plan for the Berewecke Road area and as there was a lack of designated housing sites it led to infill applications.
- It was a small site, with the development “shoe-horned in” next to the pavement and represented over development.
- There was an accumulative effect of development on road safety.
- It needed to be ensured that the beech tree was not put at risk.
- Potential problems with road safety from the access at peak times.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee resolved to refuse permission in accordance with policies DM15, DM16 and DM17, as the quantum of development would appear cramped in the street scene and it was out of character with the prevailing character of the area. The precise wording was delegated to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman.

Item 8: Approved summer house revised site location in extended rear garden

63 St Cross Road Winchester

Case number: 18/02549/HOU

During public participation, James Bone spoke in objection of the application and answered Members’ questions thereon.

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 that an additional condition be included to the effect that no lighting should be installed without first submitting details to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

Item 9: Variation of condition 6 (08/02712/FUL) extension of opening hours.
4 De Lunn Buildings, Jewry Street, Winchester.
Case number: 18/02661/FUL.

During public participation, Zac Gurtekin, Ian Tait and Phrynnette Dickens spoke in objection of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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.

Item 10: Car Park with landscaping and new access from Worthy Road
Land At St Swithuns Church, London Road, Headbourne Worthy
Case number: 18/01978/FUL

This item was not considered at this meeting and was deferred to the next meeting of the Committee.

Item 12: Conversion to a dwelling
Lower Farm, School Lane, Headbourne Worthy, Winchester
Case number: 18/02679/FUL

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which set out that the Tree Officer had withdrawn his objection following investigation into the root area of the Horse Chestnut to the west of the outbuilding. Therefore paragraph 2 of the Landscape and trees section was amended to read:

'The landscape plan shows the removal of a number of smaller trees by the access, track and parking area. The loss of these smaller trees is considered to be acceptable. There is a significant Chestnut to the west of the outbuilding noted as T3 Horse Chestnut in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) that has a root protection area within the proposed excavation area, it is considered that this tree does not have a TPO served on it and is not readily visible in the street scene. While the loss of the tree would be lamentable it is not considered to have a high amenity value in the street scene for its loss to warrant a refusal reason.'

In addition, the Ecologist comments, last sentence should read: 'The Ecologist raised no objection subject to conditions requiring the measures set out in the Ecological Assessment be followed'.

During public participation, Sam Chisnell spoke in objection to the application and Gimma Macpherson, Kings Worthy Parish Council, and Richard Osborn, Agent, spoke in support and answered Members' questions thereon.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the Report and the Update Sheet.

Item 13: (Retrospective) Use of existing detached outbuilding as 'granny' annexe for family accommodation ancillary to the main dwelling. Orchard Gate, Lordswood, Highbridge
Case number: 18/02332/HOU

The Head of Development Management referred Members to the Update Sheet which stated that Condition 02 should read as follows:

'The residential accommodation hereby permitted, as shown in drawing No. 02_ Revision B, shall be occupied in association with the dwelling house or shall be used for the purposes ancillary to the dwelling house (Orchard Gate). At no time shall the building be occupied as an independent planning unit of residential accommodation, business, commercial or industrial purpose.'

During public participation, Maggie Hill, Colden Common Parish Council spoke in objection to the application and Mrs S Rayner spoke in support and answered Members' questions thereon.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee agreed to refuse permission as the development was tantamount to a new dwelling in the countryside and was contrary to policy MTRA4. The precise wording was delegated to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman.

RESOLVED:

1. That the decisions taken on the Development Control 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 (15 Silwood Close) permission be refused in accordance with policies DM15, DM16 and DM17, as the quantum of development would appear cramped in the street scene and it was out of character with the prevailing character of the area. The precise wording was delegated to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman.

(ii) That in respect of item 8 (63 St Cross Road) permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Report and the Update Sheet and an additional condition be agreed to the effect that no lighting should be installed without first submitting details to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

(iii) That in respect of item 13 (Orchard Gate, Lordswood, Highbridge) permission be refused as the development was tantamount to a new dwelling in the countryside and was contrary to policy MTRA4. The precise wording was delegated to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman.

3. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2235 – WATER LANE, BISHOPS SUTTON, ALRESFORD**
(Report PDC1125 refers)

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 2235 be confirmed.

4. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2233 – LAND AT PITT MANOR COTTAGE, KILHAM LANE, WINCHESTER**
(Report PDC1127 refers)

RESOLVED:

That, having taken into consideration the representations received, Tree Preservation Order 2233 be confirmed.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and adjourned between 12.10pm and 2.00pm and concluded at 4.10pm.

Chairman