

Public Document Pack

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 27 September 2023

Attendance:

Councillors
Rutter (Chairperson)

Edwards
Achwal V
Gordon-Smith
Laming

Lee
Read
Small

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor Cunningham

Deputy Members:

Councillor Bolton (as deputy for Councillor Cunningham)

Other members in attendance:

Councillors Brophy, Cramoysan, Porter, Tippet-Cooper, Warwick, and Williams

[Video recording of this meeting](#)

1. **APOLOGIES AND DEPUTY MEMBERS**

Apologies were noted as above.

2. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Lee advised that the application at agenda item 12 (Land off Coronation Road, Swanmore) was within his ward, however, he had taken no part in discussions regarding the application, therefore he took part in the consideration of this item and voted thereon.

Councillor Achwal and Councillor Small advised that the application at agenda item 10 (The White House Cottage, Shedfield) was within their ward, however, they had taken no part in discussions regarding the application, therefore they took part in the consideration of this item and voted thereon.

Councillor Laming advised that the application at agenda item 6 (Torf House Shepherds Lane Compton) was within his ward, however, he had taken no part in discussions regarding the application, therefore he took part in the consideration of this item and voted thereon.

Councillor Read advised that the application at agenda item 14 (St Michaels Hambledon Road Denmead) was within his ward.

Councillor Rutter advised that the application at agenda item 7 (Ro-Mar-Ed Mortimer Close Kings Worthy) was within her ward, and she knew one of the objectors, however, she had taken no part in discussions regarding the application, therefore he took part in the consideration of this item and voted thereon.

Councillor Bolton advised that the application at agenda item 13 (Winters Hill Hall, Winters Hill, Sciviers Lane, Durley) was within his ward, 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. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING.**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 August 2023 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) (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:

6. **TORF HOUSE SHEPHERDS LANE COMPTON WINCHESTER HAMPSHIRE (CASE NUMBER: 23/01181/FUL). (BADGER FARM & OLIVERS BATTERY)**

Proposal Description: Demolition of the existing residential dwelling and annex, and the erection of five residential dwelling houses, with associated access, landscaping and parking.

The application was introduced and during public participation, Mark Leigh spoke in objection to the application, Chris Rees (Applicant) and Nick Culhane (Highway Consultant for the applicant) spoke in support of the application and Councillor Frances Strange, (Compton and Shawford Parish Council) spoke against the application and answered members' questions.

Councillor Jan Warwick spoke as a ward member and expressed several points on behalf of residents which could be summarised as follows.

1. That over 100 residents had expressed concerns about the proposal, primarily focusing on its material and cumulative impact on the community.

2. The proposal went against key planning policies, including District Local Plan Policies DM15, 16, 17, and 18, as well as the Compton Down Local Area Design Statement and the Compton and Shawford Village Design Statement.
3. The residents' association had raised concerns about traffic issues and setting a precedent for high-density development.
4. She felt that multiple grounds existed for refusing this application, encompassing both highway concerns and issues with the proposed properties.
5. That the proposed properties extended significantly beyond the existing building lines along Shepherds Lane, greatly increasing the density.
6. That Shepherds Lane had six existing dwellings and Field Close behind it, where privacy would be compromised by this development.
7. That the removal of trees and hedgerows, the proximity to other properties, and a lack of privacy screening showed inadequate provisions to minimise the impact of development.
8. That the proposal lacked smaller or social housing options, opting for five very large houses, neglecting a diverse community's needs, and contravening policy CP2.
9. That the choice of five large properties seemed economically driven, rather than a result of community or Parish Council discussion.
10. That if the application were to be approved then the following amendments were requested:
 - a. Reconfiguring plans to align with Shepherds Lane's existing building line.
 - b. Ensuring all third-story windows faced the rear, protecting existing residents' privacy.
 - c. Installing established hedging for front boundaries to harmonise with the street scene.
 - d. Implementing rigorous traffic management and promptly repairing road and verge damage to an adoptable standard.

Councillor Adrian Brophy spoke as a ward member and expressed several points on behalf of residents which could be summarised as follows.

- 1) He wished to raise resident concerns about road safety and its impact.
- 2) That objective reports spanning two decades highlighted local infrastructure challenges.
- 3) That housing proposals in Compton Down faced repeated rejections due to density-related road safety concerns over 20 years.
- 4) That concern originated from inadequate road infrastructure, particularly at Otterbourne Road and Shepherds Lane junctions, which were considered unsafe by residents.
- 5) That Hampshire Highways' current assessment contradicted prior evaluations, leading to a request for a deferred decision and detailed justification for changes.
- 6) That junctions, including Shepherd's Lane, Hurdle Way, and the busy Otterbourne Road, raised highway safety concerns due to design concerns, affecting visibility and safety.

- 7) He presented past refused applications, including:
 - a) In 2003, the Hurdle Way redevelopment refused permission due to junction inadequacies, emphasizing hazardous conditions.
 - b) In 2004, a Hampshire County Council traffic survey found that three additional housing units caused a significant traffic increase, compromising safety.
 - c) In 2005, four houses on Cliff Way were refused due to traffic increases and safety concerns.
 - d) Post-2005 surveys found infill breaches, leading to an embargo on infill dwellings by Winchester City Council in 2006.
 - e) In 2006, concerns arose over incremental developments on Windy Ridge and Cliff Way, impacting traffic flow at junctions with substandard visibility.
 - f) In 2008, applications were rejected for cumulative traffic increases exceeding five per cent, deemed material.
- 8) That nothing substantial has changed since then, with the same safety issues persisting, highlighted by recent accidents at Cart and Horses Junction in Kingsworthy.
- 9) That these concerns without substantial changes supported a fresh Hampshire Highways evaluation.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application and received additional advice from the committee's legal officer and Service Lead: Built Environment regarding highway matters and the weight that members should give to consultee responses.

RESOLVED

The committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report. In addition, the committee asked that their views expressed regarding the Landscaping Plan be further considered by officers.

Councillor Read left the meeting after this item and did not return.

7. **RO-MAR-ED MORTIMER CLOSE KINGS WORTHY HAMPSHIRE SO23 7QX (CASE NUMBER: 22/02746/FUL). (THE WORTHYS)**

Proposal Description: Erection of new detached dwelling and garage along with car parking and use of existing access onto Mortimer Close.

The application was introduced, and Members were referred to the update sheet which provided additional information regarding a change to the wording of condition 4. The update set out in full the detail of the change proposed. In addition, the case officer advised that a representation was received this morning objecting to the proposal. The person had previously objected and so had been considered with the report. The objector also submitted photographs, but in accordance with the public speaking protocols, it was explained that it was too late to put these on the committee presentation. These photos had been

assessed and the recommendation remained, the objection nor photos raised new material planning matters not already covered in the officers report. to .

During public participation, Owen Newton spoke in objection to the application, and Philip Dudley (Agent) spoke in support of the application and answered members' questions.

Councillor Jackie Porter spoke as a ward member and expressed several points on behalf of residents which could be summarised as follows.

- 1) That prior infill development had raised concerns, especially regarding properties where measures minimised impact.
- 2) That residents had three main objections: road width, character, and safety access.
- 3) That the road had sharp bends which limited forward views.
- 4) That sufficient space for vehicles, including visitors, was crucial during and after construction, with no road parking due to its single-carriageway nature and the need for emergency access.
- 5) That the building's height, including dormers, exceeded neighbouring properties, raising concerns about shadowing and privacy, especially on Russet House.
- 6) That the third objection related to the lack of local consultation with residents, with potential solutions achievable through smaller compromises and better communication.
- 7) That an additional concern involved the wider transport network, especially traffic and child safety at the school crossing, and the overlapping of construction hours with school operations.
- 8) That the absence of a sufficient path along Church Lane had increased car reliance, highlighting the need to consider the impact of another building, especially in light of recent accidents like the one at Cart and Horses Junction.

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 the update sheet, subject to the following.

1. An additional condition regarding the removal of permitted development rights in Classes A, B, and C of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015.
2. An additional informative requesting that construction traffic should be encouraged to avoid using Church Lane during daily school start and finish times.
3. The precise wording of the above to be delegated to Service Lead: Built Environment.

8. **3 BAIGENT CLOSE, WINCHESTER, SO23 0PE (CASE NUMBER: 22/00185/FUL) (ST BARTHOLOMEW)**

Proposal Description: Construction of 2-storey side extension to existing 4-bedroom small HMO (Use Class C4) to provide 2 additional bedrooms.

The application was introduced and during public participation, Alexander Bone spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor John Tippett Cooper spoke as a ward member and expressed several points on behalf of residents which could be summarised as follows.

- 1) That the application aimed to expand an existing House of Multiple Occupation (HMO), adding two additional occupants to a former single-family home, which raised questions about the overall gain or value of this change.
- 2) He urged careful consideration of objections from local residents, especially those in and around Baigent Close, who had expressed concerns about the negative impacts. He also noted Mr. Hill's objection, which underscored the area's original family-oriented intent.
- 3) He pointed out that, despite the officer recommendation's claim of acceptability without harm to neighbouring amenities, the City of Winchester Trust objected and had cited concerns about noise, overlooking, overshadowing, late-night activities, and parking issues.
- 4) He reported that former Councillor Ferguson, who conducted a site visit, revealed how the building's height would lead to overshadowing and a loss of amenity for residents in maisonettes at number one and two Baigent Close.
- 5) He observed elevation differences between number one, number two, and number three, suggesting the proposed extension could obscure light and invade the privacy of number one and two Baigent Close.
- 6) He disagreed with the recommendation's assertion of acceptability and compliance with development plan policies.
- 7) He highlighted the local community's strength and supportiveness, consisting of individuals, couples, and families proud of their local area. He acknowledged the thriving student and young professional community, which contributed economic and cultural benefits to the city.
- 8) He recognized the delicate balance between housing needs and the quality of life for Baigent Close residents, emphasizing their well-being over limited gains from this application.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED

1. The committee voted against the recommendation to approve planning permission and instead voted to refuse permission for the proposal. In reaching this decision they raised the following material planning matter which weighed in favour of refusing planning permission:

2. That due to the scale, positioning, and relationship with the neighbouring properties, the building had an adverse, overshadowing impact on neighbouring properties and was therefore contrary to Policy DM17 of the Local Plan part two. The precise wording of this to be delegated to the Service Lead: Built Environment.

9. **2 QUARRY BUSINESS PARK, LOWER LANE, BISHOPS WALTHAM, SOUTHAMPTON (CASE NUMBER: 22/02582/FUL) (BISHOPS WALTHAM)**

Proposal Description: Change of use of the above-mentioned premises from Class E (Commercial, Business and Service) to Class B8 (Storage or Distribution), together with associated external alterations.

The application was introduced and during public participation, Anthony Beable spoke in objection to the application, Charlotte Mills (Agent) spoke in support of the application and answered members' questions.

Councillor Jonathan Williams spoke as a ward member and expressed several points on behalf of residents which could be summarised as follows.

- 1) That residents had expressed concerns primarily about lighting, traffic, and noise and that Bishops Waltham Parish Council had requested support for their objections to the application.
- 2) That the site is situated between a care home and sheltered accommodation, known as Yew Trees,
- 3) He supported Condition 5, ensuring further Winchester City Council approval regarding lighting.
- 4) That the area falls within Bishops Waltham Conservation Zone and Dark Skies policy, necessitating the prevention of light spillage.
- 5) He suggested further restrictions on delivery and opening times similar to those approved in 2019 for Bishop's Waltham Depot.
- 6) That proposed delivery times should align with the 2019 approved hours of 8 AM to 7 PM on weekdays and 8 AM to 1 PM on Saturdays, with no operations on Sundays or bank holidays.
- 7) That these adjusted hours would reduce adverse effects on neighbouring residents, including the care home and sheltered accommodation at Yew Trees.
- 8) He questioned the significant disparity between the applicant's and noise impact contractor's customer number submissions and sought clarification.
- 9) That the agent's response indicated an average of six customers per hour, while the contractor reported a maximum of 2.9 customers per hour.
- 10) He urged the committee to consider altering conditions to match the original permitted opening hours for Bishop's Waltham Depot.
- 11) That proposed adjustments would mitigate noise impact for nearby residents, especially at Yew Trees and within the Bishops Waltham Conservation Zone.

- 12) That maintaining late opening times while increasing local employment opportunities remained possible under the proposed opening hours.
- 13) That the suggested opening hours exceeded those of comparable sites in Bishops Waltham with similar classifications and residential settings.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED

1. The committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.
2. In addition, it was agreed to amend the condition relating to lighting with the following additional wording “and must thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details”
The precise wording of the condition is to be delegated to
Service Lead: Built Environment.

Councillor Edwards left the meeting during the consideration of this item and returned for all the following items.

10. **THE WHITE HOUSE COTTAGE BOTLEY ROAD SHEDFIELD
SOUTHAMPTON HAMPSHIRE (CASE NUMBER: 23/01084/FUL).
(WHITELEY & SHEDFIELD;)**

Proposal Description: Change of Use from a Domestic Ancillary Outbuilding to a Separate Dwelling house (Use Class C3).

The application was introduced and during public participation, Jeremy Gardiner (Agent) spoke in support of the application and Councillor David Ogden, (Shedfield Parish Council) spoke against the application.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application and received additional advice from the committee’s legal officer regarding a previous appeal decision and the weight that members should give to it.

RESOLVED

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

11. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS (WCC ITEMS 12 - 14) (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:

12. **LAND OFF CORONATION ROAD CORONATION ROAD SWANMORE HAMPSHIRE (CASE NUMBER: 23/00252/FUL). (CENTRAL MEON VALLEY)**
Proposal Description: Erection of new detached dwelling.

The application was introduced and during public participation, Darren Harman spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor Malcolm Wallace spoke as a ward member and expressed several points on behalf of residents which could be summarised as follows.

- 1) That the plot is exceedingly small.
- 2) That Mr Harman's density calculations raised concerns, underscoring the plot's small. The application heavily relies on a prior approval, with unclear historical context.
- 3) That Local Plan Policy DM15 mandates development alignment with local area distinctiveness. It allows proposals that enhance the landscape and townscape framework as per local character assessments and design statements.
- 4) That the application contradicts Swanmore's design statement, specifically in sections 2.3 and 5.2. The former advocates guarding against excessive development and inappropriate infill to preserve the rural or village environment. The application appears to fall short in multiple aspects.
- 5) That section 5.2 of the design statement emphasises positioning choices that enhance visual diversity, protect neighbours' privacy, and avoid intrusive changes to established landscape views. The site's unique constraints, including vehicle reversing onto a private road, underscore its small size.
- 6) That the application strays from Swanmore's Village Design Statement principles, drawing objections from the parish council, who deemed it insensitive and inappropriate infill.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application and received additional advice from the committee's legal officer to clarify that this application was a resubmission of a scheme which was submitted and permitted in 2019 but did not commence within 3 years of the date of the permission and therefore lapsed and the weight that members should give to this.

RESOLVED

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

13. **WINTERS HILL HALL, WINTERS HILL, SCIVIERS LANE, DURLEY, SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE SO32 2AL (CASE NUMBER: 23/01340/FUL). (UPPER MEON VALLEY)**

Proposal Description: Change of use to allow 4 weddings a year, 2 community events, 5 indoor catered events and 3 outdoor theatre events alongside associated parking.

The application was introduced and during public participation, Kerry Pitter spoke in objection to the application, and Edward Balfour (Applicant) spoke in support of the application and answered members' questions.

Councillor Jonathan Williams spoke as a contiguous ward member and expressed several points on behalf of residents which could be summarised as follows.

- 1) That residents had primarily contacted him regarding noise and traffic concerns.
- 2) He acknowledged the officer's recommendations, which included conditions to address these concerns, namely condition three required a noise management plan to be submitted for approval before planning consent was granted. He requested further clarification on the specifics of this condition for the benefit of concerned residents and how it correlated with condition six, which restricted the number of weddings to four per year and imposed time constraints on music and closure times.
- 3) He raised the issue of traffic, particularly during this year's Garden Fair, where long queues caused significant congestion in Durley, Bishop's Waltham, and surrounding areas. He therefore welcomed the Traffic Management Plan condition for events.
- 4) He suggested an additional condition for the applicant to collaborate with transport providers to enhance the shuttle service from Bishop's Waltham, noting past issues with traffic, especially during the Garden Fair.
- 5) He appreciated condition two, which mandated the creation and management of a habitat and sought further clarification on the noise management plan's implementation for the directly impacted residents.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED

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

2. In addition, it was agreed that whilst an ecological impact assessment containing a number of recommendations was referenced in several conditions, that a further condition be added as an all-encompassing condition setting out that the requirements of mitigation outlined in the report must be adhered to. The precise wording of the condition is to be delegated to Service Lead: Built Environment.

14. **ST MICHAELS HAMBLEDON ROAD DENMEAD WATERLOOVILLE HAMPSHIRE (CASE NUMBER: 23/01121/FUL). (DENMEAD)**

Proposal Description: Revised application for Replacement Dwelling previously approved 28/10/22 - ref: 22/01720/FUL.with Design & Access Improvements.

The application was introduced, and Members were advised of a typographical error on page 239 of the report pack under the section titled Ecology and Biodiversity, paragraph two where a reference was made to condition 11 which should refer to condition 10.

During public participation, Jim Spencer spoke in support of the application and Councillor Kevin Andreoli, (Denmead Parish Council) spoke against the application and answered members' questions.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED

1. The committee agreed to grant permission for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report including the amendment following the officer's verbal update.
2. In addition, it was agreed to amend condition 4 to state that the garage and first-floor games room must be used for incidental purposes to the dwelling house and to then amend the reason for this condition to state that it is to control the use of the building as it is within the countryside. The precise wording of the condition is to be delegated to Service Lead: Built Environment.

The meeting commenced at 9.30 am and concluded at 4.20 pm

Chairperson

This page is intentionally left blank