

# Public Document Pack

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, 5 February 2025**

Attendance:

Councillors  
Rutter (Chairperson)

Achwal V (except Item 10)  
Clear  
Godfrey  
Laming

Langford-Smith  
Small  
White  
Williams

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor Cunningham

Deputy Member:

Councillor Godfrey (deputy for Councillor Cunningham)

Other Members that did address the meeting:

Councillors S Achwal, Cook, Gordon-Smith, Morris and Power

[Full recording of the meeting.](#)

---

### 1. **APOLOGIES AND DEPUTY MEMBERS**

Apologies were as noted above.

### 2. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

The Chairperson made a statement on behalf of the committee that the applicant in respect of Item 10 (4 Abbotts Ann Road, Winchester – case number: 24/025/11/HOU) was a fellow WCC Councillor and the Cabinet Member for Climate Emergency and was therefore known to them in their capacity as colleagues. However, they had taken no part in discussions regarding the application, therefore they took part in the consideration of the item and voted thereon.

In addition, Councillor V Achwal declared that they had predetermined the application (in respect of Item 10 above) following discussion with the applicant's husband. Councillor Achwal stated that they 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.

Councillor Williams declared a disclosable pecuniary interest due to their role as Hampshire County Councillor. However, as there was no material conflict of interest, they 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.

In addition, Councillor Williams made a personal statement in respect of item 13 (Land at High Street, Twyford, Winchester - case number: SDNP/23/04351/FUL) and item 14 (20 Hazel Close, Colden Common – case number: 24/02006/TPO) due to applications falling within their county council division. However, they had taken no part on discussions regarding the applications, therefore they took part in the consideration of the items and voted thereon.

Councillors Achwal and Small made a personal statement that they were Ward Members in respect of item 12 (Five Oaks Farm, Winchester Road, Shedfield - case number: 24/01868/FUL). However, they had taken no part in discussions regarding the application, therefore they took part in the consideration of the item and voted thereon.

3. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 December 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, 12 AND 14 AND SDNP ITEM 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 Chairperson reminded applicants and agents in attendance that members of the committee would not take part in discussions regarding applications prior to their determination and requested that any additional information be submitted through planning officers in future.

The committee considered the following items:

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

6. **BEREWEEKE COURT NURSING HOME, BEREWEEKE ROAD,  
WINCHESTER, HAMPSHIRE, SO22 6AN (CASE NUMBER: 23/02001/FUL)**

Proposal Description: Item 6: Demolition of redundant care home and associated outbuildings, redevelopment of the site to provide 32 apartments including 50% affordable housing and associated alterations to site access, sub-station, hard and soft landscaping, car parking, cycle store, plant room, refuse and recycling store, drainage, boundary treatments and other associated works.

It was noted that the majority of the committee had visited the application site on 4 February 2025 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 sets out in full the following:

- (i) A change to plan numbers in relation to condition 2.
- (ii) A change condition 7 regarding the damp-proof course level.
- (iii) An amendment to the report to remove the repetition of condition 19.
- (iv) A change to the wording of condition 20.
- (v) An amendment to condition 22 in relation to the parking management plan.
- (vi) A further objection was received on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2025 and a further comment was received in relation to parking and a request for double yellow lines.
- (vii) An additional note from Environmental Protection and an additional condition to read as follows:

‘Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted, full details demonstrating how noise sensitive premises will be suitably protected from external noise or vibration shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Development must then continue in accordance with the approved details. Any mitigation measures must be in operation prior to the occupation of the development.

Reason: To ensure acceptable noise levels within noise sensitive premises are maintained.’

In addition, a verbal update was provided at the meeting by the planning case officer for additional wording ‘Prior to damp-proof course...’ to be added in respect of the additional noise condition set out in (vii) above.

During public participation, Peter Richards and Mark Robinson spoke in objection to the application and Daniel Wiseman spoke in support of the application and answered Members’ questions thereon.

Councillor Morris spoke as Ward Member in objection to the application. In summary, Councillor Morris raised the following points:

- **Overdevelopment and Intrusiveness:** Councillor Morris stated that while there was no opposition to redeveloping the site, the current proposal represents overdevelopment, which would be intrusive, obstructive, and unworkable.
- **Parking Shortfall:** He highlighted a significant shortfall in parking provision, noting that the proposal included only 18 parking spaces for 32 units, while the council's adopted parking standards required 62 spaces. Even accounting for car-free units, there remained a shortage of 13 spaces. Councillor Morris argued that approving the proposal would mean agreeing to a proposal that does not meet the adopted parking standards.
- **Practicality and Future Car Ownership:** Councillor Morris questioned the practicality of the proposal, pointing out that there was nothing to stop residents of car-free units from requiring a car later, which would exacerbate parking issues.
- **Lack of Capacity:** The development lacked spare capacity for food deliveries, visitors, and emergency services.
- **Mitigation Concerns:** Questioned the applicant's attempt to mitigate parking concerns using census data, suggesting it could be misleading. In addition, he raised concerns about a proposed parking management scheme, stating that the scheme should be considered before deciding on the building's size and the number of parking spaces.
- **Conflict with Local Plan:** Approving the application would be an exception to policy DM of the local plan and the Winchester Council residential parking standards supplementary planning document.
- **Urban Design Assessment:** The number of parking spaces falls well below Winchester's parking standards for this type of development.
- **Open Space Deficiency:** The proposed open space, described as a narrow sliver of lawn, was insufficient for the number of residents, lacked amenity for children, was of low design quality, and would be in almost permanent shadow. Therefore, he considered the application to be contrary to policies CP13, CP15, CP16, and CP20.
- **Biodiversity Net Gain:** Councillor Morris referenced the comments of the HCC ecology team, noting that the submitted biodiversity net gain assessment was of limited value and its accuracy could not be checked. He noted that there was ample time to address the concerns.
- **Design Issues:** The proposal falls short of policies DM15, DM16, and DM17, presenting an imposing, box-shaped block that would loom over neighbouring properties, particularly the garden of 5 Bereweke Road. The building's height and position on a rise give it undue prominence. The proposal also falls short of policy CP13 on design grounds.
- **Balconies:** Councillor Morris drew attention to the Urban Design assessment that advised the removal of the balconies.

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 Update Sheet and the verbal update as set out above.

7. **LAND ADJACENT TO THE RUNNING HORSE, MAIN ROAD, LITTLETON, HAMPSHIRE (CASE NUMBER: 23/02848/FUL)**

Proposal Description: Item 7: Change of use to a dog walking field for commercial use by the public; erection of fencing; new hardstanding for vehicle parking and turning; retention of stable building for storage; and associated works.

The application was introduced. During public participation, Councillor John Biddlecombe (Littleton and Harestock Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Richard Osborn and Nick Culhane 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, subject to ensuring that the management plan in the condition deals with the changeover time period between booked appointments, with a restriction of one dog booking permitted per hour

8. **LAND NORTH OF THE AVENUE, ALRESFORD, HAMPSHIRE (CASE NUMBER: 23/02918/FUL)**

Proposal Description: Item 8: Change of use to agricultural land to a sui generis use for secure dog walking, together with the instalment of stock fencing to secure the area.

The application was introduced. Members were referred to the Update Sheet which set out in full an update to the supporting representation section of the report.

During public participation, Tim Blockley and Orlando Rooker-Roberts spoke in objection to the application and Ed Daniel spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

Councillor Gordon-Smith spoke as Ward Member in objection to the application. In summary, Councillor Gordon-Smith raised the following points:

- As a long-term resident, Councillor Gordon-Smith emphasised the importance of open countryside access for dog walking and health.
- He raised concerns about potential noise from dog barking, citing the council Animal Welfare Officer's statement about the large potential for noise nuisance, especially from lively, undertrained dogs. A personal experience of

hearing distressed dogs barking outside a shop, even through double-glazed windows, was shared to illustrate the disruptive impact.

- Objections were raised regarding a potential increase in traffic on the private road. Councillor Gordon-Smith suggested that Hampshire Highways might not fully appreciate the concerns of everyday drivers.
- The argument that dog paddocks reduce noise nuisance, such as sheep worrying, was deemed unconvincing. He argued that people with badly behaved dogs were unlikely to use dog paddocks.
- In conclusion, Councillor Gordon-Smith cautioned that dog walking paddocks might lead to further developments and retrospective planning applications, potentially creating problems.

Councillor Power spoke as Ward Member in objection to the application. In summary, Councillor Power raised the following points:

- Expressed concern about the impact on residential amenity due to the development.
- Described the location as one of the few places where the Milky Way was visible due to the lack of ambient light levels.
- Stated there would be nuisance on three subjects: noise, the conditions allow for lighting when there should be no lighting in rural areas, and access via a single-track road with no pavements or passing places.
- Anticipates another 40 traffic movements a day on the single-track road, which was the only access for both pedestrians and residents in cars.
- Noted that two properties adjoining the site currently have a beautiful view over the valley, which would be obstructed by a 1.8 metre stock fence, forcing residents to choose between privacy and their view.
- Referenced the Animal Welfare Officer's concerns about the revised management plan, stating that it does not reassure them that the owners of the site have the expertise to manage it.
- Cited the Historic Environment Officer's reference to unspoiled views to the west and north across the valley and to the trees on the skyline beyond.
- Requested further limits on the opening hours and that no lighting be installed, if the committee were minded to approve the application.

During discussion, the committee considered that, should they be minded to approve the proposal or it be heard at appeal, any lighting condition would need to be significantly strengthened to include a caveat stating that no lighting of any type should be installed.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

#### RESOLVED:

The committee agreed to refuse permission for the following reasons:

- (i) Tranquillity, Noise and Neighbour Impact. Contrary to policies: DM13, DM17 and DM23 of Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) and MTRA4. The proposal provided insufficient information justification to show that noise proposals would

not have a significant or detrimental impact on neighbouring amenities. The precise wording to be delegated to the Chair of Planning Committee, in consultation with the Service Lead: Built Environment.

9. **8 CULVERWELL GARDENS, WINCHESTER, HAMPSHIRE, SO23 9JG**  
**(CASE NUMBER: 24/02249/HOU)**

Proposal Description: Item 9: Two storey rear extension; Single-storey rear extension; removal of existing ground floor and first floor extension; conservation style rooflights; external and internal repairs and alterations (Amended Plans and Description).

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

- (i) A letter received from Southern Planning Practice on 31 January 2025.
- (ii) An amendment to the report to reflect that seven objecting representations have been received.
- (iii) A further group objection from five properties on Culverwell Gardens and 1 Century's End received on 30 January 2025.
- (iv) An email communication received concerning receipt and advertisement of shadow analysis.
- (v) An amendment to condition 3 to read as follows:

Condition 3. Notwithstanding the annotations detailing the proposed materials on the Proposed Plans and Elevations (082001\_Rev A, received 27/11/2024) and the materials specified within the 'Materials' section of the application form, the proposed cladding is not approved.

No development shall take place until a Materials Schedule (and samples if requested) demonstrating the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Development must be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development presents a satisfactory and high-quality appearance in the interests of the amenities of the area.

During public participation, Martin Holmes spoke in objection to the application and Alexandra Webb and Daniela Salgado Silva 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 and the Update Sheet.

10. **4 ABBOTTS ANN ROAD, WINCHESTER, HAMPSHIRE, SO22 6ND (CASE NUMBER: 24/02511/HOU)**

Proposal Description: Item 10: Installation of Valiant aroTHERM Plus 7KW air source heat pump in rear garden.

The application was introduced. Members were referred to the Update Sheet which advised that the application was being reported to the committee because the owner of the property was an elected Member of Winchester City Council and Cabinet Member for Climate Emergency.

In addition, the Update Sheet set out in full an amendment to page 168 of the report.

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.

11. **FIVE OAKS FARM, WINCHESTER ROAD, SHEDFIELD, SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE (CASE NUMBER: 24/01868/FUL)**

Proposal Description: Item 12: The partial change of use of agricultural barn to office and storage use and use of part of the yard area for parking; External alterations to provide new windows and doors and new mezzanine internally

The application was introduced. During public participation, Samuel Hiscock spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

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

- Made reference to several previously refused planning applications and unresolved issues with Winchester City Council concerning the area.
- He stated that the original lawful use of the land was defined as mixed-use for agriculture, private keeping and exercising of horses, and a maximum of six horses for private and DIY livery.
- Referenced past refused applications, including:
  - Replacement residential mobile home with a detached three-bedroom dwelling and detached garage (application 01607).



- Retrospective application for a change of use to a forklift training facility and training area, which was refused due to conflict with policies MTR4 and CP8 of the Winchester Local Plan Part 1 (application 01 1814).
- Change of use to brick and tile sales and storage facilities (applications 1926 and 274).
- Certificate of lawfulness application rejection, associated enforcement notice, and failed appeal regarding the use of land for brick sales (application 2023/00472).
- Extraction of 230,000 tons of soft sand and phased restoration involving up to 435,000 tons of clean inert waste material, refusal included the dangerous farmyard entrance (application 2020 HCS 1483).
- Councillor Achwal argued that the planning statement's suggestion of removing existing portable buildings lacked a firm commitment.
- Suggested that approving the current application would contradict the conditions of the original land use grant.
- In conclusion, Councillor Achwal urged the committee to reject the planning 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

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

**12. LAND AT HIGH STREET, TWYFORD, WINCHESTER, HAMPSHIRE (CASE NUMBER: SDNP/23/04351/FUL)**

Proposal Description: Item 13: Proposed erection of replacement equestrian building, following demolition of existing equestrian buildings.

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

- (i) Further comments received from Twyford Parish Council regarding the cumulative development and the impact of this on the settlement gap.
- (ii) Two further letters received from the occupiers of Colleton House seeking further clarification.

During public participation, Councillor Chris Corcoran (Twyford Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and Robert Tutton spoke in support of the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

Councillor Cook spoke as Ward Member in objection to the application. In summary, Councillor Cook raised the following points:

- Councillor Cook supported the parishes and residents' objections to the application, citing suspicion about the applicant's motives and genuineness.

- Concerns were raised that the applicant, described as a developer, may be aiming to build a house instead of a stable, potentially compromising a sensitive site.
- Councillor Cook urged the council to base its decision on the South Downs National Park policies and the Twyford neighbourhood plan.
- A key issue highlighted was the increased visual impact of the proposed replacement block. The submitted plans were criticised for lacking detail, particularly regarding stall layout and the absence of natural light in some boxes.
- She questioned the suitability of keeping horses in boxes for extended periods (24 hours a day, 7 days a week), contrary to the standards of the RSPCA and the British Horse Society, also noting the absence of grazing, a menage, or a walking ring.
- Councillor Cook raised concerns about road safety due to high traffic volume (15,000-18,000 traffic movements daily) with speeding on the road near the proposed stable.
- The scale of the proposed stable building was a major point of contention, being significantly larger (270% larger, three times the floor area, and four times the volume) than the existing stables.
- Referred to a previous application for eco-lodges on an adjoining site, where South Downs National Park councillors supported the parish's interpretation of policy LEH1 and refused the application.
- In conclusion, Councillor Cook asked the committee to refuse the application in its current form. She clarified that the parish council was open to development and would not object to rebuilding the stable in its current location, perhaps slightly larger. The objection was specific to demolishing the stables and building a much larger one in another part of the field.

In response to questions in relation to precedent with regards to an increase in development to equestrian sites in similar applications and appeal outcomes, the council's Senior Planning and Litigation Lawyer clarified this would be a case of planning judgement based upon the merits, with the law clear on changes of use.

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: LEH1 (Twyford neighbourhood plan – settlement gaps), SD4 (1b & 3 - character), SD5 and SD24(1a) - intensification of equestrian use). The precise wording to be delegated to the Chair of Planning Committee, in consultation with the Service Lead: Built Environment.

#### **Application outside the area of the South Downs National Park (WCC):**

13. **20 HAZEL CLOSE, COLDEN COMMON, WINCHESTER, HAMPSHIRE, SO21 1DL (CASE NUMBER: 24/02006/TPO)**

Proposal Description: Item 14: T6 – (Remove) (Amended)

The application was introduced. Members were referred to the Update Sheet which set out that further to closer examination of GIS maps, it had been noted that the TPO reference should read TPO1212 T1 and not T2. Amended maps to reflect this were displayed during the officer's presentation.

During public participation, Diana Watts and Councillor Maggie Hill (Colden Common Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application and answered Members' questions thereon.

In response to questions in relation to litigious pursuance for ground heave upon removal, the council's Senior Planning and Litigation Lawyer clarified that although there was some mention to potential of heave within documentation, there was no specific further information to establish this. The committee were reminded that it was required to look at the impact upon subsidence if the tree remained.

Furthermore, the council's Senior Planning and Litigation Lawyer confirmed that in a civil context, the council were required to make a judgment 'on the balance of probabilities'. In response to further questions, the council's Tree Officer clarified that a visual root analysis of the tree had been undertaken and not a full DNA root analysis.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application.

RESOLVED:

The committee agreed to defer the application for further information to be obtained, including a full and detailed DNA root analysis of the one tree proposed to be felled, prior to determination of the application.

14. **PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT APPEALS QUARTERLY REPORT - 1  
OCTOBER 2024 - 31 DECEMBER 2024**

The Corporate Head of Planning and Regulatory Services provided the committee with a detailed summary of the 9 planning appeal decisions for the period 1 October 2024 to 31 December 2024 and the 1 enforcement appeal decisions for the period 1 October 2024 and 31 December 2024.

The Chairperson thanked members and the Planning Team for the positive appeal outcomes achieved.

RESOLVED:

That the summary of planning and enforcement appeal decisions received during the period 1 October 2024 and 31 December 2024, be noted.

The meeting commenced at 9.30 am, adjourned between 1 pm and 2 pm and concluded at 4.30 pm.

Chairperson