

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Date and Time:** Wednesday 22 March 2023 at 7.00 pm

**Place:** Council Chamber

**Present:**

Quarterman (Chairman), Oliver (Vice-Chairman), Cockarill, Forster, Kennett, Makepeace-Browne, Southern, Wildsmith and Worlock

**In attendance:**

**Officers:**

Stephanie Baker, Development Management & Building Control Manager

Natalie Jarman, Principal Planner

Alexander Ralph, Planner

Tola Otudeko, Shared Legal Services

Jenny Murton, Committee Services and Members Officer

### **73 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting on 15 February 2023 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

Councillor Makepeace-Browne highlighted that she was not at the last meeting so could not comment on their accuracy.

### **74 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies had been received from Councillors Blewett and Radley.

### **75 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Forster declared a non-pre-jududcial interest in Item 5 as he is also a Hampshire County Councillor. The Chairman confirmed that as the Minutes of the QEB Steering Group (Item 5) were for noting only this was not required.

### **76 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman had no announcements.

The Development Management and Building Control Manager updated Members on the latest recruitment to the team.

Five out of six positions advertised have now been filled; this includes three Team Leaders, a Senior Tree Officer and Assistant Conservation Officer. These new officers will be starting between mid-April and early June.

In the interim two contractors are currently working as Team Leaders. The Planning Team is grateful for patience during the period of reduced capacity.

**77 MINUTES OF QEB TRANSPORT STEERING GROUP MEETING**

The Committee noted the QEB Transport Steering Group meeting Minutes from 20 January 2023.

**78 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS**

The planning reports from the Executive Director, Place were considered and accepted.

**79 23/00100/HOU - 15 CARTHONA DRIVE, FLEET, HAMPSHIRE, GU52 7SF**

The Planning Officer summarised the application as erection of a first-floor side extension with front dormer. He confirmed that the application was being discussed at this meeting due to the applicant being a staff member who worked in the Council's Place department.

A Member questioned what a catslide roof was and this was confirmed by the Development Management & Building Control Manager.

A Ward Member spoke to confirm that they saw no issue with the proposal, for a small extension, with minimal impacts.

The Chairman proposed the Officer's recommendation to grant, subject to conditions listed in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Southern.

The recommendation was unanimously carried.

**DECISION: GRANT, subject to conditions listed in the report.**

*Notes:*

*There were no speakers and there was no site visit.*

**80 22/01933/FUL - LAND NORTH OF WINCHFIELD COURT, PALE LANE, ELVETHAM, HOOK, HAMPSHIRE,**

The Principal Planner summarised the application as erection of a detached five-bedroom dwelling, garage and associated works.

She explained that the application had been brought to the Committee due to an Appeal against non-determination and to allow the Council's case to be made at that appeal. Members were asked to indicate what determination they would have made in respect of the application.

Whilst there was Officer-level delegation to determine the reasons which would have been given for refusal of the non-determination appeal, Officers considered it appropriate for this application to go to a public meeting due to public interest on the site and wider enforcement matters.

Members questioned:

- Why the application is now at an appeal against non-determination stage and if anything had delayed this process.
- Whether the proposal was retrospective in nature.
- Enforcement action on the wider site.
- Why there had been no specific reference to the legal Section 52 Agreement, why it is not included in the reasons for refusal and the reasons for this.
- Whether the Planning Inspectorate was aware of the legal agreement regarding the Section 52 Agreement and whether documents could be sent to the Inspectorate relating to the non-determination appeal.

The Development Management and Building Control Manager confirmed that the Section 52 Agreement is a separate legal restriction and not a reason for refusal in this application. It was confirmed that Officers will send details and copies of the Section 52 Agreement to the Planning Inspectorate for completeness.

The Committee questioned the speaker on the scale and size of development the Winchfield Neighbourhood Plan may have allowed, outside of any settlement boundary.

Members also questioned how the Winchfield Neighbourhood Plan and Hart Local Plan policies are considered or take precedence over one another.

The Ward Councillor gave a brief history of the site of the proposed application, wider site enforcement matters and how over the years it had been divided into several parts.

Members debated:

- The distance to shops and local amenities from the site of the proposed development.
- The lack of public transport to the site of the proposed development.
- The type of roads that go to and are around the site of the proposed development and that they are very narrow.
- If a 5-bedroom house was sustainable in this location and how it may integrate into the area.

Members expressed their sympathy to the Applicant in terms of potential unfairness in what they were sold or led to believe.

Members were shown a map displaying the two Enforcement notices on the site, that are for Change of Use and Operational Development. These cover the

application site and this was a point of clarification following the speaker's comments.

The Development Management and Building Control Manager summarised the seven reasons that were included in the report for refusal.

The Chairman reminded that the group that a recorded vote was not required for this item and a decision would not be made by Committee given the non-determination appeal.

The Committee unanimously agreed to endorse the Officer's recommendation and report that the application would have been REFUSED for the seven reasons set out in the Officer's report.

**DECISION: The Committee endorsed the Officer's recommendation and report that the application would have been REFUSED for the seven reasons set out in the Officer's report.**

**It was also agreed by the Development Management and Building Control Manager that relevant information relating to the Section 52 Agreement would also be included for the Planning Inspectorate in this Appeal.**

*Notes:*

*There was no site visit.*

*Mark Leedale spoke For the application.*

The meeting closed at 7.48 pm