

## MINUTES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**  
**Monday 19<sup>th</sup> December**  
**7:00pm –Dance Studio, The Harlington**

**Present:** Cllr Pierce - Chairman  
Cllr Holt  
Cllr Robinson  
Cllr Schofield  
Cllr Hope  
Cllr Wright

**Officers:** Charlotte Benham – Projects and Committee Officer

1	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>Apologies were received from Cllrs Gotel and Jasper.</p>
2	<p><b>Declarations of interest to any item on the agenda</b></p> <p>No declarations of interest were declared.</p>
3.	<p><b>Public Session</b></p> <p>Three members of the public were present – Phil Gower and Colin Gray from FCCS and George Woods.</p>
4	<p><b>Approval of the Minutes</b></p> <p>The minutes of the Development and Control meeting held on Monday 5<sup>th</sup> December 2016 were accepted as correct record of the meeting.</p>
5	<p><b>Current Applications to be Considered:</b></p> <p><b>16/02839/FUL</b> Harvester , Cove Road Conversion from Harvester to Miller and Carter. External alterations including new paved area with pergola, reduction in parking bays, new bi fold doors, new paving and fencing with lighting to pedestrian entrance and bull statue to car park Comments require by 30<sup>th</sup> December</p> <p><b>NO OBJECTION</b> However concern that the bull statue could be a safety hazard – there’s no barrier and it’s made from metal – the horns could possibly cause harm to children.</p>

**16/03092/HOU**

125 - 127 Clarence Road

Single Storey rear extensions to both properties, following demolition of existing rear extension & enclosed timber lean to(no 127)

Comments required by 29<sup>th</sup> December

**OBJECTION**

- Concern over possible breach in 45 degree rule
- Loss of sunlight to no.125

**16/03193/HOU**

Mallards, Stockton Avenue

Replacement Windows

Comments required by 29<sup>th</sup> December

**NO OBJECTION****16/03194/FUL**

115 - 123 Fleet Road

Palmerston House and Principle House, 111-123 Replacement of windows and doors including creation of new openings (windows and doors); together site works comprising provision of refuse and cycle stores and alterations to car parking layout

Comments required by 29<sup>th</sup> December

**NO OBJECTION**

- Are these changes part of a plan to eventually convert to flats. What is the basis of the number of bins and cycle racks?
- Bin store seems impractical – surely a commercial property should use large commercial bins?

**16/03024/HOU**

2 Rowan Close

Single storey front extension, front dormer and two storey rear extension

Comments required by 9<sup>th</sup> January

**OBJECTION**

- Plans are inaccurate – the building is actually much closer to the boundary and much closer to the adjoining property so proposed rear first floor window would see into neighbour's bedroom window
- Porch will take up parking space so a dimensioned parking plan for a 5 bed house needs to be submitted. On road parking is not practical.

**16/03159/HOU**

4 Johnson Court Kings Road

Hip to gable roof extension

Comments required by 28<sup>th</sup> December

**OBJECTION**

- Symmetry of the two ends of the semi-detached property will be lost. Currently the 4 semi-detached properties are designed to look like 2

large detached properties.

- Negative impact on street scene.
- No parking plan has been submitted – the properties are currently underprovided with only two parking spaces per property and there is no extra on-site parking available. Parking on King's Road should not be encouraged, it is a main road and a cycle route.

**16/03181/FUL**

Dudley Court Award Road

Erection of an apartment building, part 2, part 3 storeys, comprising of 16 1-bed and 2-bed apartments. Includes associated car parking and landscaping following the demolition of the existing apartment building

Comments required by 28<sup>th</sup> December

**OBJECTION**

- Gen 1 (i) – development is not in keeping with local character by virtue of their scale, design, massing, height.
- Out of keeping with street scene and local character.
- Grass has been replaced by hard standing which will cause flooding problems – this has already happened with the other Sentinel development

**16/03242/HOU**

117 Kings Road

Extension of dropped kerb

Comments required by 7<sup>th</sup> January

**NO OBJECTION**

- Did the garage built in 2016 have planning permission?
- Permission for a drop kerb be sought from HCC not HDC?

**16/03260/HOU**

11 Courtmoor Avenue

Erection of a detached garage, conversion of existing garage and erection of a single storey extension (resubmission of 16/01764/HOU)

Comments required by 6<sup>th</sup> January

**OBJECTION**

- A double garage under Hart's standards should be 6x6m
- Poor design
- Negative impact on street scene
- Condition should be applied that extension cannot be used as a separate dwelling

**16/03129/OUT**

Pale Lane Farm Pale Lane

Outline application for the development of up to 700 residential dwellings, site for primary school and local centre, together with associated vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access, drainage, landscape works and provision of general open space. Full details for the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace and means of access.

Comments required by 22<sup>nd</sup> December

Although lacking amenities, the housing development has been well considered, it is just in the wrong location - the development will have significant negative impacts on the surrounding area.

**OBJECTION:**

- Developer is redefining the Western boundary of Fleet as the River Hart and its immediate flood plain.
- It falsely claims to be a sustainable development when it relies on a greater area to provide employment, secondary education, medical facilities, and a range of retail and service outlets.
- It is too far from the main facilities of Fleet to be deemed an extension, most facilities are not walkable.
- The access into Fleet to the station is over the railway and the restrained junction of Fleet Road, Elvetham Road, Reading Road North and Hitches Lane. This junction is already stressed by the developments along Hitches Lane and the expanded catchment area for Calthorpe Park School.
- Access to the station is either by Elvetham Road and its ultimate junction with Fleet Road or RRN and the Oatsheaf traffic lights. Roads such as Stockton Ave and Knoll Road, unsuitable minor residential roads will be used to by-pass the junction of Elvetham Road and Fleet Road
- Traffic attempting to access Winchfield Station will place peak traffic on minor country roads.
- Direct access onto the M3 is not legal and residents will either have to access J4a, again via Fleet or J5 via Fleet Road to HW and onto the A30.
- Traffic could pass through Elvetham Heath to access both the station and J4a but this would add significant traffic load onto unsuitable minor estate roads. It could create a new rat run.
- The “sustainable” bus service is not that regular and is criticised for not linking up with the mainline train services. It will not provide any alternative to the use of private cars.
- There is very limited local employment opportunity. Much of the office stock in and around Fleet, including Ancells Farm is rapidly converting to residential accommodation.
- Local employment is rooted in retail or the service sector which does not pay salary levels commensurate with buying a house in Fleet. One bedroom flats are trading in excess of £200,000.
- Pale Lane is most likely to attract commuters employed in the major centres of London, Heathrow, Reading and Basingstoke.
- The largest employment site in Hart, Hartland Park is applying for planning permission to convert to residential housing. All named employment sites within Hart are minor employers.
- There is significant in-commuting to Fleet coming from less expensive areas that do not attract the same price premium as Fleet.
- The report fails to stress that the site is sandwiched between an elevated motorway and a railway line and the strategy is to locate the

cheaper and affordable housing adjacent to the less desirable boundaries. The motorway, elevated past the site, will lead to noise and air pollution.

- UK generally refuses to acknowledge US research that reveals the health impacts of living adjacent to major highway routes.

SANGS are mitigation measures to take the pressure of development off the SPA. They are meant to keep the new residents off the SPA by providing a suitable more convenient space. They are not really opening up the country side to all comers. They are not serviced with adequate car parking to attract visitors nor safe cycle routes to allow sustainable access. They meet only a locally generated need.

It is recognised that Ancells Farm with its limited retail offering and local facilities such as the community centre, pub and park is not well connected to Fleet and has become an isolated development. The same has happened at Elvetham Heath and Zebon Copse. They are not part of the larger community and yet are not self-sufficient nor sustainable. They become commuter enclaves.

Not too surprisingly the SANG in the west of the site is on the edge of the River Hart Flood Plain, making the site inaccessible for periods of the year and therefore does not consistently meet the parameters of being an alternative site to the SPA.

NOTE the words about parking, not resolved, but policy requirements will be met – there is no Policy only an advisory standard. Inadequate parking facilities on Edenbrook Estate is evidence of the consequences of inadequate parking provision.

NPPF 39 directs local planning authorities to take account of:

- The accessibility of the development - POOR
- The type of mix and use of development – RESIDENTIAL ONLY
- The availability and opportunities for public transport – VERY LIMITED
- Local car ownership levels HIGH and
- An overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles. NOT ACHIEVED BY BEING AN ISOLATED SITE.

See travel statement that whilst the site sits in Zone 3 it is more appropriate to use Zone 2 as Elvetham Heath. The parking standards are based upon distance from principal services and the site falls within ZONE 3 so ZONE 3 standards should be used. Experience to date is that HDC's parking standard is regularly exceeded and on road parking causes problems for residents, emergency services and waste disposal vehicles.

The HDC parking standard is flawed in that it sets the parking requirement against the distance to Fleet Station. This is not the sole attractor for traffic. The Traffic study shows a broad distribution of routes for commuters. It is not primarily work that drives car ownership in Fleet, it is a combination of a multitude of activities partly driven by a lack of convenient bus services, generally well off families and pure convenience; a car can get you to where you want when you want it. The parking provision should not be reduced below Hart's Standard.

The Travel Study tells us that we have to accept the traffic impacts because

they are not “severe” and Central Government has dictated that anything up to severe is acceptable.<sup>1</sup> Are traffic numbers and the lengths of queues the only parameters that define severe. Severe is a locally defined word, not one defined in Westminster. Significant traffic queues and extended peak traffic periods are an emerging characteristic of the Fleet area. This development can only exacerbate this situation and be described locally as “severe.” Fleet is a small market town, not a major urban conurbation.

Government in its attempt to define sustainable development actually linked sustainability to “quality of life.”<sup>2</sup>

*Sustainable development recognises that the three ‘pillars’ of the economy, society and the environment are interconnected. The Government has initiated a series of growth reviews to put the UK on a path to strong, sustainable and balanced growth. Our long term economic growth relies on protecting and enhancing the environmental resources that underpin it, and paying due regard to social needs. As part of our commitment to enhance wellbeing, we will start measuring our progress as a country, not just by how our economy is growing, but by how our lives are improving; not just by our standard of living, but by our quality of life.*

Placing pressure on vital services such as schools, medical facilities, basic road infrastructure, does not improve one’s quality of life.

The South East Plan, May 2009, although now defunct, was prepared with extensive research. Policy CC7 Infrastructure and Implementation starts:

*The scale and pace of development will depend on sufficient capacity being available in existing infrastructure to meet the needs of new development. Where this cannot be demonstrated the scale and pace of development will be dependent on additional capacity being released through demand management measures or better management of existing infrastructure, or through the provision of new infrastructure.*

Contributions to infrastructure meet none of these conditions. Development has to be infrastructure led. Financial contributions do not provide, on time, school places, additional medical capacity or road infrastructure. They only contribute to a degradation in the quality of life of the broader community.

Again at paragraph 5.19 of the South East Plan, it states:

*Government agrees that the timely provision of infrastructure is a fundamental tenet of this Plan, and key aspect of improving the quality of life of all those in the region.*

Paragraph 20 of NPPF states “to help economic growth, local planning authorities should plan proactively to meet development needs of business and

<sup>1</sup> NPPF para 32 “development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe”

<sup>2</sup> DEFRA 2011 February 2011 Mainstreaming Sustainable Development

	<p><i>support an economy fit for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.”</i></p> <p>And further at NPPF para 21 it states “<i>local planning authorities should:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Set out a clear economic vision and strategy for their area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth.”</i></li> </ul> <p>We have contested in the past that Hart are not planning for internal economic growth and therefore the only way to support the economy is to build the infrastructure to allow the residents of these new developments to access the main rail and road network.</p> <p>Local traffic jams stifle economic development and create local pollution, both contrary to sustainable development.</p> <p>Para 37 NPPF states:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities.</i></p> <p>There are no such policies, but the development of an isolated site nowhere near major employment areas and the lack of infrastructure to access them is not readily adjacent to secondary education, medical facilities or shopping fails in principle.</p> <p>Under the current Local Plan, the development fails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEN1 (ii) causes loss of amenity to existing and adjoining residential, commercial, recreational by virtue of increased pollution and traffic generation.</li> <li>• GEN1 (iv) development constitutes ribbon and sporadic development unrelated to existing patterns of development within the district – this is not an urban extension.</li> <li>• GEN1 (viii) gives rise to traffic flows in the surrounding road network which will cause material detriment to the amenity of nearby properties and settlements and highway safety.</li> <li>• GEN1 (x) will lead to problems further afield by causing heavy traffic to pass through residential areas.</li> <li>• T5 fails to improve capacity on roads administered by HCC to meet safety, economic and environmental objectives of area and route strategies. Increased congestion on local roads does not support the economy and increases local pollution.</li> <li>• T9 does not improve the Fleet Road /Fleet Station/ Waterfront Business Park with regard to road safety as a consequence of development.</li> </ul>
6	<p><b>Noted:</b></p> <p>The weekly lists were noted</p>
7	<p><b>To Note:</b></p> <p><b>Appeals:</b></p> <p>16/00164/HOU  13 Darset Avenue  Two storey rear extension and roof dormer</p>

	<p><b>Enforcement cases received:</b></p> <p>16/00428/XPLAN3 6 Whitewater Road Complaint Alleged development not in accordance with approved plans relating to 16/00929/HOU</p> <p>16/00418/OPERT 4A Wood Lane Complaint: Demolition of buildings and bungalow at site without permission</p> <p><b>Enforcement cases closed:</b></p> <p>16/00350/COND3 42 Reading Road South Complaint: Alleged breach of condition relating to closure of doors at car wash Conclusion Breach Ceased</p> <p>16/00418/OPERT3 4A Wood Lane Complaint: Demolition of buildings and bungalow at site without permission Conclusion: Not a breach of planning control</p> <p>16/00127/XPLANS 159 Albert Street Complaint: Alleged development not in accordance with approved plans relating to 15/02638 and commencement of work in breach of the provisions of condition Conclusion: Not Materially Different</p> <p>16/00393/XPLAN2 5 Alton Road Complaint: Alleged development not in accordance with the approved plans relating to planning permission 15/02961/FUL Conclusion: Not a breach of planning control</p>
8	<p><b>Noted:</b></p> <p><b>Hart Planning Meeting Dates</b></p> <p>11th January</p>
9	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p> <p>9<sup>th</sup> January</p>

**The meeting closed at 8.30pm**

**Signed:**.....

**Date:** .....