



## MINUTES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

### DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Meeting held on Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> April  
at 7pm in The RVS, The Harlington

**Present:**

Cllr Schofield  
Cllr Holt  
Cllr Hope  
Cllr May  
Cllr Robinson

**Officers:** Charlotte Benham

1	<b>Apologies</b>  None received.
2	<b>Declarations of interest to any item on the agenda</b>  None declared.
3	<b>Public Session</b>  None.
4	<b>Approval of the Notes</b>  The minutes of the development and control advisory group meeting held on Monday 27 <sup>th</sup> March were accepted as a correct record of the meeting.
5	23/00630/FUL 52 Church Road Fleet Hampshire GU51 4LY <a href="#">Erection of a detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space (revision to planning permission 22/02764/FUL)</a> Comments required by 11 April <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Modifications are unclear.</li><li>• There are extensive ground works to protect tree and the tree root zone.</li><li>• There are extensive drainage works recommended by the Drainage Officer which should be supported.</li><li>• It is essential that the boundary facing Church Road is kept green - close boarded fencing is not acceptable.</li></ul>

- These three issues should be made Conditions of any approval and both the Tree Officer and the Drainage Officer should be involved in various stages of the development and work should not proceed until each stage is signed off
- The artist's impression of the street scene only screens the property when the trees are in full leaf, otherwise when the trees are bare the new property will be quite visible from Church Road.

OBJECTION unless the Conditions mentioned above are being applied i.e.

- 1 – Tree & Tree root zones being protected
- 2 - Drainage works recommended by HDC's drainage officer being implemented
- 3 – Boundary facing Church Rd kept green, no close boarded fencing

23/00593/HOU

23 Friesian Close Fleet Hampshire GU51 2TP

[Erect, replace and raise the height of boundary treatments](#)

Comments required by 14 April

NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE but Raising the fence to 2.45m around the whole property appears excessive, suggest it is either lowered or the trellis is removed.

23/00592/FUL

Wood Norton Stockton Avenue Fleet Hampshire GU51 4NP

[Replacement of timber windows to match existing](#)

Comments required by 14 April

NO OBJECTION

23/00624/HOU

71 Velmead Road Fleet Hampshire GU52 7LS

[Removal and raising of roof to create a first floor with rear dormer and 4 rooflights on the front roof slope, detached garage, gates and garden room](#)

Comments required by 17 April

- Loss of a bungalow as main bedrooms and bathroom moved upstairs – Guest bedroom retained downstairs but only toilet facility. Breaches Fleet Neighbourhood Plan Policy 11.
- Front elevation is totally out of character with the area especially the 4 roof lights to the front elevation. Overall unbalanced and poor design as the property becomes top heavy.
- Proposed gate and side walls out of keeping .
- Garage only 6 x 6 so cannot be classed a double garage under Hart's TAN - all parking then would have to be to front of property. A parking plan that meets Hart's standards is required. Parking plan also needs to meet Fleet Neighbourhood Plan, that 50% of frontage be retained as soft landscaping
- Support neighbours' objections

OBJECTION

23/00432/HOU

94A Reading Road South Fleet Hampshire GU52 7UA

[Erection of a two storey rear extension, replacement of front dormers, replacement of roof above bedroom 5 and porch, insertion of velux windows to rear elevation, additional cladding on ground floor front and rear elevations, replacement windows in hallway and kitchen/diner on front elevation and new roof tiles](#)

Comments required by 17 April

- Well-designed extension that maintains a good balance and respects local character
- Full height opening doors to two upper bedrooms appears to have no glass balustrade or safety measures?

NO OBJECTION in principle

23/00525/FUL

Branksome Chambers Branksomewood Road Fleet Hampshire GU51 4JS

[Erection of three porches and alterations to bike and bin store](#)

Comments required by 18 April

- Original proposal had all bins in a single compound to rear of building convenient for waste collection.
- 6 bins now moved to the front door of each flat at ground level which means the collection must be on Branksomewood Road on the pavement on a busy thoroughfare for access to the high street or the doctors' surgery in the opposite direction
- The original proposal with development out to the pavement edge was objected to - this is an attempt to increase the area of each flat
- Having a waste bin immediately outside the front door in a semi enclosed space is not a good environment

OBJECTION

23/00659/HOU

1 Fieldway Fleet Hampshire GU51 4ER

[Erection of single storey rear extension](#)

Comments required by 18 April

- No issues with the proposed development, but as both garages are lost need to provide onsite parking for a minimum of 3 vehicles.
- Need an on-site parking plan that meets Hart's TAN
- Parking plan also needs to meet Fleet Neighbourhood Plan policy 15 front gardens - that 50% of the soft landscaping can be maintained to support bio-diversity and climate change

OBJECTION until adequate parking plan as above has been ascertained .

23/00673/HOU

16 Fern Drive Church Crookham Fleet Hampshire GU51 5NW

[Erection of a single storey side extension](#)

Comments required by 18 April

- There has already been a rear extension and this adds a bathroom to the extension so that it can become an annex.
- Not an attractive extension as no attempt to tie in the roof with the existing property – out of keeping. Suggest design could be improved by changing roof design more in keeping with main dwelling
- Could become an additional bedroom – question parking provision? A parking plan that meets Hart’s standards is required

NO OBJECTION in principle subject to an adequate parking plan but strongly recommend extension roof be amended to improve design.

23/00172/FUL

Pioneer House Barley Way Fleet

[Extension of roof with dormer and external fire escapes together with associated ancillary works](#)

Comments required by 20 April

- This looks like a late realisation that the additional 7 flats at the second floor level (roof space) have no safe fire exit and this is to meet fire safety requirements
- The addition looks like “a bolt on solution” - not well designed and requiring an adjustment to the roof line to allow access to the new level fire escape. Fire escape is poor design and out of keeping and becomes a dominating feature of the development
- It does not enhance the design of the building and the flat roof extension to cover the fire escape flies beyond the profile of the roof – out of keeping
- The preferred solution would be to abandon the 7 flats in the roof space – they are poor design within themselves. Recognise cannot object to flats as they come under permitted development but they do not meet minimum space standards and have absolutely no natural light. Would also note development is not sustainable as no social aspect

OBJECTION

23/00290/FUL

176 Fleet Road Fleet Hampshire GU51 4DE

[Removal of ATM, nightsafe and existing signage and associated alterations to shopfront](#)

Comments required by 20 April

- Loss of a bank
- This removal of any indication that it was a bank and presenting a bland frontage to increase the rentability of the property
- No issues apart for the loss of a public facility

NO OBJECTION

23/00173/FUL

Technology House Barley Way Fleet

[Extension of roof with dormer and external fire escapes together with associated ancillary works](#)

Comments required by 20 April

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a parallel/sister application to Pioneer Housse - it is again a late modification to meet fire safety regulations as property developed into the roof space and the additional 7 flats at the second floor level (roof space) have no safe fire exit.</li> <li>• The gable ends are necessary to gain full height access to the stair case but do not create a sympathetic roof profile. A consequence of overdevelopment of the site</li> <li>• It does not enhance the design of the building - looks like an obvious bolt-on. The flat roof extension to cover the fire escape flies beyond the profile of the roof – looks out of keeping</li> <li>• Poor design as the fire escapes become dominating features of the development.</li> <li>• Again the best solution would be to remove the roof space accommodation – they are poor design within themselves. Frustratingly cannot object to flats as they come under permitted development but they do not meet minimum space standards and have absolutely no natural light. Would also note development is not sustainable as no social aspect</li> </ul> <p>OBJECTION</p>
6	<p><b>Noted:</b></p> <p>The weekly lists</p>
7	<p><b>Noted:</b></p> <p><b>Hart Planning Meeting Dates</b></p> <p>19<sup>th</sup> April</p>
8	<p><b>Date of Next Advisory Group Meeting</b></p> <p>24<sup>th</sup> April</p>

**Meeting closed: 8.10pm**

**Signed:**.....

**Date:** .....