

MINUTES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Meeting held on Monday 23rd September at 7pm in The Function Room, The Harlington

Present:

Cllr Holt Cllr Robinson Cllr Schofield

Officers: Charlotte Benham

1	Apologies
	Cllrs Chenery and Cllr Hope
2	Declarations of interest to any item on the agenda
	None declared
3	Public Session
	None present
4	Approval of the Minutes
	The minutes of the development and control advisory group meeting held on Monday 9 th September were accepted as a correct record of the meeting.
5	24/01725/FUL 248 Fleet Road, Fleet, Hampshire GU51 4BX
	Change of use of commercial ground floor unit from dry cleaners (Class E) to
	takeaway (Sui Generis) with installation of a kitchen extractor fan to the rear
	Comments required by 24 September
	• The environmental Health Officer has some concerns about the exhaust system.
	• What is of particular concern is the cumulative effect of the number of food outlets
	concentrated in this one area with residential dwellings above. Can a combination
	analysis be done as well as stand alone?
	OBJECTION - support environmental health officer's comments

	795/GPDCOM
	is House,1 Waterfront Park, Fleet
	ge of use from Office (Use Class E) to Residential (Use Class C3) to
	e 25 dwellings
Comr	nents required by 26 September
٠	This is Permitted Development over which we have very little control.
•	Traffic is bound to be less for residential over commercial use. Adequate parking is
	being provided based upon Hart's standards.
•	There are no immediate flooding issues.
•	No recreation space for flats.
•	Majority of the flats are barely minimum space standards. Do we need any additiona
	one bedroom flats in Fleet?
Unabl	e to object as it's permitted development
24/01 [.]	797/GPDCOM
NTT F	louse,2 Waterfront Fleet GU51 3QT
	ge of use from Office (Use Class E) to Residential (Use Class C3) to
-	e 42 dwellings
Comm	nents required by 26 September
•	This is the second unit belonging to the same group who own Cygnus House.
	Obviously, a developer getting out of commercial property.
•	More 1-bedroom units slightly above minimum standards (around 46 m ²) and the 2
	person units are absolute minimum space standards.
•	Do we need any more flats on the market?
٨٥	ain Parmittad Davalanment so no antian to abject as doos not
-	ain Permitted Development so no option to object as does not acerbate traffic or flooding.
U.A.	
24/018	319/HOU
	n ,Victoria Hill Road Hampshire, GU51 4LG
	on of a fence and replacement gate up to 1.8m in height (coloured Yello
	Site Plan) and a fence up to 1.8m in height set back 2.5m from the real
	rty boundary (coloured Green on the Site Plan)
Comm	nents required by 27 September
٠	The statement from the Tree Report as below is incorrect:
	Hart District Council website indicates the property is affected by a Tree Preservation
	Order but is not located within a Conservation Area. Subject to the implementation of
	the detailed methodology within this report there should be no discernible impact or
	retained trees.
•	The property is located in Character Area 1 of the NFCA and therefore comes within
	Hart's Policy area and the Fleet Neighbourhood Policy Area – Policy 16. Policy 16.5
	states Boundary treatments shall reflect the semi-rural nature of the Conservation
	Area and help preserve views within and at the boundaries of the CA. The preferred
	options are hedges with, if necessary due to security considerations, inconspicuous
	fencing behind and modest wooden gates to driveways.

	• The replacement of hedges with wooden fences or brick walls and the use of metal gates will not be supported.
	 Long runs of exposed timber fencing nearly 2m high cannot be supported.
	 The tree report exposes the significant number of trees that would be affected by the
	proposed fence work. This will make fence post locations irregular and impact
	standard fence panel lengths. It would dictate a significant amount of hand work and
	customising of fence panels.
	• The opposite side of the footpath is already fenced. Fencing of the property boundary
	will make a corridor of fencing. Again, it would be preferable if the fencing could be
	set back off the boundary and leave a green edge to the footpath.
	• Examples of other misdemeanours in the Conservation Area, especially Freshwood
	House, which is a significant blot on Reading Road North, should not be used as
	evidence for another breach of the Conservation Area management but for a call to
	enforce the NFCA Management Plan.
	OBJECTION
	24/01825/HOU
	29 Tavistock Road, Fleet GU51 4EJ
	Demolition of conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension Comments required by 27 September
	Comments required by 27 Ocptember
	No objection to the proposed structure but there is a recognised issue with
	foundation works within the projected root zone of a TPO'd oak tree. The tree
	report is not endorsed by a recognised tree company.
	OBJECTION until tree issue resolved
	2 The Spinney, Fleet, Hampshire, GU51 4EP Erection of single storey rear extension, two storey side extension and
	alterations to external fenestration
	Comments required by 27 September
	No issues with the proposed extension to the property.
	• It is proposed to expand from a 3 bedroom to a 5 bedroom house which requires 4
	parking spaces. The overall width of the plot is 8m which would only allow 3 parallel
	 parking spaces – inadequate parking. Parking would mean that the front garden would be totally given over to hard
	 Parking would mean that the nont garden would be totally given over to hard standing which breaches Fleet Neighbourhood Plan Policy 15, Residential Gardens.
	standing which breaches neet weighbourhood nam oney 15, hesidential Galdens.
	OBJECTION
	24/01821/HOU
	7 Osborne Drive,Fleet,Hampshire, GU52 7LL
	Demolition of the existing carport and the erection of a new timber framed flat
	roof carport
	Comments required by 3 October
	NO OBJECTION
1	

	24/01442/HOU
	38 Guildford Road,Fleet,Hampshire, GU51 3EY
	Removal of fence and erection of a 1.8 metre brick wall on the boundary line
	and conversion of garage into storage
	Comments required by 3 October
	Comments required by 5 October
	• Appears to be a definition problem between a wall that is principally brick and a fence primarily wooden. The existing rear wall is a brick construction softened by creeping
	vegetation.It is not clear if the proposed wall adjacent to the neighbouring property in Cyprus
	Drive is a 6 foot brick wall or a lower wall with a slatted timber topping (see elevation drawings)
	• A 6 foot high brick wall would be totally out of keeping with the local character and an oppressive construction immediately on the neighbour's boundary.
	 If the wall was a lower construction with an open timber top it would be more acceptable, and planting could soften the impact.
	 Appears to be a construction on the corner boundary that could have required
	 Appears to be a construction on the corner boundary that could have required planning permission?
t	Holding objection until wall issue clarified – is it all brick or is it brick with timber top. If timber topped would be more acceptable and impact could be further reduced by planting
	24/01850/HOU
	Burnside, Fleet, GU51 3RE
	Erection of an extension to garage and insertion of roof window to existing side
-	extension
(Comments required by 3 October
	Appears a nominal amendment and no change in the number of bedrooms
	24/01859/AMCON
	50 Elvetham Road,Fleet,GU51 4QE
	S73(a) application for the variation of Condition 6 (landscaping) attached to
	Planning Permission 21/01978/FUL - Erection of an extension to the existing
	commercial building and hard surfacing to facilitate car parking and turning
(Comments required by 3 October
	• This property is just outside the NFCA being on the railway side of Elvetham Road.
	• 2m high chain link fencing to the front boundary is out of keeping with the local
	character.
	• Gates should be set at least a distance from the kerb to allow a vehicle to pull off the
	road in the event the gates are shut as this is a very busy road at certain times of the
	day – road safety issue.
1	NO OBJECTION in principle, however if gates set back further from kerb and
	2m high chain link fencing replaced with more appropriate front boundary screening then would be more acceptable
6 -	To Note:

	Review of weekly lists
7	Noted:
	Hart Planning Meeting Dates
	16 th October
8	Date of Next Development Control Committee Meeting
	Monday 14 th October

Meeting closed: 8:15pm

Signed:....

Date: