

## MINUTES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

### DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Monday 24<sup>th</sup> October

7:00pm – RVS Offices, The Harlington

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

**Absent:** Cllr Jasper

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

1	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>Apologies were received from Cllr Hope.</p>
2	<p><b>Declarations of interest to any item on the agenda</b></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
3.	<p><b>Public Session</b></p> <p>Two members of the public were present: Phil Gower from FCCS and the owner of 35 Chesnut Grove who came to talk to the committee about application 16/02730/FUL – the only change to the previous application was the addition of a bat loft.</p>
4	<p><b>Approval of the Minutes</b></p> <p>The minutes of the Development and Control meeting held on Monday 10<sup>th</sup> October 2016 was accepted as correct record of the meetings.</p>
5	<p><b>Current Applications to be Considered:</b></p> <p><b>16/02284/HOU</b> 127 Clarence Road Single storey rear extension, following demolition of existing rear extension and enclosed timber lean-to Comments required by 31<sup>st</sup> October</p> <p>NO OBJECTION</p> <p><b>16/02557/HOU</b> 35 Aldershot Road Extensions and alterations</p>

Comments required by 8<sup>th</sup> November

**OBJECTION**

- Because of property being on a the busy A road a parking plan with dimensions needs to be submitted which shows the ability to enter/exit the site in a forward direction
- The proposed Juliet balcony is too invasive in regards to loss of privacy in neighbouring property's a breach of GEN1 (iii)- a normal window would be acceptable.

**16/02610/HOU**

11 Westover Road

2 storey side and rear extension and single storey rear extension

Comments required by 31<sup>st</sup> October

**OBJECTION**

- Concern over breach in 45 degree rule and possible loss of light to neighbour
- Poor design – proposed extension give appearance of small house detached from the existing house – relevant policies GEN 4 / URB16(i)
- Study could be counted as a bedroom
- Drop kerb is needed (not a planning issue!)

**16/02614/HOU**

6 Darset Avenue

Single storey rear extension to form kitchen and dining room

Comments required by 2<sup>nd</sup> November

NO OBJECTION subject to the development being in keeping with the neighbour's extension (no. 7)

**16/02658/HOU**

45 Elms Road

Erection of a double storey side extension

Comments required by 8<sup>th</sup> November

**OBJECTION**

- Drive should be made of a permeable surface, not tarmac
- Parking plan looks impractical & one car is shown parking on road – this will have a negative impact on parking & traffic in the neighbourhood which is already at saturation.

**16/02667/HOU**

11 Burnside

Single storey wrap around extension at ground floor level, comprising of a garage to the east and a family and dining room to the north, and addition of a bedroom at first floor level to the north

Comments required by 4<sup>th</sup> November

**OBJECTION**

- 4 cars in a row is unacceptable under Harts standards
- Garage is not big enough to be classed as a garage under Harts standards
- Possible breach in 45 degree rule
- Ensure space between proposed extension and plot boundary is big enough to get waste bins through to rear of property, otherwise provide a suitable storage space removing waste bins from public view.

**16/02684/HOU**

Selbourne Broomrigg Road

Installation of a 9m x 4.25m tiled one-piece composite swimming pool consisting of a GRP laminate shell with steel support beams. The pool is to be installed below ground and due to the integral strength of the shell does not require backfilling with concrete. In effect the pool can be removed and recycled in the future.

There will be a 1.20m wide concrete foundation applied to the perimeter of the pool (150mm deep) to accommodate paving slabs. Excavation will require approximately 66 cubic metres of soil to be removed

Comments required by 10<sup>th</sup> November

NO OBJECTION

Subject to protection of trees during construction

**16/02697/HOU**

17 Basingbourne Road

Single storey rear extension and part garage conversion

Comments required by 10<sup>th</sup> November

NO OBJECTION

**16/02770/HOU**

17 Basingbourne Close

Single storey rear extension to kitchen

Comments required by 10<sup>th</sup> November

NO OBJECTION subject to protection of oak tree during construction

**16/02715/HOU**

24 Howard Close

Conversion of existing garage to enlarge kitchen and single storey extension to form new garage

Comments required by 11<sup>th</sup> November

OBJECTION

- Garage is too small to be classed as a garage under Harts standards
- Dimensions of parking spaces shown on plan do not meet Harts standards - 2 cars will not fit on the front of the property therefore parking is inadequate.
- Require a suitably dimensioned parking plan to demonstrate onsite parking (GEN1(vii))

**16/02773/ADV**

Harvester Cove Road

Replacement signage in keeping with Mitchell's & Butlers Branding

Comments required by 11<sup>th</sup> November

NO OBJECTION to signs A,B,C however sign D is quite large and should be referred to highways. We suggest the possibility of putting a sign on the roundabout under the sponsor a roundabout scheme.

**16/02730/FUL**

Grasmere 35 Chestnut Grove

Erection of two detached, two-storey dwellings following the demolition of an existing garage with associated repositioning of an existing access.

Comments required by 11<sup>th</sup> November

NO OBJECTION

**16/02760/HOU**

45 Tamworth Drive

Single storey side + rear extension

Comments required by 11<sup>th</sup> November

NO OBJECTION subject to the tree officers comments that protective fencing should be used during construction to prevent damage to TPO'd tree

Due before meeting:

**16/02636/EIA**

Redevelopment Of Pyestock North Hartland Park Request for a Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Opinion under the 2011 EIA Regulations in connection with the proposed redevelopment of the former Defence Evaluation and Research Agency (DERA) site, Pyestock.

Comments required by 24<sup>th</sup> October

We support a full EIA in the format proposed by the developer– EIA should specifically address impact on:

- Traffic
- The strategic gap
- Trees/woodland and protected areas
- Ecology
- Public Amenities
- Education
- Sustainability (not just of the newly built environment, but the in broader community terms)

We'd also like to make some specific comments regarding the Scoping Report:

- We are shocked that Fleet Town Council is not mentioned as a consultee!
- The report states the intention to remove woodland because it is no longer worth saving when it was made a condition on the original approval that the woodland was subject to a woodland management plan that has obviously not been followed!
- Based on the figures presented within the report, the open developable area is only of the order of 21.8 hectares. It is stated that the developer intends to build 1,500 properties which means densities of around 70 houses per hectare. The only way that this density can be achieved is by many properties being built 4 – 6 storeys high which is completely out of keeping with the rest of the Fleet area
- 1000 – 2000 square metres of commercial and public space equates to around 1% of the total site which is far smaller than early indications, and would be inadequate for a sustainable community.
- Only 4,500 parking spaces are to be provided for the whole site which equate to around 3 spaces per property – this does not appear to address any visitor parking or parking to use amenities.
- When the site was cleared buildings were collapsed and those with basements will now be filled with rubble – these areas need special attention within the development proposals
- Site is close to SPA & Fleet Pond SSI areas – people will cut across the pond area to get to the station and there will likely be an increase in bicycles using the pond as a shortcut which may well cause irreparable damage to a protected area.
- The peak traffic patterns will be significantly different to the commercial use of the site and the impact on the surrounding road network needs to be thoroughly addressed
- There needs to be an overview of the educational demands from the

	development beyond just the proposed primary provision.
6	<p><b>Noted:</b></p> <p>The weekly lists were noted</p>
7	<p><b>To Note:</b></p> <p><b>Enforcement cases received:</b></p> <p>16/00365/OPERT 4 Beech Ride Complainant: PUBLIC Complaint: Alleged development not in accordance with submitted plans</p> <p><b>Enforcement cases closed:</b></p> <p>16/00344/COND2 18 Church Road Complaint: Breach of Conditions - Condition 7 of 15/00275/FUL - construction method statement Conclusion: Not Expedient to take enforcement action</p>
8	<p><b>Noted:</b></p> <p><b>Hart Planning Meeting Dates</b></p> <p>9th November &amp; 14th December</p>
9	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p> <p>Monday 7<sup>th</sup> November – 7pm in the Harlington, RVS Offices</p>

**The meeting closed at 8.35pm**

**Signed:**.....

**Date:** .....