

## MINUTES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

### DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Monday 10<sup>th</sup> April

7:00pm – RVS, The Harlington

**Present:** Cllr Pierce - Chairman  
Cllr Holt  
Cllr Jasper  
Cllr Hope  
Cllr Schofield  
Cllr Gotel  
Cllr Wright

**Absent:** Cllr Robinson

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

1	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>No apologies received</p>
2	<p><b>Declarations of interest to any item on the agenda</b></p> <p>Cllr Jasper – 111 Albert street</p> <p>Cllr Holt - Quillets, Calthorpe Road</p>
3.	<p><b>Public Session</b></p> <p>One member of the public was present – Phil Gower from FCCS</p>
4	<p><b>Approval of the Minutes</b></p> <p>The minutes of the Development and Control meeting held on Monday 27<sup>th</sup> March were accepted as correct record of the meeting.</p>
5	<p><b>Current Applications to be Considered:</b></p> <p><b>17/00579/FUL</b> Nisaba House Waterfront Business Park Retrospective application for the enlargement and replacement of existing ventilation openings and the creation of additional ventilation openings to the facade of Nisaba House Comments required by 28<sup>th</sup> April</p> <p>NO OBJECTION</p>

**17/00631/HOU**

20 Durnsford Avenue

Rear single storey extension to the property, replacing the existing conservatory structure

Comments required by 18<sup>th</sup> April

NO OBJECTION

**17/00646/HOU**

99 Tavistock Road

1st floor side extension with hipped roof, over existing ground floor

Comments required by 17<sup>th</sup> April

NO OBJECTION

Subject to a condition that the trees be protected during construction

**17/00673/HOU**

111 Albert Street

Erection of part two-storey and part single storey side extension including internal and external alterations with partial demolitions and material alterations to existing front facade with replacement of concrete roof tiles with slate tiles to match existing style

Comments required by 21<sup>st</sup> April

OBJECTION

A dimensioned car parking plan is required as a side extension will prohibit cars being parked beside the house

**17/00683/HOU**

Quillets Calthorpe Road

Proposed single storey extension to the detached residential dwelling plus replacement detached triple garage combined with Pool House, Garden Store and Games Room within the roof space above to accompany the new open air swimming pool

Comments required by 21<sup>st</sup> April

OBJECTION

- Condition the garage is not used as a separate dwelling
- Trees need to be protected during construction
- Dove cote and timber cladding is out of keeping in conservation area
- proposed garage is very large
- The lantern on the proposed extension is out of keeping with the rest of the house

**17/00689/HOU**

17 Chestnut Grove

Single storey side and rear extension

Comments required by 21<sup>st</sup> April

NO OBJECTION

- Subject to the addition of a suitable bin store at the front of the property
- Garage is too small to be classed as a garage under HDC standards

**17/00692/ADV**

Edenbrook

Sales and Marketing Signage 5 x single side totems, 8 x double sided totem, 3 x fred cut brushed aluminium text, 1 x brushed silver ACM sign

Comments required by 21<sup>st</sup> April

**OBJECTION**

- Signs should have a time restraint
- Ridiculous number of signs, don't need that many!
- 4 bed show home shown on plan has 3 cars in a row which is not compliant with HDC standards

**17/00693/HOU**

6A Castle Street

Single story flat roof extension at the rear

Comments required by 25<sup>th</sup> April

**OBJECTION**

- Parking plan that meets HDC standards is needed
- Breach in 45 degree rule, changing the plan to say 55 degrees does not change the fact

**17/00696/FUL**

242 Oatsheaf Parade

Change of Use of 242-246 Oatsheaf Parade from Yoga Centre (D2) to create six residential units, comprises 4 x one bedroom flats and 2 x two bedroom flats. Associated cycle and bin storage and parking to rear for 11 cars

Comments required by 27<sup>th</sup> April

**OBJECTION**

- Question whether they own the whole carpark?
- Residential bin storage is impractical – bin lorries will not collect them in their current location
- Designating parking spaces is unlikely to work, people will just park wherever there's space
- Parking is inadequate – 11 spaces needed for flats and the ground floor premises is commercial not a warehouse therefore they should be providing parking (7 spaces not 3)

**17/00471/OUT**

Hartland Park

Hybrid Planning Application (part full, part outline) for a residential-led mixed use redevelopment comprising:

1. Outline Planning Application with means of access (in part) to be determined (all other matters reserved for subsequent approval), for the erection of up to 1,500 dwellings (Use Class C3); a local centre including residential (Use Class C3 within the up to 1,500 dwellings) and up to 2,655m<sup>2</sup> (GEA) of retail, commercial and/or community floorspace (Use Classes A1 to A5, B1, D1 and D2); a primary school (Use Class D1); drainage works including balancing ponds; on and off-site SANG mitigation; creation of landscaping, open space and

ecological habitats; car and cycle parking; demolition of existing buildings; site clearance; earthworks; site remediation; provision of utilities infrastructure; off-site highway works; and all other ancillary and enabling works.  
2. Full Planning Application for the erection of 189 dwellings (Use Class C3); access; drainage works including balancing ponds; creation of landscaping, open space and ecological habitats; car and cycle parking; earthworks; demolition of existing buildings; site remediation; provision of utilities infrastructure; off-site highway works; and all other ancillary and enabling work  
Comments required by 12<sup>th</sup> April

## **OBJECTION**

GEN1 – Proposals for development will be permitted where they

- (i) Are in keeping with the local character by virtue of their scale, design, massing, height, prominence, materials, layout, landscaping, siting and density.

The Developer aims to avoid compliance with this policy by claiming it is an isolated development, but it is completely out of character with the general nature of Fleet and its surrounding area. This introduces a style and character, height and density, totally out of keeping with the general semi-rural nature of Fleet. This development has very little opportunity to reflect the generally “sylvan” character of Fleet. This development achieves densities typical of major towns.

PPS3 suggested the following Density Range (dwellings per hectare):

Location

City Centre	Above 70
Urban	40-75
Suburban	35-55
Rural	30-40

Fleet should typically be classified as Suburban/Rural

Parts of Pyestock area has densities as high as 90+ totally out of keeping as some are 5 storey high apartment blocks

(xiii) avoid installation of lighting, which is visually damaging to the character of the area. This brownfield site sits in the middle of a designated “Strategic Gap” see Policy CON19.- Development will NOT be permitted which would diminish the Defined Strategic Gaps Physically or VISUALLY. Street lighting and domestic lighting with 3, 4 and 5 storey flats will become visible in the surrounding dark space and therefore appear to coalesce the adjoining settlements.

A major issue was made in the earlier Commercial Planning Application that any development outside the existing footprint of developed land was an incursion into and therefore a diminution of the Strategic Gap. It is proposed within this new residential development to extend well beyond the original brownfield building footprint and therefore significantly diminishes the Strategic Gap.

The significant reduction in the depth of the belt of trees surrounding the site

will remove much of the natural screening effect and allow visual intrusion into the Strategic Gap. The Developer cannot rely on tree screening from land outside his control.

GEN4 Development proposals will be permitted where they sustain or improve the Urban design qualities of Towns, Villages or other settlements which derive from their layout and form, scale, character or appearance, special features or the arrangement scale and design of buildings and spaces.

The developer is arguing that this is an isolated development and therefore can create its own character, but the supporting text includes matters such as – scale where the relative size status prominence of buildings spaces and features and their component parts will be considered in respect of context and again this takes us back to be within a Strategic Gap and need to maintain separation of settlements, so the design should respect its location.

GEN9 relates to development on contaminated land. It has been pointed out that there are two potential sites of contamination 1) the old tank farm, currently shown to be occupied by the school playing field and 2) the old on-site treatment works which has evidence of sludge settling lagoons and is proposed for residential development.

GEN11 relates to areas liable to flood or which would unacceptably increase the risk of flooding on other land. There is serious concern that introducing SUDS onto the site could impact ground water levels which could increase flows/seepages to the West of the site which in turn could negatively affect the stability of the West facing slopes that drain onto MOD land.

CON 6 restricts development that can cause significant harm to existing or former heathland habitats, either directly or indirectly. A number of acid heathland areas previously classified as SINCS have been degraded on the site and there is no identified measures to recover the acid grassland areas. These were previously identified as requiring protection and should be considered in the environmental objectives of the project.

CON 8 identifies development which would affect trees, woodland and hedgerows of significant landscape amenity value. The woodland perimeter to the site has provided significant screening to the site from accessible vantage points including the Ively Road which passes to the south east of the site. Reduction in the tree belt will make the residential development very visible from the road, especially at night which is both a loss of amenity, no longer passing through a green verged and treed landscape, plus the visibility through street and residential lighting which significantly reduces the impact of the strategic gap.

Affordable housing – the Developer has reduced the provision of AH to 20% a loss of 300 affordable homes. This will have significant knock on effects for the whole delivery of homes through Hart, it totally frustrates their declared policy as there will not be the opportunity to recoup this number of houses on the light of the other declared settlements.

This situation is further exacerbated by the development of office conversions which are making no contribution to affordable homes so in combination this defeats HDC's Policy. The only available solutions are to refuse permission, renege on Policy, or build a further disproportionate

	<p>number of houses to achieve a level of affordable housing.</p> <p>The development is NOT sustainable. It creates very limited employment, both in the short term and the long term. It does not provide adequate on site recreational and sporting facilities, does not support its own medical or educational needs; it is totally dependent on an adjoining existing settlement, principally Fleet. <b>It is a dislocated urban extension.</b> It is not a sustainable community.</p> <p>There is no provision to bring public transport onto the site. The road lay out is totally inadequate.</p> <p>It will pose significant pressures on overstressed infrastructure. The traffic analysis is flawed in that it relies on a distributed traffic flow to schools and to work, whereas in the former it most likely that all the children on site will go to a single location and therefore a suite of traffic analysis is more appropriate to highlight the potential impacts of any selected option.</p> <p>In accord with Natural England, Fleet Town Council would not support the use of the Bramshot Farm SANG to secure planning approval for this development.</p> <p>Overall Fleet Town Council cannot support this application on a whole range of issues, it has very little to commend it. The conclusion is refusal.</p>
6	<p><b>Noted:</b></p> <p>The weekly lists were noted</p>
7	<p><b>To Note</b></p> <p><b>Planning appeals:</b></p> <p>15/02915/FUL 329 Fleet Road Demolition of Nos.329-331 Fleet Road and erection of four storey hotel containing 71 bedrooms with parking for 39 cars Appeal Dismissed</p> <p><b>Enforcement cases received:</b></p> <p>17/00072/OPERT Bramshot Lane Complainant: PUBLIC Complaint Enforcement Enquiry</p> <p><b>Enforcement cases closed:</b></p> <p>16/00442/XPLAN3 5 Denning Close Complaint Noncompliance with the approved details of application14/03037/HMC - Materials. Conclusion Planning Application Approved</p> <p>16/00411/OPERT3 2C Guildford Road Complaint Erection of outbuilding to the front of the property</p>

	Conclusion Planning Application Approved
8	<p><b>Noted:</b></p> <p><b>Hart Planning Meeting Dates</b></p> <p>13<sup>th</sup> April</p>
9	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p> <p>Monday 24<sup>th</sup> April – 7pm in the RVS, Harlington</p>

**The meeting closed at 8.10pm**

**Signed:**.....

**Date:** .....